SENATE

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 4, 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 Vice President.

Rev. Father Alexander George, pastor of the St. John's Eastern Orthodox Church, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, offered the following prayer:

Almighty Father, in an era of trial, confusion, and anxiety, we turn to You, as an ever-present help in time of trouble.

You have blessed us and we are grateful. We thank You for this land, for its material resources and spiritual blessings, but one more thing we require of You—the vision, the courage, and the determination to build the kind of world in which You would have Your children live—a world of universal freedom, justice, and peace.

We thank You for this Senate which was called to establish such a world. Undergird our spirits and strengthen our faith that we may remain tireless in our efforts, loyalty unwavering, courage unfaltering, and hope invincible that our dream may be translated into a blessed reality. For this we pray through the One who turned people into followers and caused the revolution, Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, October 3, 1967, be approved.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions of the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, in accordance with the previous agreement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

[No. 274 Leg.]

Aiken	Dirksen	Lausche
Anderson	Dominick	Long, Mo.
Brewster	Ellender	Long, La.
Brooke	Gruening	Mansfield
Burdick	Hansen	McCarthy
Byrd, Va.	Harris	McGee
Carlson	Hart	McGovern
Church	Hartke	McIntyre
Clark	Hickenlooper	Metcalf
Cotton	Hill	Monroney
Curtis	Kennedy, N.Y.	Morton
Nelson	Prouty	Stennis
Pearson	Proxmire	Symington
Pell	Ribicoff	Talmadge
Percy	Scott	Williams, Del.

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

I also announce that 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.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). A quorum is not present.

Mr. CLARK. 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 Pennsylvania.

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	Mundt
Bartlett	Holland	Murphy
Bennett	Hollings	Muskie
Bible	Hruska	Randolph
Boggs	Inouye	Smathers
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Smith
Cannon	Javits	Sparkman
Case	Jordan, N.C.	Spong
Cooper	Jordan, Idaho	Thurmond
Dodd	Kennedy, Mass.	Tydings
Eastland	Kuchel	Williams, N.J.
Fannin	Magnuson	Yarborough
Fong	McClellan	Young, N. Dak.
Fulbright	Miller	Young, Ohio
Griffin	Mondale	
Hatfield	Morse	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

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. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, No. 371, offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY]. The time for debate is under the control of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], each Senator being allotted 10 minutes.

Who yields time?

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I would like to review briefly for the benefit of my colleagues the provisions of the Prouty-Scott amendment in the nature of a substitute for the Emergency Employment Act contained in title II of this bill.

Under our version, priority will be given to heads of families who are unemployed or low-income persons living in poverty in filling all positions created under title II.

We have added a part B to title II called the Human Investment Training Act. This is patterned in many respects on the Human Investment Act approach which I have sponsored for the last 3 years and which is supported by most of my Republican colleagues. Under this provision, the Secretary of Labor is authorized to make financial grants covering job-training costs to employers in private industry who institute training programs for the disadvantaged poor under plans approved by the Secretary of Labor.

Up to 37½ percent of title II funds may be used by the Secretary for implementing this type of creative job training. The Secretary of Labor may also spend an additional 20 percent of title II money for making further training programs available under the highly regarded on-the-job training and other MDTA programs.

Some of my colleagues sincerely believe that make-work programs provide an answer to our poverty problems. In my opinion, however, such an approach constitutes no real long-range solution to the war on poverty and is warranted only to the extent that some of our people are at a point in life where further education and training cannot qualify them for productive jobs.

Our proposal also contains much more realistic provisions with respect to funding of title II programs which should appeal to many who are concerned about increasing the fiscal deficit through excessive spending on nonmilitary programs.

There is presently a $2.8 billion authorization for title II of the bill. The Prouty-Scott substitute amendment reduces this authorization to $875 million plus $50 million for interest-free loans which will eventually be repaid to the Treasury.

This substantial saving is accomplished by eliminating all authorizations for fiscal 1969 and by substantially reducing the authorizations for fiscal 1968 which will have but 6 or 7 months remaining by the time this bill becomes law.

Mr. President, the concept that poverty can be substantially reduced only by the involvement of the private sector of our economy in meaningful training programs has received support from many and diverse sources.

Secretary of Labor Wirtz, in testimony before our committee, commented:

> The most underdeveloped aspect of the manpower program (and possibly the poverty program as well) involves the potential for increased private participation.

The 1967 manpower report to the President concluded that a basic issue in the occupational training task confronting us was "the possibility and desirability of financial assistance to employers to help them continue to carry the largest share of the training burden."

General President Hutcheson of the

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Carpenters' Union wrote in his organization's newspaper last year that—

> 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.

Nationally syndicated financial columnist Sylvia Porter wrote early this year:

> 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.

And, a well-known authority in the field of manpower programs recently told me that a survey which he had conducted around the country showed that MDTA had the capability to expand very rapidly and that participants in such programs could easily be doubled, but that "nobody has made that kind of proposal for MDTA."

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

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, involvement by private enterprise is the direction emphasized by the Prouty-Scott amendment, rather than the making of thousands of unmeaningful WPA-type jobs. Under our proposal, upon which you will shortly vote, more than $500 million of the $875 million authorized for title II will be available to the Secretary of Labor for implementing human investment and MDTA on-the-job training programs by private employers, and for other vocational and institutional training programs under MDTA. Of course, as I have already pointed out, priority in filling these positions will be given to unemployed and low-income persons in the poverty category who are heads of families.

Our substitute amendment also includes the amendment proposed by the junior Senator from South Dakota, which expands the definition of "eligible areas" for these programs to include rural areas which have problems of outmigration.

Mr. President, facing the issues squarely, I hope that the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee will find it possible to support the Prouty-Scott amendment, together with a majority of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], I ask unanimous consent to suggest the absence of a quorum, with the time to be charged to neither side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and 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.

How much time does the Senator from West Virginia yield himself?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. President, the Prouty-Scott amendment would substitute for the present title II of S. 2388 a modified version of that title, which would include both the Clark-Javits Emergency Employment Act—part A—and the Prouty Human Investment Act—part B—with a total authorization of $925 million for fiscal 1968. The amendment would thus authorize $375 million less than would be authorized for the Emergency Employment Act under the present title II in this fiscal year.

The amendment contains no fiscal 1969 authorization. The present title II would authorize $1.5 billion in fiscal 1969.

Under this amendment, at least 12½ percent of $875 million—$109,375,000—and up to 37½ percent of that sum—$327,125,000—would support part B projects, under which the Secretary of Labor would, pursuant to employer-submitted plans, make grants to employers to cover the costs of training and employing eligible persons.

Section 215 would extend tax advantages to employers receiving such assistance.

The remainder of $875 million would support part A, the Clark-Javits program. Fifty million dollars—instead of $300 million proposed by the committee—would be available for loans to support part A projects which, it is thought, would induce businesses to relocate in the ghettoes.

Mr. President, with all due respect to my distinguished colleagues from Vermont and Pennsylvania, I am compelled to state my opposition to the amendment which they have proposed to my motion to recommit.

The Senators propose the expenditure of just under a billion dollars to support virtually the same extremely dubious employment program approved by the committee, as well as to further the laudable purpose of getting business involved in training the poor. But the war on poverty is already involving business in training the poor—on an experimental basis—because neither OEO nor business yet knows for certain what will work best. No new legislative authority is needed and, until the experiments are evaluated, it would be the height of fiscal irresponsibility to pour in almost another billion dollars at the same time we are being asked to increase taxes.

The war on poverty is in trouble now because it has been trying to do too much too fast. What is needed now is a shakedown of current programs, not a hasty new beginning in a number of new directions.

There is plenty of authority in current legislation to do what is proposed by the Senator from Vermont. There are new pilot programs in these directions currently being begun or recently announced—all under current authorities.

For example, just the day before yesterday, President Johnson announced a $40-million pilot program under authority currently possessed by the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Department of Labor, the Department of Commerce, and other Government agencies to get private enterprise even more heavily involved in the war on poverty. The President made clear that these programs would be experimental in nature—that no one in or out of Government knew precisely which ones would work nor how they would work.

In the past few years, other programs of this general nature have been begun. In his speech yesterday, the Senator from Vermont was high in his praise of the Labor Department's on-the-job training program. But on-the-job training already exists under current legislation, and the Department of Labor has not requested additional authority nor does it need such authority.

In addition, OEO is currently experimenting with new approaches to the involvement of private business. If they work, their cost to the Federal budget and to the U.S. economy will be substantially less than the cost of the program proposed by the Senator from Vermont. An example is the success insurance program, which is designed to induce private employers to take the poor into training slots by reimbursing business only for those poor trainees who did not work out in these new jobs. It is quite clear that title I of the bill reported by the committee contains plenty of authority to continue and expand these approaches. Section 123 alone allows many new and experimental training programs, whether public or private. It allows ample authority for programs originally proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania as well as authority for these now proposed by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. President, let us think for a moment of the American taxpayer who makes the war on poverty possible. The amendment offered by the Senators from Vermont and Pennsylvania would add $925 million to the President's budget in this fiscal year. I have heard it said that this would be an improvement upon the committee-reported version of title II because it would involve $1.875 billion less than the committee version. However, the cost to the taxpayer in this fiscal year would be only $375 million less than the committee-approved version. If it is the intention or hope of our distinguished colleagues from Vermont and Pennsylvania to sweeten the taste of title II in this fashion, I am compelled to say that few, if any, of our taxpaying constituents can hope to find the taste of an additional $925 million, on top of an absolutely unprecedented peacetime deficit, to be sweet.

To approve any version of title II which I have yet heard suggested would be to make the entire war on poverty even more vulnerable than it already is with both the American public and with Congress. It is simply no answer, Mr. President, to the extravagance proposed in the committee-reported version of title II to instead propose to break the administration's budget ceiling by $925 million at

precisely the moment we are urging the administration to cut back on nondefense expenditures. In other words, this amendment is no cure to the committee version of title II.

Finally, Mr. President, it is clear that both the committee version of title II and that preferred by the sponsors of the pending amendment must be rejected on the grounds that neither version has been the subject of the thorough hearings traditionally required in this body prior to a commitment to a vast new domestic program. In fact, they have not been subject to any hearings at all. We have no clear idea of exactly how the so-called emergency employment program will work or exactly how it would related to—or perhaps duplicate and confuse—existing employment programs. We have no evidence that the so-called Human Investment Act would really be effective in reaching and benefiting those most in need of employment assistance. In any event, it would be unthinkable to commit ourselves to either of these alternative versions of title II without the benefit of the most extensive hearings and the most careful deliberation at the committee level.

Mr. President, for all the reasons which commend themselves to me, and I am sure to most of my distinguished colleagues, with great force, I urge that the pending amendment be rejected.

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 rejecting the Prouty amendment to my motion so that we can reach a clear-cut final vote on my motion to recommit with instructions to delete title II in its entirety.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. As I understand it, if the Prouty amendment is defeated, the question will recur on the motion of the Senator from West Virginia to strike title II.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. The purpose of the Senator's amendment to strike title II is to enable the war on poverty to continue without making it an all-out war on the American taxpayer.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes, and may I reiterate that, if the Prouty amendment is rejected, the vote will recur on my motion to recommit with instructions to report back forthwith with title II deleted.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. May I ask the Senator if it might not be possible to obtain some sort of agreement that we would vote on the Byrd motion first? My thought is that it would be logical to permit Senators who would simply like to vote for the big reduction provided in the Byrd motion to do so. If it does not carry, then we can vote on motions that would provide for lesser reductions. I wonder if it might be possible to arrange votes in that order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time of the Senator from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have 30 seconds.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, there is no time left.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 30 seconds.

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

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, both sides get 30 seconds, then.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Fine.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Could it be agreed that we would have an opportunity to vote for the larger reduction first, and then, if that fails to carry, that we could vote for lesser reduction?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I believe that the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont would have precedence over the vote on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Would the Senator from Vermont be willing to let us vote on the Byrd motion first, and then vote on the Prouty motion, in the event the Byrd motion fails?

Mr. PROUTY. No; if the Senator will yield, I think we have a clear-cut issue here, and should just follow through on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from Vermont has 6 minutes remaining. The time of the Senator from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I recognize we are not likely to convince anybody of anything in 1 minute. I am the coauthor, with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] of the basic measure, but I believe that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] has now sharpened and refined it in a way which is satisfactory to me, and I hope to Senator CLARK, and we support it.

Mr. President, the essence of the finding being made by the Senate, if it agrees to this amendment, is twofold:

First, we would be finding, by our vote, that jobs are the basis for dealing with the major national crisis in the slums and ghettos, and that there is no other basic and direct way to meet it; that the slums and ghettos need this application of help—which is sustained by three high-level commissions of the President appointed in 1966 and 1967, as well as, in my judgment, by every whit of the evidence before the committee on which I have the honor to serve with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], and others.

Second, Mr. President, the Senate would be finding that the crisis of the cities deserves, in the interests of the tranquillity and morale of the country, the priority which we would thus be giving it.

For those reasons, I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I hope that all Senators who intended to vote for the original Emergency Employment Act will support the unanimous view of the Democratic members of the subcommittee by voting for the Prouty amendment.

The Prouty amendment is the result of some intensive discussion between members of the subcommittee on both sides of the aisle. In my opinion, if Senators wish to do something for the poor in the cities, they will vote for the Prouty amendment, and not throw their votes away on a futile effort to pass the Emergency Employment Act as it came to the floor.

With the support of those on this side of the aisle who supported the committee on the Emergency Employment Act, I have some confidence that the Prouty amendment can be adopted.

I believe the Prouty amendment would do almost as much as can realistically be expected to be done in this fiscal year to get jobs for those in the cities who so badly need them. A vote for the Prouty amendment is a vote for an effective program in the war against poverty.

In conclusion, I point out that this is an authorization bill, not an appropriation bill. No one can tell how much it will cost the taxpayers of America, if anything, until the appropriating process has been completed. The rural part of this bill is just as important as the urban part. The rural ghettos, the delta counties, will receive their share of benefits.

I hope that the Prouty amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, how much time is remaining on each side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has 2 minutes remaining. The time of the Senator from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I have put on each Senator's desk a thumbnail sketch of what my amendment will accomplish.

First, it would reduce the $2.8 billion authorization in title II of the bill to $875 million, plus $50 million for interest-free loans which is repayable. That is a reduction of about $1.875 billion.

It would permit the Secretary of Labor to use up to $328,125,000 for human investment training programs run by private industry, which have been demonstrated to be the most effective type of job-training programs conducted thus far.

It would also permit the Secretary to use up to $175 million for on-the-job training and other vocational and institutional training programs under the Manpower Development and Training Act.

It would require the Secretary of Labor to give priority in filling all employment

and job training openings created by title II programs to unemployed and low-income persons in the poverty category who are heads of families. Thus, a total of $503,125,000 can be used by the Secretary for on-the-job and institutional training, designed to enable these people to acquire the skills to become productive.

This is a proposal which solicits the cooperation of industry; and under this proposal, I am sure that management and labor will cooperate with the Secretary of Labor to make this a successful program.

I realize that some people are unemployable, and that the Government, as the employer of last resort, will have to take care of them through job creation. I agree that it is far better to make some kind of jobs for them than to keep them on the welfare rolls. However, the main emphasis and thrust of my amendment is on training such people when and where they are trainable so that they can obtain the necessary skills to fill productive jobs in the private sector of our economy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 2 minutes have expired.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that each side be allowed 1 additional minute.

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

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I call attention again to these facts:

First. The activities that the Senators seek to have performed may largely be performed under present authority.

Second. No hearings have been held on this amendment or on title II of the bill.

Third. Title II was not requested by the administration.

Fourth. The shortcomings of the already-existing poverty programs should be corrected before we engage upon a new and costly venture.

Fifth. Even though the Prouty amendment purports to cut the authorization under title II, in reality it would only be reduced from $1.3 billion in fiscal year 1968 to $925 million—a reduction of only $325 million.

If we agree to the Prouty amendment, we will be saddling the taxpayers with a program which will cost at least $925 million and which has not been requested by the administration. So while the amendment appears to be making a cut, in reality it is authorizing $925 million that has not been requested by the administration and which will further increase the budget deficit if moneys are later appropriated.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, if we agree to the Prouty amendment, we shall be making it possible for a good many people who are now unemployable to receive training which will take them off the relief rolls. If that is not saving money for the taxpayers, I do not know what is. My amendment would cut by nearly $2 billion the authorization as proposed when the measure first came to the Senate floor.

I yield such time as I have remaining to the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I spent all of yesterday morning at a poverty conference, where I heard leaders of the poverty-stricken people of this country. I believe that the adoption of this amendment would save the taxpayers many times the initial cost of the Prouty amendment, because I know the poverty-stricken people of this country are looking to Congress to give them the program the Prouty amendment proposes. Certainly they recognize it is not in the administration bill; that is why this great effort is being made by the poverty-stricken people of this country to call attention to their plight and to seek to obtain the help for which they plead.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the committee report on the Emergency Employment Act includes ample documentation of the fact that its goal—jobs—is an absolute necessity in any solution to what we have come to recognize as the crisis of the cities.

The suggestion by Mayor Lindsay of New York last year that his city will need a 10-year Federal outlay of some $50 billion, and the interpolation of that figure into a $1,000 billion national requirement, shocked many of us into a new awareness of the crushing problems of decaying housing, woefully inadequate public facilities and services, and human despair that are plaguing our urban areas.

The availability of meaningful employment can attack these problems at all levels. A job can change dependency into dignity, and can build toward a lifetime of self-sufficiency for people who might alternatively spend all of their days on public assistance. Moreover, under the provisions of this bill, the jobs will be in the fulfillment of important public needs that would otherwise not be met.

At the same time, I think it is highly important to pay attention to the location of the jobs that will be created. Employment is needed in the cities by people who are there now. But we should also consider this legislation in light of the fact that some 600,000 Americans are migrating from the countryside to urban areas each year in search of work opportunities. The limited number of jobs it will create will clearly accomplish little in remedying existing urban unemployment if that heavy migration continues at the present rate.

Some 47 percent of the native South Dakotans who were living in 1960, for example, were residing in other States—a total of 430,194 people. By far, the largest proportionate share of them went to urban areas such as Los Angeles and San Francisco in California, which received 98,854 native South Dakotans, or Minneapolis-St. Paul in Minnesota, which was the destination of 53,749 people who left my State.

These people sought opportunities elsewhere primarily because of decreasing agricultural opportunities and corresponding business declines in small towns and cities. The process is continuing today.

These people may have found jobs. If so, they took the place of people who made up the internal population growth of the cities. If not, they and others like them from all parts of rural America are among the urban unemployed. In either case, they compounded both the physical and human problems of the cities that have their roots in overcrowding.

I do not believe that the Emergency Employment Act of 1967 can have its maximum beneficial impact unless some of the assistance it provides is directed toward stemming migration from the rural States to urban centers. I believe we need to do what we can to prevent further population shifts that add to the congestion of our cities.

The bill does recognize this need by calling for new jobs in both rural and urban areas. However, precisely because outmigration occurs, most rural areas would probably not be able to qualify under the criteria it uses for establishing areas that are eligible for assistance—chiefly unemployment and underemployment. A slow rate of economic growth, or even an actual drop in employment such as occurred in my State between 1950 and 1960, is usually not reflected by higher unemployment rates because those who cannot find work migrate to the cities.

To overcome this problem, I have offered an amendment which would add "problems of outmigration" as a factor to be considered along with unemployment, underemployment, and a high proportion of low-income people as a factor to be considered by the Secretary of Labor. This would have the effect of extending the benefits of the bill to rural States such as South Dakota. I am pleased that Senator PROUTY, of Vermont, a senior Republican member of the committee, is incorporating my amendment in his proposed revision of the bill.

Let me stress that, since migration is recognized as a problem that aggravates urban unemployment in the bill, my amendment in effect would merely bring the operative provisions of the bill more in line with its findings and declarations.

Mr. President, a job training program of this kind is in the interest of the American taxpayer because it will take people off the welfare rolls and train them for private industry. It will also take idle men off the streets where they provide the grist for costly violence, riots, and crime. The present system which relies so heavily on the welfare dole, is costly and ineffective. I want to see these financial and human costs reduced and the best way to do that is through good job training efforts. I also want the rural and small-town youth who are now leaving my State to be encouraged instead to stay with us. That can only be possible if we step up the job training and job opportunities in our rural States, which this program as revised by my amendment would help to do.

Senator PROUTY's version of the bill is considerably more modest than the committee version. I support it as a prudent,

less costly version of the job training bill. I support it because it relies more heavily on private industry to carry out job training. I support it because it takes into consideration rural States as well as urban areas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having expired, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARTLETT (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. INOUYE (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withdraw my vote.

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

I also announce that 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 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] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced as follows—yeas 42, nays 47:

[No. 275 Leg.]

YEAS—42

Aiken	Hatfield	Morton
Boggs	Jackson	Muskie
Brewster	Javits	Nelson
Brooke	Kennedy, Mass.	Pearson
Case	Kennedy, N.Y.	Pell
Church	Kuchel	Percy
Clark	Long, Mo.	Prouty
Cooper	Magnuson	Randolph
Dirksen	McCarthy	Ribicoff
Fong	McGee	Scott
Griffin	McGovern	Tydings
Gruening	Metcalf	Williams, N.J.
Harris	Mondale	Yarborough
Hart	Morse	Young, Ohio

NAYS—47

Allott	Bible	Byrd, W. Va.
Anderson	Burdick	Cannon
Bennett	Byrd, Va.	Carlson
Cotton	Holland	Murphy
Curtis	Hollings	Proxmire
Dodd	Hruska	Smathers
Dominick	Jordan, N.C.	Smith
Eastland	Jordan, Idaho	Sparkman
Ellender	Lausche	Spong
Fannin	Long, La.	Stennis
Fulbright	Mansfield	Symington
Hansen	McClellan	Talmadge
Hartke	McIntyre	Thurmond
Hayden	Miller	Williams, Del.
Hickenlooper	Monroney	Young, N. Dak.
Hill	Mundt	

NOT VOTING—11

Baker	Gore	Pastore
Bartlett	Inouye	Russell
Bayh	Montoya	Tower
Ervin	Moss	

So Mr. PROUTY's 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Arizona.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, with an amendment:

H.J. Res. 853. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 580).

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1968

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed immediately to consideration of House Joint Resolution 853, which is an amendment to the continuing resolution for fiscal year 1968.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 853) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. HAYDEN. This amendment, as it passed the House Tuesday, October 3, 1967, merely provides for the extension until October 10, 1967, of the existing provision of the first continuing resolution under which governmental activities without their regular annual appropriation have operated since June 30, 1967.

The committee recommends that the House resolution be amended to extend the termination date of the continuing resolution to October 23, 1967. The date provided for in the House-passed version is October 10, which is only 4 working days from today.

Four of the fiscal year 1968 appropriation bills, Interior, Treasury-Post Office, Legislative, and Defense, have been enacted into law. In addition, two fiscal year 1967 appropriation bills have been signed into law: the second supplemental and the Defense supplemental. The Agriculture and Independent Offices appropriation bills are in conference while the Labor-HEW conference report has been agreed to and filed.

The State, Justice, Commerce, and judiciary appropriation bill, the Transportation appropriation bill, the Public Works appropriation bill, and the NASA appropriation bill are on the Senate Calendar.

There is one appropriation bill in the Committee on Appropriations—the District of Columbia bill. Hearings have been virtually completed on this bill. The remaining three appropriation bills, foreign aid, military construction, and the supplemental, are in the House Committee on Appropriations awaiting authorization.

I urge the adoption of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DODD in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In line 5, after the word "thereof", strike out "October 10, 1967" and insert "October 23, 1967".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I believe that a joint resolution of this nature should be considered in a little less hubbub, so that Senators will know what they are voting on.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. MUNDT. This is the joint resolution which was passed by the House of Representatives to continue the appropriations at present levels until October 10. The Senate should be aware that this is a most unusual step. Normally, in traditional times, when we are not flirting with bankruptcy, we pass such joint resolutions——

Mr. DOMINICK. May we have order, Mr. President? I cannot hear the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The attachés will please take their seats. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. MUNDT. Normally, when we are not flirting with bankruptcy and courting financial disaster, we merely pass continuing resolutions a month or so at a time, when dilatory tactics in one body or the other delay the timely passage of appropriations bills and when meeting only from Tuesdays to Thursdays in the month of October tends to keep us here forever to get little business done. But these are not normal times, except that we still continue with our abbreviated workweeks, which I believe is wrong. Except for that, there is nothing normal about these times. We are in war.

Our financial problem is very serious. The administration is now trying to impose another 10-percent levy on the taxpayers. We are confronted with a $29 billion deficit, perhaps more.

So there was a reason why the House, in a rollcall vote, extended the present level of appropriations for only 10 days; and there is a reason why a collateral action was taken by the Ways and Means Committee, when it said, in effect, "We are not going to consider tax increases at all or have another committee meeting

unless and until either the President or Congress, or both, show us where some cuts can be made in the expenditures." That is the unusual feature of this matter as it comes before us today.

So when the resolution came to the Senate committee, it did not seem quite right merely to keep the same 10-day level approved by the House because by the time the joint resolution gets through and is on the President's desk, only 4 or 5 days might be left. But it did seem to many of us that it was entirely wrong to consider the resolution as just an ordinary extension of expenditures; because if we are to effectuate some economies, we should be working on them this week, right now, and not continue *to spend* until the end of October at the same old reckless level.

We had quite a little discussion in the committee. It was proposed by the President, and recommended by the President's spokesman on the committee, that the extension be continued until November 10. That would be normal, in normal times. It was finally suggested that the time be shortened a little, to the end of October. Some of us felt that it should be October 10, but that such action today might be a little unrealistic in getting the desired results.

Finally, as a substitute for the longer extension which was before us, I suggested that we extend the time only to Monday, October 23, because Sunday is the 22d and Saturday is the 21st, and unless Congress changes its habits—it does not meet much on Friday any more; and if it does, it does not usually vote—we would have only until the 20th, which would allow only 10 days beyond the House action. So my motion was adopted, I believe unanimously, but certainly without any dissenting votes, and the Senate should approve it here today. But I believe we should approve it with the recognition that it commits us and supports the House and applauds the move in the direction of some additional economizing.

We nearly voted almost a billion additional dollars this morning on a proposal that had never even had a hearing. No Senator who voted for it—except perhaps the author—knows exactly what was in it, and yet in the recent rollcall it was narrowly defeated.

We say we do not want tax increases; we do not want to belabor the poor taxpayer. But the Senate nearly said, "Here goes a billion dollars more." Actually, had we failed to defeat that proposal, the consequent upsurge of inflation would have oppressed and harassed the poverty stricken much more than they would have been aided by the near billion dollar new expenditures for untried programs.

Let us get serious about this matter of inflation. The time has come for some belt tightening, for some rescission measures; and the time has come for the watchdogs of the Treasury, if any remain, to remember, every time we now pass an appropriation bill, that it is for 9 months. We can cut back 25 percent on all the increases, effectuate economy, yet change nothing in the activity rate, because we are legislating now for only 9 months, appropriating for 9 months, but we continue to appropriate on a 12-month basis, while only 9 months remain in the fiscal year.

This is October. So far as I know, this session of Congress apparently never intends to adjourn. I see no activity stirring up. We do not meet in the evenings, we do not meet on Saturdays, we do not vote on Fridays, and sometimes we discontinue our work on Thursdays. That is not my responsibility. I am not the leadership. However, there are some economies we should effectuate and look at since we are not very busy at other jobs.

Somebody at the other end of the avenue and Members of this body and of the other body should remember that we are now committing ourselves as a group to try to do some economizing. That is what this very unusual, short term continuing resolution is all about.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have been interested in what the distinguished Senator from South Dakota has just said about a so-called abbreviated workweek in the Senate. I respectfully challenge the Senator's characterization and refer him to the fact that the record just does not bear him out—there have been no such abbreviated weeks in the Senate. I cite as my proof, in addition to my actual knowledge, and I am sure it is the Senate's actual knowledge, too, that up through October 1, the Senate had been in session 150 days, and during that time had been in session 783 hours and 36 minutes which is nearly 6 hours a day; in comparison with the other body which had been in session for 140 days, and the time in session had been 611 hours and 40 minutes.

I say to my distinguished colleague from South Dakota, the Senate has not been operating on a Tuesday-to-Thursday basis. We have been meeting on Saturdays, when necessary, but fortunately, thanks to the cooperation of the Senate as a whole, the calendar has remained relatively clear up to the present time. I am sure that a close investigation of the record will show that the Senate has been equally productive in disposing of legislation on Mondays and Fridays as on the other days of the week.

Insofar as the proposal to pass the buck to the President on this matter of expenditures is concerned, I would point out that we have a far greater responsibility than does the President; our responsibility is prescribed by the Constitution and if we are afraid to face up to that responsibility, we should not pass the buck to him.

I would point out also that over the past several months, the President has requested the leadership time and time again to please get the appropriation bills to him as soon as possible so that after determining where the Congress wanted emphasis, he could apply the scalpel and belt tightening and see where additional cuts may be made. But the task will not be easy. The figure within which to work is something like $21 billion. Is he going to cut out defense expenditures in excess of $70 billion? He cannot touch $13 billion we are paying in interest today. He should not touch veterans' benefits. What he has done has been to make recommendations based on laws passed by the Congress which call for appropriations, as well as authorizations. So I think that really it is our responsibility and not the President's; I think it is up to us here in the Congress to take the initiative on this matter.

There are four appropriation bills on the calendar now, including the NASA appropriation, which was reported by the full committee yesterday and appears on the calendar today. It will be some time before these bills reach the White House for signing; all of them are going to generate some debate and thorough consideration. The President should be given this opportunity to try to excise what he can out of the appropriation bills. But at the same time Congress must face up to its responsibility and cut out projects and appropriations which may not be deemed worthy and indeed, essential. In that respect I will be just as diligent as any Senator in fighting for appropriations for my State. However, I think collectively we should face up to our responsibility—our responsibility under the Constitution—to the end that this difficulty, which could well develop into a political donnybrook, could be forestalled and settled.

This matter of the continuing appropriations was discussed, as the Senator from South Dakota pointed out, in the Committee on Appropriations this morning. Various suggestions were made: to agree to the House date of October 10, to agree to a date of October 25, or to agree to a date of October 31—which I advocated by the way. Finally, in an effort to reach unanimous agreement, the committee agreed to the date proposed by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, who now has the floor.

It is true that we do face troublous times in this Nation today; in my opinion, the most troublous times in the history of our Republic. There is a very difficult situation in Vietnam. There is urban unrest in our cities. We face the possibility of a $29 billion or $30 billion deficit for this fiscal year; and even if the President's proposal is agreed to and a tax increase of something on the order of $7 billion or $8 billion is forthcoming, it will cause little more than a dent in this deficit.

If the position of the President prevails and the appropriation bills he sought are enacted, and if we do not go beyond the expenditures he recommends, it is his hope that between $4 and $5 billion will be saved. I say: Stay as close to his budget as possible, give him his chance, and let us face our responsibility.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I wish to say to my distinguished friend that what he said pretty well reiterates the point of view I expressed. I find nothing that he said which I can disagree with very seriously, except one point.

If I said, in my enthusiasm, trying to be heard above the chaos of the Senate, an abbreviated session of the Senate instead of the Congress, I apologize. I was trying to apply the rules of comity between the two Houses. If I did not, I

should have said Congress, and let the RECORD so show.

Neither am I trying to pass the buck to the President, and nothing that I said indicated that. We have some responsibility in Congress in this matter.

I am well advised, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and the Congress for 30 years, that Congress has the control of the purse. I always look a little askance at the process that says, "Hurry up. Pass appropriation bills. Send them to the White House, and let the President decide what to spend." That process moves in the direction of item vetoes. If we ever establish an item veto in this country we will have destroyed the independence of Congress because we will have given the President control of the purse.

I hope the President will make some rescissions. I think that Congress should, too. Before we send our appropriation bills down there, we should be sure that we have squeezed out all the waste we can.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator in that respect, but I point out that under the Reorganization Act we are supposed to have appropriation bills passed by June 30. Here we are 3 months into the present fiscal year, 3 months beyond the time when we were supposed to be finished with their consideration.

I am delighted the Senator has indicated that if we are not careful, if we operate under this procedure, we will give the President the right to item veto, which I think would be disastrous. I think the way we presently handle this matter—with bit-by-bit extensions, as is exemplified in the resolution today—tends to place more power down there at the White House, removing it from the Congress in the process. I agree with the Senator in that respect. I am opposed to any further diminution of the Senate's power. I hope the Senate will consider that today while considering this resolution.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the Senator has made a good point. Congress should maintain the control of the purse that the Constitution gives us. That control is basic and essential.

I shall join the Senator from Montana in trying to get Congress to exercise the power that the Constitution gives us over the purse, instead of trying to rely on the other end of the avenue in making decisions on the appropriations we make. We have the rescission power if we want to take a backward look at what we have done and find places to reduce expenditures already approved. I cannot, however, exonerate the President altogether in this matter. I join the Senator from Montana in saying that the President is not responsible for the fact that the Senate is 90 days late with the appropriation bills. But, if it is not the fault of the President or the Senate, the responsibility must repose somewhere. The rules of the Senate prohibit me from indicating where the difficulty lies. All I know is that someone must be responsible for the fact that, while we should pass these bills by the first of the fiscal year, that is not being done year after year. We cannot hold the President responsible for that, but we cannot exonerate him on other reasons for the prevailing "squandermania" in this era of extravagance.

If we examine the present appropriation bills and wonder why they grow so fast, so often, and so much, we will find that many new programs are being advocated, urged, and prodded through Congress on recommendations from the White House. Congress gets the price tag, and the President gets the credit. So we cannot simply say that our big financial deficit is because Congress has not met its responsibilities. After new programs have been pushed through, it becomes necessary to populate them with people to run them, and then Congress has to appropriate money for the programs.

But jointly, the Senate, the House, and the administration, since we are going to be here for quite a while, should effectuate some genuine economies. This should be done before we even take up a tax bill, to say nothing about having any hope of passing the new levies on to our hard-pressed taxpayers.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Although it is apropos to the Senator's remarks, I hesitate to bring up a minor matter. Since we are considering finances in the area of billions of dollars, this item for only $40 million might be considered inconsequential. However, I assure the Senator that $40 million is not a negligible amount to me.

Yesterday, it was brought to my attention that there is a new program, which will cost $40 million and which reportedly will be executed under existing legislation and with existing money. It is an entirely new slum employment program, which is relevant to the exact bill we are discussing. There are many considerations in the Labor and Public Welfare Committee regarding the approach to a slum employment plan, but here we find that there will be a pilot plan for five cities which have been selected, and the moneys will be provided from existing Federal programs.

I have asked the Secretary of Commerce, who made the statement, to supply me with the exact sources of the funds to be so used. I think we have the right to know. I have cited this as a concrete example—fresh, brand new—of what the Senator has been talking about.

However, I think the time has come when we should know. I, as a Senator, wish to find out as much about it as I can.

I agree completely that under present conditions it is time to take another hard look at the money that is provided and what is happening to our taxpayers' dollars, and to make certain that the Senate and House know exactly how much is being provided, how much is actually needed, and what use is actually being made of the money.

I mention this as a minor item. But $40 million multiplied enough times becomes quite an important sum.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's statement. Forty million dollars is not a minor item. It is an important amount of money to me. I do not know whether this is a program which has been enacted by legislation and for which funds have been appropriated as a line item or whether, in fact, it is, as the Senator says, money which has been accumulated by reprograming or overfinancing certain other programs so that the President uses it to start out on a new and gay adventure.

That is the kind of proposal as to which, I think, without incurring the danger of an item veto, the President could show us where economies can be made.

Let me illustrate another one: In the last days of December, 1965, in a brief and courageous statement which was applauded around the country, President Lyndon Johnson said from his ranch in Texas, "We have got too many people employed on the payroll."

He was meticulous. He was precise and exact in his language.

He did not say, "We have got too many people working in the Government." He said, "We have got too many people employed on the Federal payroll." He did not indicate what percentage were working.

More than 3 million persons are on the payroll. He said, "We are going to cut down 25,000 of them next month."

So I watched the papers, as other Senators, I know, watched the papers; but there was no 25,000 reduction that month.

The following month instead there was an increase of 23,000.

The number was increased by, I think it was, 17,000 the following month.

In the next 12 months—looking back—President Johnson (by executive action on the part of his administration, by scratches of the pen, added 200,000 more persons to the Federal payroll.

There are 200,000 persons who can be taken off the Federal payroll by the man who added them. There is a logical and effective place for the President to cut down, without trying to exercise the item veto, a place where he can help to effectuate an economy.

Statisticians figure that the average Federal employee costs the taxpayer $7,000 a year. Some, of course, are paid more and some less. That is the average cost, however.

The 200,000 multiplied by $7,000 is $1,400 million. The President could save us that much money and take that burden off the taxpayers simply by taking off the payroll the 200,000 people he added to the payroll after the time he said there were already 25,000 too many on that same payroll.

That kind of cooperation between Congress and the administration could help to obviate the necessity for a tax bill, or could make the enactment of a tax bill effective in curbing inflation if we find we still have to have one, after we have engaged in some economies.

Those kinds of exercises of the scalpel, which the Senator from Montana talks about, are within the proper administrative purview of the President, and he does not have to exercise the item veto to obtain these economies. He also can make sure that there are not those extra funds which come at this time of year

when we vote a 12-month appropriation to meet 9 calendar months for the remainder of the year. We have already financed, at the present level, the first 90 days by our continuing resolutions.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wish the Senator, when he talks about additions to the payroll, would differentiate between those added to the Defense Establishment and to the war effort, and those which were added to the regular Government departments.

It is my distinct impression—and the Senator is a Member of the Appropriations Committee—that in most of the regular Government departments we have held employment, in many cases, at a plateau—in some cases, at a lower level.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct about his overall concept that war is responsible for the addition of some people to the Federal payroll, but the Senator is talking about the wrong war. In the last year, there has not been a great expansion of civilian employment at the Pentagon necessitated by the war, but there have been a great many additions of civilian payrollers in the Government in fighting the war on poverty. I say that without any criticism of the war on poverty.

But let us find out what we are doing. The President has said and the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee has said that in the past 5 years this country has spent more money fighting the war on poverty than it has in fighting the war in Vietnam.

Unhappily, we do not seem to be winning either one.

Let us keep the record straight. It is not the war in Vietnam which has created the 200,000 additional employees; it is the war on poverty.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We should be more definitive about where they were added. I do not know the figure. The Senator is probably correct.

Mr. MUNDT. I say they have not been added to the old-line agencies for the established traditional functions of the Government.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Colorado and I usually start out with a lecture on Parkinson's law within the independent agencies. I must say that in the past 3 years we have kept employment almost at a plateau. Only with rare exceptions have there been any increases in those agencies or others.

Second, I think it ought to be understood, when we talk about the responsibilities of Congress, that we speak only for the Senate. I do not know of an appropriation bill—most of them are now ready for action—which has not been under the budget estimate in many cases. I do not know of an appropriation bill, with the exception of the one involving the OEO and other similar programs, in which that is not true. With respect to the regular appropriations, the Appropriations Committee has lived up to its responsibility.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct. Those bills are under the budget estimate most of the time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. They are under the budget.

I go back to the independent agencies appropriation bill, which is a big bill. In the past 12 years we have kept that bill under the budget estimates; for instance, a total of something like $6 billion.

As was pointed out, there is one agency we cannot do anything about. I refer to the Veterans' Administration appropriation. The appropriation for that agency has gone up, but most of its costs are fixed charges; there is not much we can do about them.

Medical costs have increased. The veterans are getting older. I think there are in this country, from all the wars, going way back, 21 million veterans.

I think the Senate Appropriations Committee, particularly the subcommittees having to do with the regular Government agencies, have done a real, responsible job in cutting the budgets. All the bills that I know of are ready for floor action. The appropriation bill for the new Department of Transportation is an exception. We had no criteria to work with, because that Department is new. But the rest have been under the budget. I think if we added up the cuts they would run into hundreds of millions of dollars.

The poverty program is another story, also the so-called war—or both wars, whatever one wants to call them. But I think we have done a good job and a responsible job. Perhaps some programs could be cut, but I suggest that some of the appropriations that the committee agreed to proceed with are somewhat necessary, because unless some of the programs are kept going, in which the Federal Government participates jointly with private enterprise, as it does in many of them, earnings will not be created that will enable taxes to be paid into the Treasury.

Many programs could be cut, and we might find the Treasury in the same condition as Mother Hubbard's cupboard. In other words, we must proceed with some of these programs so as to keep the country moving, in order that money can come into the Treasury.

I have said I oppose the tax bill because I am not sure that the additional $7 billion or $8 billion in taxes might not have the psychological effect on the country of denying the Treasury perhaps $15 billion. I do not know whether we have reached that economic condition, but the Appropriations Committee has been very diligent.

I work on about five subcommittees. To date, we have cut every appropriation bill under the budget estimates, so far as I know. I asked the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] about the HEW bill, which he handles. That bill has been somewhat over the budget recently, but he tells me that even his bill is under the budget.

I am sure that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] will agree with me that we have kept the appropriations under the budget in all the committees on which we serve. The space bill was reported today. That bill is a great deal under the budget, and the authorization, which came after the budget cut was way down. We cut it under the authorization. Perhaps we should have cut it more.

However, some programs must be kept going in order to take care of the economy, so as to get money into the Treasury. Sometimes it is pennywise and pound foolish to say we are not going to advance money to keep certain programs moving, particularly where there is a joint effort between the Federal Government and private enterprise to keep the economy of the country moving.

The Senator from South Dakota and I have been members of the Appropriations Committee for a long, long time. It has taken a pretty diligent job to do much cutting under the original budgets sent up to us by the President.

Mr. MUNDT. I am glad the Senator emphasized that, because it is true. I did not emphasize it in my statement.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I did not suggest that the Senator did not. I can understand the argument over the new programs—the poverty program, the program for the cities, and others which are comparatively new. There we come up against a question of judgment as to whether they are worthwhile continuing. I have heard it suggested that the public works bill is always an easy one to pick on. Some of these programs can be suspended, but unless some public works programs are continued, programs which create jobs and keep the economy moving forward, the Treasury would lose more by cutting out those appropriations than if Congress provided the money.

Mr. MUNDT. There is no question about that. I too am proud of the fact that, on the Senate side—and let it be said for the House side, too—we have kept below the budget estimate.

For the benefit of the people in the country who read the RECORD, so that they can understand governmental gobbledygook, when we talk about cutting under the budget, I should explain that the budget is simply the amount that President Johnson, or whoever is President, asks Congress to provide for his programs. This means that when Congress provides appropriations that are under the budget, it provides less than what the President has asked to be enabled to spend.

So we have effected some economies. The question remains: Who is spending the money? Who is responsible for it? At least, when Congress cuts under the budget, we deny the President some of the money he has asked for. It is not easy to do. It takes cooperation between Democrats and Republicans. We do not do it capriciously or on every item, but we do it where it can be done and that is a precise demonstration of specific economies being produced by congressional action.

I think we should declare an armistice on the war on the American dollar simply by suspending some programs and holding them in abeyance during the war. Some of these programs could be slowed down during the war. Some of them could be put entirely on the shelf by saying, "This is a wonderful project, but let us do it after the war is over." I do not think Congress can conduct business as usual in wartime any more than we can have business as usual around the countryside in time of war—and we are in a war. In fact, I think the Senate has been spending a great deal more time debating the war—with futility—than it has the

economy which is an area of action in which we have authority to act.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, first of all, the matter pending before us is the continuing resolution, which I believe came out of the committee almost unanimously, and which I support, but it has raised questions which ought to be discussed now, at the time it is being considered.

I do not want anything I say to be considered in opposition to the resolution, because I do support the committee action and the resolution in its amended form. But there are certain implications that arise out of the situation in which we find ourselves today of which we ought to take cognizance. In fact, we ought to be aware that there is a red light in front of us and that we had better slow down in the course we are pursuing. The distinguished Senator from South Dakota has touched on this point briefly.

A few moments ago on the floor of the Senate the distinguished majority leader used the term that we should get these bills passed and then let the President "apply the scalpel." Mr. President, if we accept this kind of thing, the very basic constitutional processes of this country are in dire danger. It is the obligation of the Congress to appropriate after proper authorization.

Of course, we recognize the right of the President to withhold after Congress has appropriated. But to fall into the mental trap of saying "We will just pass these bills, and let the President apply the scalpel" simply means that we are transferring all of our authority to the President in the appropriations process; and where, to this budget of $131 billion, the scalpel will be applied becomes then the prerogative, not of Congress, but of one man down at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

I was interested in the discussion between the two members of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], who is the chairman of the Independent Offices Subcommittee, of which I am ranking minority member. But after all is said and done, the facts are that the increase in total spending since 1960 has been 83 percent, and nondefense spending has more than doubled. Much of it is accounted for, of course, by increased Federal employment.

It seems to me if we are going to get Congress back on the right legislative track, there are certain things that should be done. But I am absolutely opposed to the idea of sending our appropriations down to the President, all $131 billion of them, and letting the President, in effect, use an item veto on such things as he wishes. Heaven knows what that would be. Probably none of us would agree with the way he did it, and that includes the members of the majority party as well as those of my party.

In seeking to put us back on track, I remind the Senate that the President said, more than 2 months ago, that he was anticipating and staring right in the face, a $28 billion deficit. But we have not received from the President, during this entire year—although the inflationary impact on our economy has been apparent for months—one single modification of the budget. If there have been any modifications, they have all been upward.

I have in my hand a chart which, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. ALLOTT. I see that the budget estimate on the Treasury-Post Office bill was $7,615 million. The conference committee's final bill was $7,545 million, or $69 million under the budget figure.

The Interior bill, in the President's budget, was in the amount of $1,458,000,000, and the bill as passed was in the amount of $1,382,000,000, or $75 million under the budget figure.

The Defense bill, which amounted to $71.5 billion, in round figures, in the budget, was finally passed in the amount of $69,936,000,000, or $1,647,000,000 under the budget.

So the guidelines that the President set down for us in his budget at the beginning of the year have remained unchanged; and those of us who serve on the Appropriations Committee know all too well why they remain unchanged. When the independent offices appropriation bill was recently considered by the Senate, particularly as to the item for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the pressure was on every member of that committee to put every last dollar that the President had requested in his budget in that bill. The pressure on the committee was so great, and the pressure on the Senate was so great, that every last dollar the President asked for went into that bill, in accordance with the budget which he submitted to us in January.

I think, as I look through these figures—and I believe these are the only four appropriation bills that have become law in this session; these figures were hastily gotten together for me, but in those bills which have passed the Senate or been reported to the Senate, in every instance, they are decidedly less than the budget figures. I say and I believe that in view of the situation in this country, which the President himself recognized, he had an obligation to send to us, not yesterday, not last week, but 2 or 3 months ago, if not by the beginning of the summer, an amended budget, to try to stave off this financial dilemma, if in fact it does not turn out to be a catastrophe, which we face.

I say only this in conclusion: I am concerned about this method of procedure. I am unwilling, as a Senator, having taken my oath of office before the Senate three times, to concede to the President, in effect, an item veto, and to pass bills based upon his budget which he submitted to us the first of the year, without any revision from him, and say, "Well, we are going merrily on our way, here is the budget; now you cut it wherever you desire."

When we do that, if we fall into that trap—and that is what many people are thinking of today, right here in the Senate and in the House of Representatives—if we fall into the trap of seeking to let the President do our job for us, we will have surrendered more power to the President this year than Congress has surrendered to him in the last 10 years.

There is only one path for us to follow, and that is to do our job as effectively as we can. But I feel it is a necessity that I try to point out to Congress the trap in which we are becoming ensnared, which can bode no good for the country, and can only serve to break down our legislative processes and give to the President a power that every Congress in the history of the United States has always refused to give to the President—that of an item veto—because that is what shirking our responsibility would mean.

EXHIBIT 1

Bill	Budget estimate	House passed	Senate passed	Plus or minus budget	Conference	Plus or minus budget	Public Law No.
Treasury-Post Office	$7,615.15	$7,499.23	$7,555.17	−$59.98	$7,545.64	−$69.51	90-47
District of Columbia	526.06	463.34					
Interior	1,458.22	1,365.31	1,399.36	−58.86	1,382.85	−75.37	90-28
Independent offices	10,804.64	10,013.18	10,487.64	−317.11			
Labor-HEW	13,424.15	13,137.48	13,421.66	−2.49	13,276.02		
State, Justice, Commerce	2,342.94	2,194.03	[1] 2,185.87				
Legislative	[2] 231.31	228.09	275.89		275.70		90-57
Agriculture	5,021.09	4,770.58	6,782.53	+1,761.43			
Defense	71,584.00	70,295.20	70,132.32	−1,427.58	69,936.63	−1,647.38	90-96
Transportation	1,718.62	1,530.20	[1] 1,615.41				
Public works	4,867.81	4,622.92	[1] 4,776.06				
NASA	5,100.00	4,583.40	[1] 4,678.90				

[1] Reported version; no Senate action yet.
[2] Estimate to House; estimate to Senate, $276.01.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. I applaud the Senator from Colorado for pointing out this potential entrapment. But those of us on this side of the aisle are in a very difficult dilemma. We do what we can to hold down the appropriations. I am sure that the Senator from Colorado has done more than his share in trying to hold down appropriations within the Appropriations Committee.

But when the chips are down, Mr. President, we are outvoted. We do not control the Senate. These appropriations are made, apparently, on the basis of the budget that was presented earlier this year, which is long since outdated.

People then say, "Well, the Appropriations Committee did a pretty good job.

It held the figure down below the budget." Or they say, "It didn't exceed the budget."

This is relatively meaningless when the budget itself is completely out of date. It went out of date formally about 2 months ago when the President issued the supplemental budget message in which he asked for a 10-percent tax increase and indicated that their figures were off a little bit as of early this year; that expenditures were going to be several billion dollars more and that revenues were going to be several billion dollars less.

What should have been done, as the Senator from Colorado ably pointed out, is for the President to have sent along a supplemental list of budget requests geared into his supplemental budget message and then let the Appropriations Committee consider those recommendations. However, no recommendations were forthcoming.

That does not mean, however, that the legislative branch of the Government should compound the error by shirking its responsibility to the taxpayers of this country. And it still had the responsibility to look at this supplemental budget message of the President and be guided accordingly in its appropriations. However, it has not done so.

In fairness, I recognize what so many of our colleagues in the House have been trying to do, because they have been in the same boat that the Senator from Colorado and other Senators on this side of the aisle have been in. They have been trying to cut appropriations in the House. They have been trying to recognize that the original budget request was outdated and outmoded and that there was an impending $29 billion deficit. However, they were not able to succeed because they did not have the votes.

So the Congress itself, as a whole, shirked its responsibility, apparently wanting to play a cat and mouse game with the President over who is going to face the public reaction to recommended cuts in the programs, and shirking its responsibility by appropriating according to the outdated original budget. We are faced with a $29 billion deficit as a result.

So, a group of representatives, faced with, I think, no other alternative, have said: "Since those in control of the legislative branch of the Government have shirked their responsibility, the only way we can see to cut this deficit down and put some kind of a stop to inflation and high interest rates is to give the President a direction to take the scalpel and cut off $5 billion or so."

It is an exceedingly difficult situation to be faced with. Members of the legislative branch of the Government who have been unable to get those in control of the legislative branch to live up to their responsibilities to have this Government live within its means, have as a last resort said, "Well, if we have to, for the sake of the economy of this country, for the sake of the soundness of the American dollar, and for the sake of stopping inflation and the high interest rates, let us abdicate a proper legislative power and let the President use a scalpel to the extent of $5 billion."

I do not like to see this last resort have to come about, but I do not know what else there is to do.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] offered several amendments last week to the appropriations bill on independent offices and HUD. Every one of those amendments was rejected by a vote of about 2 to 1 or 3 to 1. And those amendments were not designed to eliminate programs. They were designed to cut the figures back to the amount the House itself had appropriated.

In the face of that, I do not see how I or any other Member of this side of the aisle can expect to do anything except take this action as a last resort. And when I refer to this side of the aisle, I give recognition to a few of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have joined with us in trying to do something about it. However, those in control of this body have frustrated that effort. I do not know what else we can do now.

It is too late. They are not going to recall the appropriations bills and not only cut them below the budget at the beginning of the year but cut them down to fit the budget that came out 2 months ago.

I do not know what else we will do except to say to the President, "Mr. President, we will give you a tax increase if you will use the scalpel and cut $5 billion in expenditures so that we will have a two-way sacrifice: a sacrifice by the taxpayers and a sacrifice by the administration."

With that one exception, I do agree with what the Senator from Colorado has said.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator and appreciate his remarks.

In conclusion, I do not think this is a situation where we ought, for 1 minute, to depend upon the President to apply the scalpel.

If we do, we are surrendering our rights, powers, and authority. And frankly, I do not have the confidence in any man that I would have in the Senate to exercise the power of cutting the appropriation bills in the areas in which it thinks they should be cut.

After all, we all represent States. We represent a composite point of view of the United States. We are elected directly by our constituents. This is a surrender. It is a mental entrapment that I do not think Congress should abide by.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I support the resolution reported by the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona. I should like to comment a moment or two on the action taken yesterday in the House of Representatives.

It seems to me that the action of the House Ways and Means Committee in refusing to consider the President's 10-percent tax increase proposal until Federal spending has been reduced has great significance.

The House Ways and Means Committee is dominated by Democrats and is led by the distinguished Representative WILBUR MILLS, of Arkansas. That committee acted by the impressive vote of 20 to 5.

In my judgment, the committee majority has a far more accurate view of the sentiment of the public than does the Johnson administration.

I applaud the action of the House committee under the chairmanship of Representative MILLS. Neither the President nor Congress has faced squarely the need to get this Nation back on a sound fiscal basis. We have a joint responsibility, as I see it. The President and Congress must act jointly in this matter of fiscal responsibility.

Under the law, the President has the responsibility to submit a budget, but only Congress has the power to appropriate.

I was most pleased—and I think it is highly important—to have this debate take place today because the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]—all these outstanding Senators—have made clear that the Senate has reduced the spending proposals submitted to Congress by the President.

In order for our Government to return to a higher degree of fiscal responsibility, it is important that the President of the United States take the leadership in this matter. It is important that he take the leadership and submit to Congress an amended budget.

This morning, various Members of the Senate, led by the distinguished senior Senator from Washington, have pointed out that the Senate has cut the appropriations recommended by the President, and presumably additional cuts will be made in the President's proposals. But as I view the matter, that is not enough to accomplish the job.

It is necessary that the President submit a revised and reduced budget and take the leadership in a matter of such grave fiscal difficulty.

The gravity of our situation has been pointed up by the action yesterday of the House Ways and Means Committee, which, by a vote of 20 to 5, under the leadership of the distinguished Democratic chairman, made clear that it will not consider a tax increase as recommended by the President until Congress and the President have taken steps to reduce Federal spending.

I am not impressed with the argument that Congress should pass the appropriations bills and then let the President make the decision as to whether or not and where there will be reductions. The effect of that argument is to say, "$5 to $7 billion of unnecessary spending is included in this budget, but we want you to appropriate that money anyway—appropriate $5 to $7 billion more than is necessary—and then the President will determine whether or not to spend it and, if so, where."

I do not believe that is the appropriate approach. I believe that the appropriate approach is to follow the established law and procedures, that the President should submit a budget—in this case a revised budget—and then Congress should consider his recommendations and vote on the appropriations it believes are necessary.

I submit that unless spending is checked, the citizens of our Nation must

pay much heavier taxes or suffer severe inflation—and both or either of these results hit hardest the average citizen.

As has been pointed out on the floor of the Senate this morning, Federal spending has increased 87 percent since 1960, and more than 50 percent of this increase has been in nondefense spending.

Perhaps Chairman MILLS and his strategic committee will provide the rallying point for those who want more sanity in the handling of the taxpayer's dollar.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I agree with the majority leader and other Senators who have said that it is the responsibility of Congress to cut these appropriations.

In this connection, I call attention to the fact that four appropriations bills are on the Senate Calendar, and I am certain that an opportunity to cut the appropriations will be available to us at that time. Amendments to reduce those appropriations will be submitted. How we vote on those measures will show whether or not we, as Members of the Senate, are in earnest when we suggest cutting the appropriations.

Much has been said about the fact that we can achieve economy by merely voting for all that is in the budget. I call attention to the fact that this annual escalation in expenditures develops because in the original appropriations Congress will approve 99 percent of the budget and then boast that we have reduced expenditures by 1 percent. But we overlook the fact that we get at least one or two supplemental appropriations for each of these agencies. When we get through we almost always have approximately 115 to 120 percent appropriations as compared with the year before.

An excuse has been made that the reason so many employees were added in the last few months is that a war is going on.

On September 20, 1966, at which time the President issued an Executive order freezing civilian employment in the Federal Government at the then existing level, the same war was going on, and it was just as serious as it is today. Notwithstanding the Executive order, the administration in the succeeding 9 months added 206,432 civilian employees to the Federal Government. They were not all in defense agencies; over 120,000 were scattered throughout the various civilian agencies to take care of the expansion of the Great Society.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a breakdown of these 121,123 employees. This shows that every agency of the Government added to the public payroll in violation of the President's Executive order freezing employment.

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

Department or agency	June 1966	June 1967	Difference
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT DEFENSE)			
Agriculture	118,585	121,871	+3,286
Commerce	39,873	38,193	−1,680
Health, Education, and Welfare	100,012	105,600	+5,588
Housing and Urban Development	14,464	14,757	+293
Interior	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	----------	58,325	+58,325
Treasury	91,365	89,496	−1,869
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT			
White House Office	295	272	−23
Bureau of the Budget	626	654	+28
Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources	----------	23	+23
Council of Economic Advisers	53	55	+2
Executive Mansion and Grounds	68	68	----------
National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber	22	40	+18
National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty	----------	18	+18
National Aeronautics and Space Council	28	28	----------
National Conference on the Problems of Mexican-American and Puerto Rican Communities	----------	2	+2
National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development	----------	24	+24
National Security Council	37	38	+1
Office of Economic Opportunity	2,908	3,020	+112
Office of Emergency Planning	414	425	+11
Office of Science and Technology	55	101	+46
Office of Special Representative for Trade Negotiations	31	23	−8
President's Commission on Budget Concepts	----------	16	+16
President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia	26	----------	−26
President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice	46	7	−39
President's Commission on Consumer Interests	27	19	−8
President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in Housing	8	6	−2
President's Council on Youth Opportunity	----------	4	+4
White House Conference on Civil Rights	43	----------	−43
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	24	28	+4
American Battle Monuments Commission	439	440	+1
Atomic Energy Commission	7,445	7,506	+61
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES—Continued			
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	693	753	+60
Civil Aeronautics Board	824	639	−185
Civil Service Commission	4,385	5,499	+1,114
Commission on Civil Rights	167	173	+6
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission	227	362	+135
Export-Import Bank of Washington	302	310	+8
Farm Credit Administration	239	233	−6
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	5	9	+4
Federal Communications Commission	1,541	1,538	−3
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,573	1,837	+264
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,288	1,320	+32
Federal Maritime Commission	257	270	+13
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	436	451	+15
Federal Power Commission	1,163	1,208	+45
Federal Radiation Council	6	4	−2
Federal Trade Commission	1,136	1,173	+37
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	191	110	−81
General Accounting Office	4,144	4,219	+75
General Services Administration	38,175	39,891	+1,716
Government Printing Office	7,568	7,688	+120
Indian Claims Commission	19	20	+1
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,383	1,952	−431
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	35,708	35,860	+152
National Capital Housing Authority	501	658	+157
National Capital Planning Commission	62	74	+12
National Capital Transportation Agency	39	42	+3
National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities	74	91	+17
National Gallery of Art	372	411	+39
National Labor Relations Board	2,327	2,360	+33
National Mediation Board	139	140	+1
National Science Foundation	1,121	1,291	+170
Panama Canal	15,204	15,569	+365
Railroad Retirement Board	1,707	1,747	+40
Renegotiation Board	179	178	−1
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,385	1,390	+5
Selective Service System	9,047	9,014	−33
Small Business Administration	4,106	4,321	+215
Smithsonian Institution	2,042	2,213	+171
Soldiers' Home	1,141	1,152	+11
Tariff Commission	294	292	−2
Tax Court of the United States	156	154	−2
Tennessee Valley Authority	17,943	18,736	+793
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	187	180	−7
U.S. Information Agency	11,802	12,114	+312
Veterans' Administration	170,228	173,474	+3,246
Water Resources Council	5	29	+24
Total	1,556,220	1,677,343	121,123

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I mentioned that these 206,432 employees are costing $1.5 billion a year in additional expenditures, just to pay for employees whom President Johnson said, as recently as September 20, 1966, that he did not need.

The August report on civilian employment by the Federal Government discloses a reduction of 10,593 in the month of August as contrasted to a 32,215 increase for July, leaving a net increase thus far for this fiscal year of 21,622 extra employees.

This increase of 21,000 employees for the first 2 months of fiscal 1968 comes on top of an increase of 206,432 employees who were added in the last 9 months of the preceding fiscal year.

It should be noted that these increases in civilian employment by the Federal Government have taken place since the September 20, 1966, Executive order which purportedly froze the Federal payroll at the then existing level.

I ask unanimous consent that this August report, as released by the chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported civilian employment in the month of August totaling 3,001,781. This was a net decrease of 10,593 as compared with employment reported in the preceding month of July, reflecting reduction in temporary seasonal employment and temporary summer employment under the President's youth opportunity program.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1968, which began July 1, 1967, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
July 1967	3,012,374	32,215	--------
August	3,001,781	--------	10,593

Total federal employment in civilian agencies for the month of August was 1,695,235, a decrease of 5,582 as compared with the July total of 1,700,817. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in August was 1,306,546, a decrease of 5,011 as compared with 1,311,557 in July.

Civilian agencies reporting the larger decreases were Agriculture Department with 2,626, Veterans' Administration with 1,903, Interior Department with 838, and Treasury Department with 688. The largest increases were reported by Post Office Department with 1,458 and HEW Department with 535.

In the Department of Defense the larger decreases in civilian employment were reported by the Air Force with 4,092, and Defense Supply Agency with 1,905. Increases were reported by the Army with 758 and the Navy with 346.

Total employment inside the United States in August was 2,761,678, a decrease of 14,194 as compared with July. Total employment outside the United States in August was 240,103, an increase of 3,601 as compared with July. Industrial employment by federal agencies in August was 605,942, an increase of 1,461 as compared with July.

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

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 3,001,781 civilian employees certified to the Committee by federal agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in U.S. Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 119,630 foreign nationals working for U.S. agencies overseas during August who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The number in July was 122,547.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. As one example of the increased expenditures in the forthcoming appropriation bills, I invite attention to the public works appropriation, which will be before the Senate within the next couple of days. The budget estimate included nine new starts, involving future commitments of $139,756,000. The House committee approved five of those projects for future commitment, totaling $16,799,000, and provided only for land acquisitions on the remaining four projects. But then the House itself proceeded to add 16 new starts, involving future commitments of $80,028,000.

The Senate committee restored the four construction starts which the House had eliminated and then proceeded to approve 50 new construction starts involving a total future commitment of $529,387,000 over the life of those projects. These are new projects, over and beyond those provided in the budget. They are in the bill which will be before the Senate in the next couple of days, and how the Senate will vote on these proposals will determine just how serious we are in reducing expenditures.

I agree completely that it is rather hypocritical for Congress to vote the full amount of appropriations, and then later pass a joint resolution asking the President to do what we in Congress have not had the courage to do.

If we are in favor of cutting appropriations let us cut them by our votes in the Senate. Let us not pass the buck to the President. It is our responsibility.

Lest there be any misunderstanding, I am not excusing the President from his responsibility. The addition of the 206,000 employees by the executive branch was a violation of the President's own Executive order. The $1.5 million that is being paid to meet their payroll is the responsibility of the President. The only way Congress can overcome that action is by a resolution to rescind it or a cut in their appropriations. Far too often the President has been talking on both sides of this question. He talks economy in the daytime; but at night, when the lights are off in the White House, the spending gates are wide open. I say that what we need is more light at the White House so that the taxpayers can see what is going on.

(At this point Mr. HOLLINGS assumed the chair.)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate long. I favor this resolution. However, I consider it my duty to speak briefly because I believe I represent a point of view which needs to be expressed, and which is held by a good many Senators.

Mr. President, we face a financial crisis with a $29 billion deficit and we must face the facts in terms of what it takes to fight a war. That is what we must recognize. I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations. I am not given to being classed as one of the traditional economizers who might take the position to cut at any price, for any reason. I do not feel that way. I feel we cannot accept the $29 billion deficit. In my judgment the most that we can possibly tolerate without serious financial dislocation, unless we tax to get more money, is a budget deficit of between $10 and $15 billion.

I do not exculpate the President; on the contrary, I think he has a clear duty. His clear duty is to send to the Congress a message giving the priorities as he sees them upon which he desires that there be reductions of expenditures of roughly $5 billion, as is being suggested in the other body. The reason is that these sporadic cuts, based on judgment and opinion as to economizing, are not economizing and do not represent national priorities, as this is not a matter of judgment on each item or cut; but there should be a certain amount of money to show where economies will fall without impairment of the situation. It is the duty of the President to give us his judgment based upon that assumption, just as it is our judgment to give our opinion.

Mr. President, Congress must also, in my judgment, be ready to effect those cuts, which I say should be about $5 billion; but it is also the President's duty to inform us as to what tax loopholes can be closed, and there are quite a few, beginning with the 27 percent depletion allowance for oil and gas. Closing that loophole should aggregate between $3 billion and $5 billion. Then, we should, as a duty, add a tax surcharge aggregating roughly the same amount. Then, we would have had a contribution from every sector of society so that they will know what it means to fight a war and we will have brought the deficit down to manageable proportions. This is the only way it can happen.

Traditionally the President is elected by the people and that is why he has the power. He also has a duty to inform the people. He must tell us the priorities. It will not do for him to tell us he will take $1 billion off of this item or $2 billion off of that item, because a majority feel this way about it.

Mr. President, this is not a situation for business as usual. It is the duty of the President to present a budget, cut expenditures, close loopholes, and increase taxes, if the United States is to meet the issues it faces. In my judgment, unless he does that, he is not doing what we have a right to expect of the leadership he is supposed to give this Nation. That is why in the deliberations of the committee I opposed the pressures which are inherent in extensions of a few days; to show the President that we insist on proper procedures and the duties of the committees. That is very superficial. What is really profound is to have a package which would cut the deficit to manageable proportions under the leadership of the Executive, whose duty it is to do so if Congress is called upon to support him intelligently, and we are handed a package, not for just $1 billion here or $2 billion there, or $4 billion here, without a sense of national priorities.

Mr. President, I feel the cities are entitled to a high priority immediately after security, to wit, Vietnam. I think the President owes us his judgment in that respect. Otherwise, we will flounder and get into a situation where we are not able to act intelligently. I am glad that our committee did not fall for that procedure.

Inasmuch as we have no written report before the Senate in respect to this extension, it was important to express individual views as they have been expressed on this critical financial crisis.

Mr. President, a solution to our critical crisis will take the leadership of the President and not business as usual, and this is vital to the financial operations of the Government. That is why I have made the recommendations that I have made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the committee amendment and the third reading of the joint resolution.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 853) was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment to the resolution, request a confer-

ence thereon with the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HILL, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. MUNDT, and Mrs. SMITH conferees on the part of the Senate.

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 Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

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 the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1884. An act for the relief of Virgile Posfay;

H.R. 2283. An act for the relief of Dr. Ray F. McMillan;

H.R. 3727. An act for the relief of Elpidio Dimacali Damazo and Natividad Simsuangco Damazo;

H.R. 6096. An act for the relief of Mrs. Inge Hemmersbach Hilton; and

H.R. 10932. An act for the relief of Gilmour C. MacDonald, colonel, U.S. Air Force (retired).

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 1884. An act for the relief of Virgile Posfay;

H.R. 2283. An act for the relief of Dr. Ray F. McMillan;

H.R. 3727. An act for the relief of Elpidio Dimacali Damazo and Natividad Simsuangco Damazo;

H.R. 6096. An act for the relief of Mrs. Inge Hemmersbach Hilton; and

H.R. 10932. An act for the relief of Gilmour C. MacDonald, colonel, U.S. Air Force (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I submit a 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. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of October 3, 1967, pp. 27665–27675, 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. JACKSON. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report on H.R. 11722, the military construction authorization bill for fiscal year 1968, and in connection therewith, I have a brief statement I should like to make.

The report was signed by all the conferees on the part of the House of Representatives and the Senate and has now been agreed to by the House.

The sum total of the bill as agreed to in conference is $2,333,255,000. This amount is only $51,446,000 above the amount approved by the Senate and $75,551,000 below the amount approved by the House. The action of the conferees resulted in a decrease in the Department's request of $327,128,000 for a reduction of almost 12.5 percent.

As may be seen from the small increase above the amount approved by the Senate, the Senate position prevailed in most every instance. This may be further emphasized by the fact that the Senate conferees accepted a provision contained in the House-passed bill to provide $60 million for NATO infrastructure which was in the bill that passed the House but not in the Senate bill. The bill as presented to the Congress this year contained a section authorizing the Secretary of Defense to carry out bilateral and multilateral arrangements with foreign governments for sharing the costs of acquiring and construction of military facilities and installations, including military headquarters, for collective defense. Although the original bill did not so state, the arrangements relate to NATO and the money figure, which was not set out in the bill, was $60 million.

The House properly modified this language to place authority in the Secretary of the Army which is, in fact, the executive agency for this construction; limited the cost to NATO; and inserted the specific money figure of $60 million which is the anticipated expenditure for these purposes during the coming year. The Senate committee, taking note of the fact that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee granted similar authority for the NATO infrastructure in the foreign aid bill, deleted the proposed authority from the military construction authorization bill. As of this time, however, the conference between the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee has not been completed. Therefore, the Senate conferees felt compelled to include this provision in the bill. Otherwise, the total amount agreed upon by the conference would have been below the Senate figure.

While some minor adjustments were made within the requirements of the three military departments, I shall mention only one of them, namely, the Navy request for $1,135,000 to provide for a new laundry and dry cleaning plant at the Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md. The Senate denied this item in the belief that the building was overdesigned and entirely too expensive. Subsequently, a letter was received from the Department of the Navy indicating that this request might be reduced to $953,000 for a reduction of $182,000. Nevertheless, the conferees on the part of the House insisted on the original amount. This is a reduction of approximately 16 percent although the Navy frankly admits the unit construction cost of $17.85 per square foot is considered by them to be equivalent to approximately $13.50 per square foot for a commercially built facility, or some 32 percent higher. The Senate conferees acquiesced with the understanding that this discrepancy would be called to the attention of the Committee on Appropriations in order that they might give this matter due consideration in providing the funds for this project.

Next, I should like to mention the $200 million contingency fund requested by the Secretary of Defense for his use, primarily in southeast Asia. In considering the bill, the House reduced this amount to $150 million and earmarked $50 million of the remainder to be used on road construction. The conferees finally agreed to a reduction of $50 million in the amount requested, none of which is earmarked for any purpose.

Finally, I should like to refer to title VI of the bill which relates to military family housing. It is to be recalled that the Department requested the construction of 12,500 new units of family housing and the Senate reduced by 2,816 the number of units requested. Of the number deleted, the conferees agreed to restore 725 units, bringing the total number of units authorized to 10,409, for an increase of $14,552,000 above the amount approved by the Senate. I am happy to state, however, that several language provisions inserted in the bill by the Senate, which would give the Congress better control over the family housing program, were accepted by the conferees.

Mr. President, I believe that I have fairly summarized the action taken by the conference committee and I feel confident that the construction needs of the military departments and the Defense agencies have been adequately provided for for fiscal year 1968, and I shall be happy to answer any questions.

I make my motion, Mr. President.

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

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. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The question recurs on S. 2388, the motion of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] to recommit the bill with instructions.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the yeas and nays on my motion to recommit with instructions be withdrawn.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on behalf of several Senators on this side of the aisle who thought we should vote, I would have to object at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, we understand the situation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the pending motion of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], to recommit title II, take place at 1 p.m.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, with the time to be charged equally to the distinguished Senator in charge of the bill [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] whose motion is now pending.

I would ask the attachés on both sides of the aisle to notify all Senators about the vote at 1 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may be entitled to.

The very close vote, 47 to 42, by which the Prouty amendment was defeated was strong indication to me, particularly in view of the strong support from the Republican side of the aisle the Prouty amendment achieved, that it will not be many months before the Senate is prepared to face up to the problem of doing something effective for the poor people in our urban and rural ghettos in terms of giving them useful employment and thereby placing them on the tax rolls.

As a matter of fact, the vote was closer than the record indicates, because the two Senators who gave pairs were prepared to support the Prouty amendment if their votes would have made any difference.

I am not unaware of the fact that on the record vote which will take place in less than half an hour there will be an appearance of many Senators falling away from their compassionate interest in the poor people of America. The arguments which have been made with respect to no hearings on the bill, and the fiscal implications of a $2.8 billion authorization to put poor people to work, have an appeal to many Senators. There has been a curious sort of turning away from the suggestion that the swollen military appropriations, which are the principal cause of the fiscal problems we face, should be cut.

I would like to say that, as far as I am concerned, those who are committed to vote for the Clark Emergency Employment Act are released from commitments. I shall vote against the motion to strike. I would urge my colleagues who were prepared to support me in this regard to use their own judgment, because the critical vote was the vote which took place a little while ago. What was the high water mark for those who have a keen and abiding interest in the fate of the poor people of our country and seek to give it the highest consideration to which it is entitled. But I shall vote against the Byrd amendment because I believe deeply in the Emergency Employment Act, and I want to be so recorded.

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. As the Senator knows, I have high regard and great respect for the Senator from West Virginia. He is just as dedicated in his support of his amendment as I am in opposition to it. We just have honest differences of opinion. I cannot support the Byrd amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Neither can I.

Mr. MORSE. I shall not support the Byrd amendment. The Senator from Pennsylvania, in his typical fairness and graciousness, has made clear that because the vote on the Prouty amendment really was the key vote, therefore he was releasing any Senators who might think that they had committed themselves to the Senator from Pennsylvania. This is typical of the Senator from Pennsylvania. But I shall vote against the Byrd amendment on the merits as I see the merits. I may be wrong, but I feel that way.

I did not get the chance, in the minute that I had to discuss the Prouty amendment, to call attention to an experience I had yesterday that I am never going to forget, in hearing what I think is typical of the views of the poverty-stricken people of this country. I spent yesterday morning in a poverty workshop in my State. My State is not one that is characterized—I see the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] on the floor—with the kind of problems that exist in Chicago or Philadelphia or Pittsburgh or Newark or Detroit or in the other great metropolitan areas of the country.

I listened to this poverty spokesman from the ranks of poverty. In my judgment, if we do not have the crash program that the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], and the other Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and other Senators on the floor are fighting for, the taxpayers in the time ahead are going to lose many times the cost of that crash program as a result of what is going to occur in this country in the troubled spots.

I yield to no one on law and order, but let us face it, the poverty-stricken people of this country are not going to see the degradation forced upon them that is being forced upon them while we spend over $75 billion around the world, only $22 billion of which in the present defense bill is Vietnam-connected.

The taxpayers will have to face up to the fact that the poverty-stricken people of this country recognize that we cannot justify that kind of appropriation for defense in Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

I just came out of a meeting with the House on the appropriations bill in regard to military aid. There is talk that if we do not make supersonic bombers available to South America, they will go to France. Blackmail. Let them go, but also let us make clear that they are not going to get cooperation from the United States in regard to other programs. First things have to come first.

One of the first things facing the American taxpayers is that we have to meet the crisis in the poverty-stricken ghettos of America or they will pay several times the money they think they are going to save by the vote already taken here this morning and by the vote, if the Byrd amendment should pass, to be taken, which in effect will table it. That is what it means.

Does anyone think we are going to get any action on this matter before we adjourn? This is a motion, not by intent but by result, that is going to mean the postponement of consideration of this matter until we reconvene in January. That is too late. Now is the time, this is the hour, in which we have to live up to what I think—speaking of my own personal philosophy—is my responsibility to the poverty-stricken people of this country to meet the most serious domestic problem in our body politic.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with everything the Senator has said. We know there are three serious problems confronting the country today which are giving the President grave concern. They have been discussed around here day after day.

They are, in my opinion, first, the war in Vietnam, which carries with it a swollen military appropriation pressed through the Congress by the military-industrial-scientific establishment—an unconscionable amount of money.

The second is the enormous deficit which we are facing, which is going to require the flotation of $30 billion of Federal bonds next year to meet the deficit.

The third is the plight of the cities.

So far it is the point of view of the Senate that the plight of the cities and the urban ghettos come last. We are in a dilemma as to what to do about a tax increase and the deficit. That particular problem has not been solved.

There is only one way to solve this problem, and that is to cut the military budget. The only way is for Congress to

unwrap itself from phony patriotism and talk about protecting our boys by providing billions of dollars for the industrial lobby, and to put some commonsense into the economic policy of the United States.

I hope that day will come soon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one sentence?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say that I think the problem will be resolved next November at the ballot boxes, by the American people who will do the voting. They are going to put first things first; and they know that a $70 billion defense budget, the largest in the history of the Republic, is not putting first things first.

Mr. CLARK. If I may say also to my friends from Illinois and Oregon, who are among the small group on the floor of the Senate now—as is not unusual in the Senate—this fight to get some money for jobs for the unemployed in our rural and urban ghettos is just beginning. The Senator is probably correct; we probably cannot bring a bill to the floor before the end of this session. But a bill will be introduced, and hearings will be held, and every member of the Urban Coalition who says we need enough emergency employment funds to create 1 million jobs—not the 200,000 jobs that this modest proposal calls for—will have an opportunity to come in and testify. We will mark up the bill, and get it on the Calendar before we adjourn.

This fight, my friends, is just beginning; and the vote we are about to have is a very small skirmish in a very long war, which in the end will be won.

I yield to my friend from Illinois.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I just called the Department of Labor to obtain figures for unemployment in an area across the river from Illinois, in the principle Negro community of St. Louis.

The latest survey they had taken was in November 1966, but they maintain that they have no reason to believe the figures are any different today.

Their figures show that in Northside St. Louis, which is largely a Negro slum area, unemployment was 12.9 percent, overall; but that in this great country of ours, at the height of a period of sustained prosperity, the rate of unemployment there among teenagers aged 16 to 19 years is 40 percent. I have no reason to believe that that figure is too far off from the condition in my own State, in the area of East St. Louis across the river.

In August 1967, nationally nonwhite teenage unemployment was 26.6 percent, compared to 11.7 percent for white teenagers. As a rule of thumb, I am told that white teenagers have roughly four times the unemployment rate of the total labor force, which is now 3.8 percent, but nonwhite teenagers have a rate roughly twice that of white teenagers.

I think we face a very critical condition. Certainly, when we look at the billion-dollar expense that lies in the rubble of Detroit and the rubble of Newark, when we look at figures such as we are talking about now, looking back on the destructive cost of not having done something before this, is it not about time that we do something to prevent these things in the future, and not wait for the long hot summer next year, but recognize that the bitterness and the frustration of the unemployed and the idle is just as great in times of cool weather as it is in hot weather? That frustration, I submit, exists the year round.

I have struggled, in my own mind, with this problem, because I, too, know from weeks of hearings in the Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs of the Banking and Currency Committee and in the Subcommittee on Urban Affairs of the Joint Economic Committee, that the testimony that comes to us is irrefutable, from the academicians, business leaders, civic leaders, and others who come before us, who say that frustration and despair comes from inadequate education, poor housing, and lack of jobs. Unless we do something about it, this country can be torn asunder and divided by the haves and the have-nots. If we can finance a multi-billion-dollar foreign aid program for other people in other lands, we can certainly think in terms that such programs being undertaken at home.

I am impressed with one other fact.

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

Mr. CLARK. I ask my friend, the Senator from West Virginia, if he would be willing to yield the Senator from Illinois 2 minutes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield 2 minutes.

Mr. PERCY. I am impressed with the fact that the unemployed are supported now by relief measures just as my own family was in the midst of the great depression. We were on relief. We received a stipend from the Government; a food truck came by and dropped off parcels. It cost the public something to keep our family from starving in those days.

Then a WPA work project came along, and the Illinois Symphony Orchestra was created. My mother was a violinist, and she went from a relief roll to a payroll—to be sure, a public payroll, but I will never forget the sense of dignity she had, walking out with a violin under her arm, to go to play in a school for children—and that orchestra toured the Chicago area, performing for the public and for schoolchildren who had never heard a symphony orchestra; and all of the musicians in it, who had been on relief or welfare before, were now usefully employed. While the cost to the public was the same——

Mr. CLARK. That was the WPA, was it not?

Mr. PERCY. That was the WPA.

Mr. CLARK. A much maligned program.

Mr. PERCY. A much maligned program, and there is no question about it, there were flaws and holes in it. But, as a young boy, I can remember the difference between idleness, sitting at home doing nothing and taking a handout, and having a job and feeling you are contributing something.

We are not going to let people starve in this country. I think that is what we are up against right now. I am a fiscal conservative. I never had an unbalanced budget in my life—public life, private life, or business—until I arrived in Washington in January. There has been nothing but red ink since then.

So in dealing with this issue also I have tried to take the most fiscally responsible route. The first route was the 2 percent plan, under the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] and myself, whereby we established an Emergency Employment Fund without any new funds being appropriated. The second was private employment, under the Prouty amendment. I must say that the measure before us now is my third choice. It would provide public jobs—but public jobs, not public welfare; and I would always prefer a job ahead of welfare—a helping hand instead of giving a demeaning handout.

I support the position of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from West Virginia for his courtesy. I support the motion to recommit the pending bill and to strike title II thereof.

I also think that title I should be given further consideration by the Senate and that some advice and counsel should be obtained from an appropriate authority, perhaps the Senate Finance Committee, as to the demands this bill would add to our already strained sources of revenue.

More and more Senate procedure has become a practice of authorizing Federal programs on the basis of the benefits to the beneficiaries of the program proposed. Too little consideration has been given to the burden these programs place on the taxpayer.

We must weigh and judge programs we approve not only from the standpoint of the good that might be done for society, but also from the standpoint of whether our society can afford the cost required to support them.

The taxpayer, Mr. President, as a citizen, is also entitled to equal treatment by Congress, and to have his day in court. I am certainly in sympathy with people who are in poverty, and willing for the Government to help them some, if they try to help themselves, or to administer to those who are unable. But the Senator from Pennsylvania—and he and I have worked together on many matters—stated that they intend to get this money anyway, in greater sums. I believe they will, in astronomical sums, unless at some point Congress calls a halt to its present trend.

This bill, as now reported, provides for $5.05 billion, or 150 percent more than was requested in the President's budget. It authorizes $3.4 billion, or over 300 percent more than was appropriated last year. This big additional demand for more money comes at a time when all expenditures are sharply rising, revenues are falling below estimates, the deficit is growing, rapidly, and additional new multi-billion-dollar military programs are being started.

Last year's total appropriations were well above those of the year before. This year's requests are well above last year's.

Revenues to meet these expenditures are considerably less than anticipated. When the budget came to Congress in January it was estimated that in the coming year we would collect $126.9 billion. Now that estimate has dropped to $122.5 billion.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I have very little time remaining, but out of courtesy I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask the Senator if he does not really believe that the place to make such a cut would be in the military budget.

Mr. STENNIS. The last major military appropriation bill from the Appropriations Committee did have a sizable reduction. As I said then, we felt it was not cutting the bone and the muscle from the military program, nor from the war effort. I believe that continued effort can save even more money from that source.

The deficit continues to grow at a much more rapid rate than predicted. In fiscal 1967 the actual deficit was five times higher than predicted when the budget was presented. The deficit this year was estimated at the outset to be four times the predicted deficit of last year, and the most current estimates indicate that it may be six to 13 times higher than the predicted deficit of last year, depending upon what happens with regard to a tax increase.

Moreover we are at war. While there is no doubt we will obtain a victory or a negotiated peace on honorable terms, the time and the cost required to do so is highly uncertain. We have reduced defense expenditures to the lowest limit possible without cutting into the bone and muscle of our military forces. We cut this year's Defense request by $1.6 billion but some badly needed items were not requested and not enough was requested for others. As an example, we really need more pilots and other manpower, the Reserve Forces need additional equipment. One of the greatest handicaps in controlling the recent Detroit riots was the lack of transportation and communications equipment which the National Guard should have had but did not have. Some units had to charter commercial busses to get from their home towns to Detroit because they had no trucks available.

We will have to have additional money appropriated to pay for the direct cost of running the war.

We must put up an antiballistic missile defense to protect ourselves from Red China and from Russia or take the chance of having to yield to their threats and demands. This will cost many billions of dollars.

The load all the Federal programs now on the books has put on the taxpayer's back is already so heavy the average taxpayer can hardly stand up under it.

Before we pass another bill to authorize billions more of Federal expenditures, we should know what effect it will have on the taxpayer. That is why I think this bill should have more consideration. We cannot authorize a sum of money as large as that requested here without dipping deeply into the revenue now available. This bill, if passed, will put heavy additional demands upon our ability to pay for other needs and upon our sources of revenue. We need to know what effect these added demands will have, whether they will have to be met by new taxes, and if so what effect these new taxes might have on the economy generally, upon the individual taxpayer, and on the general financial condition of the country.

With all deference to those Senators who serve on the Appropriations Subcommittee that considers this bill—and I am one and take full responsibility for my part—it has had no full hearing in the lifetime of the program. The poverty program has always been in the supplemental bill and has been considered in the very last days of the session. Last year, for example, the $1.6 billion appropriation for the Office of Economic Opportunity was examined in a hearing that lasted less than 3 hours. The bill was marked up the next day and taken up on the floor of the Senate and passed the day after that—just 2 days before the Senate adjourned.

With all the demands on a Senator's time in the dying days of the session, it is impossible to give a $1.5 billion program the kind of consideration it should be given. If that procedure is to be followed in this session, as it apparently will be, the error will be compounded by over 300 percent.

The taxpaying man and woman who has to foot the bill deserves to have this program given closer examination than it has been given in the past. When a Senator votes on this bill, he should have full knowledge of what he is doing to the taxpayer as well as what he is doing for the beneficiary under the program. By recommitting the bill to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, such action as is taken on the bill can be taken in light of all the facts, and each Senator will then be aware of the full consequences of his vote, not only on the people to be helped, but also on the people that have to do the helping.

As I understand, a new tax bill will be presented to the Senate partly on the basis of being necessary because of the cost of the war. In fact, I think it will be needed largely because of excessive nondefense expenditures, including this poverty program for the past 2 years, and because of the excessive authorizations provided in this bill.

The average person paying taxes in American is the so-called small taxpayer, but in proportion to his or her earnings or retirement benefit, these taxes are very large indeed. These taxpayers are already paying until it hurts, and they will resent paying more taxes. Unless they think their money is being spent for the necessities of the Government, there will be a revolt by the taxpayer at the polls.

This bill ought to be recommitted and I hope that it will be.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, once again, I would like to briefly outline the reasons which compel me to believe that it is our clear duty to delete title II from the pending bill. These reasons, which I expressed on yesterday, appear to me to so far outweigh the arguments in favor of title II which have been offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania and others that I am sure it will be the overwhelming consensus of this body that the pending bill cannot be approved until it is shorn of title II.

First, Mr. President, the program proposed by this title would create half a million new jobs at a time when there are probably 1 million existing unfilled job openings in our economy and when there are 50,000 unfilled openings in MDTA projects in the Nation's 48 largest cities. Before we create another half million job openings, we clearly should concentrate on filling as many of these existing jobs and job training openings as possible. The problem is not a shortage of jobs in the United States, but rather a lack of qualified people to fill job openings and, in that respect, title II of this bill would go charging off in the wrong direction and at the wrong time.

Second, the jobs that this title would create would be what I have called pseudo-jobs. They would be, as I said yesterday, make-work jobs, shadow jobs, deadend jobs, jobs without a future, and jobs without the essential ingredients of meaningful employment. Such jobs would not only isolate the poor from the rest of society and freeze poverty into the proposed job categories, but would also make this body that much more vulnerable to charges of supporting Federal handouts, as well as hopelessly disrupt and undercut the President's carefully considered program for bringing greater job opportunities to the poor.

Mr. President, this crash program would crash right into a solid wall of public disapproval and by providing half a million leaf-raking assignments would contribute nothing to the national need for trained, skilled, and truly qualified workers.

Third, the program proposed by this title would be at odds with existing employment opportunity programs firmly supported by the administration which really can offer meaningful, purposeful, and career-oriented jobs. These administration programs, such as the Manpower Development and Training Act, which have already proved their success many times over in training or retraining people for better jobs, are the ones that we should give our support to, rather than going off halfcocked in search of new panaceas through ill-conceived and massively funded new programs.

Fourth, title II must be rejected because its provisions are so very vague, ambiguous, and unclear. Instead of being the product of careful and thorough study and consideration in the normal committee process, this program is urged upon us de novo, springing from the imagination of its sponsors. Rather than the product of exhaustive hearings, this program has been the subject of no

hearings whatsoever. Even if the administration and the Congress were convinced that a real national emergency existed in this area, so as to justify an emergency program of the type here proposed, the underlying concepts as well as the working details of such a program would have to be set forth for our deliberation in far more concrete and far more carefully evaluated form than is the case here. Indeed, the manifest defects in this title have been called to our attention by four of our distinguished colleagues, Senators DOMINICK, FANNON, MURPHY, and GRIFFIN, in supplemental views which they submitted to the committee report on this bill.

I am especially persuaded by Senator MURPHY's observation with regard to title II that—

> 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 the taxpayers' dollars on such a program.

Fifth, and perhaps most important, is the fact that title II of this bill would have a tremendous inflationary impact on the economy at precisely the time when anti-inflationary measures are in order. As I pointed out yesterday, nearly $3 billion poured indiscriminately into 500,000 jobs of very slight productivity must either give us a solid dose of new inflation or force the President and Congress to raise taxes even higher, and probably much higher, than now proposed. Now is not the time to add to an already fantastic national debt, or to increase an anticipated deficit for fiscal 1968, which the Secretary of the Treasury has estimated before the House Ways and Means Committee could go as high as $29 billion. The additional $1.3 billion required under this title for fiscal 1968 would not only compound this extremely dangerous deficit, but would also be a cruel blow to a President who is striving diligently to balance national needs against available limited national resources. This title would play havoc with the President's carefully considered and reasonably developed antipoverty budget and would be a grave disservice to the administration at a time of growing fiscal crisis.

Finally, Mr. President, as I said yesterday, this title raises extremely troublesome basic philosophical questions which I feel have got to be fully answered before we take a further step down the road proposed by title II. Is our country ready at this time to provide a subsidized and purposeless job to anyone who cannot or will not find work on his own? Where is the connection between such a program and truly productive, meaningful employment? How would we ever elevate people out of the make-work jobs this title would provide? If this program were enacted, would we not be creating a vast new public welfare bureaucracy? Can we justify to the American taxpayer paying up to half a million people for doing nothing productive, over the objections of the administration and contrary to our national economic situation and our priority commitment to victory in Vietnam? Can we ask the American taxpayers to assume the added and probably permanent public burden which this title would entail? Do we have the slightest idea where such a program would lead in the future except our knowledge, based upon abundant experience, that it would inevitably mushroom beyond all manageable bounds?

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be 2 additional minutes allotted to each side and that the vote which was to take place at 1 o'clock be delayed until 1:04 p.m.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator reserve that request?

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] has just asked if I could yield him 1 minute. Could we make it 3 additional minutes?

Mr. GRUENING. Could we make it 5 minutes?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I modify my request and ask for 5 additional minutes to each side, and that the vote occur at 1:10 p.m.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, can we ask the American taxpayers to assume the added and probably permanent public burden which this title would entail? Do we have the slightest idea where such a program would lead in the future except our knowledge, based upon abundant experience, that it would inevitably mushroom beyond all manageable bounds?

Mr. President, it is abundantly clear to me, and I think to the decided majority of this body as well, that the sense of the American people and of their Congress today is that this program is both unnecessary and unwise. I, therefore, urge that my motion be accepted, so as to delete this ill-considered title from the pending bill.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, as a coauthor, with Senator CLARK, of this bill, I consider it a matter of dignity and self-respect to rise in its defense.

I shall vote against recommitting the bill, and my reason, first, is that we now have a consensus in Congress, in my judgment, and in the country, that the key to dealing with the poverty program is jobs.

Second, this is a basic national crisis, tantamount to the crises which we face in Vietnam, and therefore is entitled to the highest priority. All the arguments made against it are the business-as-usual arguments. This is not business as usual. You had widespread riots and violence in American cities this past summer, involving almost 80 cities. You may have them this winter; we hope and pray we will not. Now is the time to provide against that situation.

So I urge that this matter be dealt with on the national priority to which it is entitled. Do not charge the Vietnam war against this priority. If you do, you will suffer a tremendous slackening in morale, as well as grave danger to domestic tranquility, which we have already experienced.

Finally, Mr. President, everything the Senator from West Virginia has said we have done. These are meaningful jobs, based on training, based on education. They tie the private enterprise system in completely.

This program is basic, constructive, and well architected. This is the very contribution. This was Senator CLARK's program. I wrote into it all the features the Senator from West Virginia has stated he wants. They are in the bill.

The important feature is that this matter must be put on the right priority. We are not paying for the Vietnam war. We should not be under the charge by millions of Americans that we are taking it out of their backs. That is why this program is necessary.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Alaska.

THE EFFORTS TO FIGHT THE WAR ON POVERTY SHOULD BE EXPANDED—NOT CUT BACK

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I have been consistently voting against all amendments intended to cut back the funds to be made available for the war on poverty.

This is no time to go back on the Nation's commitments to our economically disadvantaged.

For years now I have been stating that the United States is engaged in an illegal, immoral, and unconstitutional war in Vietnam, where it is an aggressor against people who have been fighting for their independence from foreign domination for decades.

It is bad enough for the United States to become involved in fighting such an unjustified war in Vietnam at the cost of tens of thousands of fine American boys killed or wounded at an ever-escalating rate and at a cost in dollars of more than $3 billion each month.

It is far, far worse to say that the United States is so deeply committed to fighting in Vietnam that it must neglect its vital needs at home. What shall it profit the United States to continue the costly stalemate in Vietnam while our cities continue in their squalor or go up in flames, while its poor face at least another generation of misery and despair, while its natural resources lie fallow and undeveloped, and while the education and health needs of its people are being shortchanged?

Some years ago, Nikita Khrushchev, speaking for the Soviet Union about the United States, said: "We shall bury you!"

Are we now seeing this prophecy coming true?

While the vital resources of the United States in both men and dollars are being needlessly squandered in the rice paddies and jungles of Vietnam, the Soviet Union is able to devote its men and money to the development of its own country.

This reckless and needless course of action is cruelly unfair to those men and women of the United States who were promised the alleviation of their manifold ills through an all-out war against poverty only to have the wherewithal to carry out the war wasted in Vietnam.

I cannot, I will not, vote to deprive the poor of the United States of funds so urgently needed for their relief only to have those funds siphoned off not only for irresponsibly fighting a senseless war in Vietnam but also to line the pockets of the corrupt military and civilian officials of the Government of South Vietnam.

I shall vote against recommitting this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I shall support the motion of the Senator from West Virginia to strike title II from the bill.

If title II is retained it would cost $2.8 billion over the amount recommended in the budget. We are already confronted with a deficit averaging $2 billion a month and an administration request for a 10 percent increase in taxes. It should be pointed out that each 1 percent increase in taxes provides approximately $1 billion. So those who will vote to retain title II in the bill, which would require an additional $2.8 billion expenditure should be reconciled to the fact that they will in effect be voting for a 3 percent increase across-the-board in income taxes. This is above the increase already requested by the President. Unless they are willing to finance that increase I do not believe they should vote for the expenditures.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

In summation, I call to the attention of Senators, first, that no hearings have been held on title II.

Second, the language in title II is vague, ambiguous, unclear, and the programs provided for are not concrete and well delineated.

Third, ample authorities exist now to do the things which title II would provide.

Fourth, we would be embarking on a new program which we might expect, as I said yesterday, to mushroom, like the prophet's gourd, overnight. Title II would provide authorization for $2.8 billion over the next 2 years; and at the end of that time, of course, we might expect—if we have learned anything by experience—that the next request would be even larger.

Fifth, I call attention again to the fact that this authorization is above the President's request, in the amount of $2.8 billion. That represents almost $3 per minute for every minute that has passed since Jesus Christ was born.

So I say to my colleagues that here is the place to apply some economy to a measure which has not been requested by the President, and to a measure which will only exacerbate the problems concomitant with a great national deficit.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

I will answer the Senator from West Virginia in a friendly way, but categorically.

First, there was no need for hearings on this emergency employment bill. We have a pamphlet this thick showing what all the witnesses said and the statements we received, emphasizing the need for an emergency employment program now. Hearings would not have changed this amount of $1 nor would it have changed one word in the bill.

Second, the language is not vague. It is precise. It would give the Secretary of Labor exactly what he would need to put this action into effect. The bill is well drawn. It is not vague.

Third, there is not ample authority to put this program into effect, and I am surprised that the Senator from West Virginia should say there is. Although there may be authority, there is no money; and what is needed is the money to do the job.

Fourth, the Senator from West Virginia has said that the new program will mushroom—and it probably will. It probably will mushroom next year, because the Urban Coalition has asked for a million jobs, not 200,000; and I predict that before 1968 is over, we will get them, because we need them, and the American people will insist on it.

Fifth, of course, this bill is above the budget request of the President. This is so because the President's budget request authorizes a swollen military budget, far above the legitimate security needs of the United States.

This is not the place to apply economy. As I have said earlier in this debate, the place from which to get the money is the military budget.

I have said that I would vote in opposition to the motion but I release all my colleagues who are committed to vote in support of the Emergency Employment Act to vote as they see fit. They will vote as their consciences dictate, and my conscience dictates that I vote against the motion.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I am going to vote for the emergency program of on-the-job training for unemployed people provided in title II of the Economic Opportunity Act amendments bill we are now considering. I think it is better to train people to be workers and taxpayers than to leave them on the welfare rolls. This whole program will cost less for an entire year than the Vietnam war costs every 2 weeks. It will provide some Federal funds to continue the emergency employment efforts Governor Agnew of Maryland started in Baltimore this summer. These jobs and the money to pay for them are desperately needed in our own State.

This is no WPA bill. It will provide a steppingstone between unemployment and jobs in private business for tens of thousands of untrained people every year. Cities and States will receive the money necessary to hire unemployed people to work on public projects—like park construction, conservation, and housing and neighborhood improvement—which are needed in both cities and rural areas. The program will take more than 200,000 untrained workers a year, give them on-the-job training, and move these men into private employment as rapidly as possible, in order to make taxpayers out of tax eaters.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, today I voted against the motion of the acting majority leader, Senator BYRD, of West Virginia, to recommit S. 2338 with instructions to the committee to strike from the bill title II. Title II would have provided an authorization of $2.8 billion for jobs for the unemployed. The motion was successful, and title II has been stricken from the bill.

The support of title II was a matter of great controversy. In frankness, if it had been adopted and passed and approved by the House, it would create a difficult fiscal problem. Thus, the question of voting against striking this title did raise the question of fiscal responsibility, even though it was known that it would be stricken from the bill.

But as in all our decisions in the Senate regarding appropriations, Members give priority to those subjects which they believe to be of the greatest importance. During this session, I have voted to reduce appropriations in a total sum larger than that involved in title II of this bill. On September 25, I voted against the military construction bill authorizing $2.3 billion which could have been postponed to later years. Bills which will be presented to the Senate before this session is over will cost more than $2.8 billion—for programs which are not needed in this year, and against which I will vote. I voted for title II as an expression of my belief that a program to provide employment must eventually be adopted by the Congress. While there are undoubtedly those who could find employment, and every effort must be made in this direction, there are thousands who because of lack of education and training cannot do so. This problem of unemployment, lack of education and housing have become the major domestic issues before this country, and must be met. They will require the full efforts of the Federal Government and also local governments and most important our private enterprise system.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, it has frequently been said that the U.S. Senate is the greatest deliberative body in the world. In fact, it has been accused at times of being too deliberative. Be that as it may, I respectfully suggest today that this great deliberative body consider an admittedly extreme but definitely possible alternative, that is, action without deliberation. Is there even one among us who would advocate such procedure? Who in these ranks would substitute impulse for committee hearings, whim for deliberations, and reflexes for Senate debate? The very idea, Mr. President, sounds preposterous. But that is precisely what we are being asked to do today. Despite the deepest traditions of the Senate, despite this body's historic insistence on thorough investigation and full discussion, we have been offered for action the unstudied, undocumented, untested and unproven Emergency Employment Act. No hearings were held on this bill, Mr. President. Not 1 minute of subcommittee consideration was given to it. Instead, the Emergency Employment Act was simply tacked onto the Economic Opportunity Amendments and sent to the full committee with scarcely more than what amounted to a sparse letter of introduction. You might say, Mr. President, that the full committee gave this

intruder the attention it deserved under the circumstances for it failed completely to give the act the detailed consideration due any proposal of this magnitude. In fact, the report expressing the need for such a program is no more than a compilation of excerpts from testimony on S. 1545 as well as some articles expressing the need for the creation of jobs. Where is the expert testimony? Where is the examination of witnesses? Where are the normal, probing, clarifying, perfecting committee arguments, pro and con? There are none, Mr. President, and for this and other reasons which I shall mention in a moment, I believe that this bill should be recommitted.

If, Mr. President, there had been full hearings and study of the proposed Emergency Employment Act, two highly important facts would certainly have been emphasized and publicized. First, of course, is the fact that enactment of this legislation would cost the taxpayers $2.8 billion, or nearly one-third of the amount which will be collected if the President's request for a tax increase is approved by the Congress. Second, and most important, is the fact that the act fails to provide even a plan which might result in meaningful and permanent employment opportunities for the disadvantaged. I shall discuss each of these points briefly.

At the present time, as we all know, the Congress is being asked by the President to approve a 10 percent surtax. Passage of this legislation will only remove some $8 billion from a budgetary deficit which, it is estimated, could reach $29 billion for the fiscal year. Yet the Emergency Employment Act would eat up nearly one-third of the extra revenue collected. The American taxpayer is already shouldering a heavy burden, and your mail and my mail show that he is beginning to rebel. If he is to be asked to carry this additional load as well, he deserves to know that the money is not going to be channeled into a wasteful effort. Yet we have no evidence to this effect. What kinds of jobs will be provided? How many? Is this the best plan for alleviating the existing employment problem? Our taxpayers, Mr. President, and this body which represents them have a right and a duty to demand answers to these questions.

Frankly, Mr. President, without testimony to the contrary, this seems to be simply another case of leaving everything to the Secretary although in the very bill we are considering today we have had ample evidence of the results of such procedure.

In the absence of full hearings and studies, we must try to interpret the Emergency Employment Act from its text alone and herein we find that the intent is to provide employment for "large concentrations of persons who are unable to obtain jobs in regular, competitive employment because of lack of education, occupation and skill, or work experience and because of artificial barriers to employment and occupational advancement." In order to accomplish this, it directs the Secretary of Labor to authorize funds for employment programs in such fields as health, public safety, education, recreation, streets, and parks. However, these will not be permanent employment opportunities. They will only be make work. I submit, Mr. President, that the circumstances of today dictate against the application of such methods which, as we all know, were once employed in another era to meet a different problem. Let me explain. When the Works Progress Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps were instituted during the great depression, the unemployment rate in this Nation was 24.9 percent. Those were devastating times demanding drastic measures. Of necessity, the viable solution sought at the time required the inclusion of make-work programs as there was a desperate need to regenerate the economy; that is, to put money into people's pockets and thereby increase purchasing power. Today, on the other hand, our Nation is generally affluent, shouldering an unemployment rate of less than 4 percent. Consequently, there is no need for us to tread down the path we took in the 1930's under dissimilar conditions.

Make no mistake, Mr. President, I do not speak lightly of our unemployment problem. Even an unemployment rate of 4 percent demands our attention and assistance, and the degree of urgency becomes all the more apparent when we study the problem in its true perspective and perceive the extent to which the illness is concentrated in our heavily populated urban areas. For instance, 15 percent of the people living in Hough are without work; 12 percent in South Los Angeles; 13 percent in the Bayside section of Oakland, and 11 percent in the Mission-Fillmore district of San Francisco. Appropriately, the bill recognizes the need in such areas but it fails to provide the proper remedy. True, the unemployed in Hough and South Los Angeles and in hundreds of other similar areas throughout the country need jobs, but jobs, as such, are not enough. They need lasting jobs with advancement possibilities. Today it is estimated that there are 1.3 million job vacancies in industry. The task we now face, therefore, is to provide the unemployed person with the necessary skills so that he can fill these existing vacancies. This is the basic philosophy behind economic opportunity and we should not distort it. What we need—indeed, what is envisioned by the phrase "economic opportunity"—is emphasis on our school systems, our adult basic education programs, vocational education, transportation and job skill training. Short-term, make-work jobs will not suffice.

The Congress has considered and made available many job training programs. It is now taking under advisement other plans designed to accomplish the same end—for example, the provision for tax incentives for industry to offer training programs to the unemployed or upgrading programs to the presently employed, and the proposal that tax incentives be offered to industries which create new plants in disadvantaged urban areas, thereby bringing job opportunities within geographical reach of the unemployed. Before the enactment of any of these proposals, however, hearings will be conducted and sufficient testimony will be taken so that the Congress can make intelligent decisions in terms of need, cost-effectiveness and possible efficacy as compared to other programs. On the Emergency Employment Act, we have no such information.

I might add in conclusion, Mr. President, that private industry has already demonstrated dramatically that it can and will tackle the job and produce positive results. In my own area of Los Angeles, for instance, in the highly publicized community of Watts, private enterprise under the leadership of Chad McClellan went to work voluntarily with no Government funding whatsoever and filled at least 18,000 jobs in a year and a half. Also in Watts, Aerojet-General opened a manufacturing plant to employ local people in making tents for the armed forces. The company's first Government contract was worth $2.5 million and resulted in the employment of 450 persons. Mr. President, these are permanent job opportunities that are being offered. I would hope that when the Congress embarks on an emergency employment program it will confine itself to finding ways to offer this type of opportunity instead of some make-work plan which, I want to emphasize again, would provide only a temporary solution at best.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia to recommit. 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 live pair with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. PROUTY (when his name was called). On this vote I have a live pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. MUSKIE (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY]. If he were present and voting he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. DODD (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. 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 concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have

a pair with the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were to vote I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], 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 Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The pair of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] has been previously announced.

The pair of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] has been previously announced.

If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 28, as follows:

[No. 276 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Aiken	Fannin	McIntyre
Allott	Fong	Miller
Anderson	Fulbright	Monroney
Bennett	Griffin	Montoya
Bible	Hansen	Mundt
Boggs	Hayden	Murphy
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Pearson
Burdick	Hill	Proxmire
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Smathers
Byrd, W. Va.	Hollings	Smith
Cannon	Hruska	Sparkman
Carlson	Jordan, N.C.	Spong
Church	Jordan, Idaho	Stennis
Cotton	Kuchel	Symington
Curtis	Lausche	Talmadge
Dominick	Long, La.	Thurmond
Eastland	McClellan	Williams, Del.
Ellender	McGovern	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—28

Bartlett	Jackson	Percy
Bayh	Javits	Randolph
Case	Long, Mo.	Ribicoff
Clark	McCarthy	Scott
Cooper	McGee	Tydings
Gruening	Metcalf	Williams, N.J.
Harris	Mondale	Yarborough
Hart	Morse	Young, Ohio
Hartke	Nelson	
Hatfield	Pell	

NOT VOTING—18

Baker	Inouye	Moss
Brooke	Kennedy, Mass.	Muskie
Dirksen	Kennedy, N.Y.	Pastore
Dodd	Magnuson	Prouty
Ervin	Mansfield	Russell
Gore	Morton	Tower

So the motion of Mr. BYRD of West Virginia to recommit was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the motion to recommit was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK obtained the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to inquire of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania whether he knows how many amendments are still to be offered. I believe there are about a dozen on this side of the aisle.

Mr. CLARK. Will the Senator from Illinois kindly withhold that request for 30 seconds?

Mr. President, in accordance with instructions just given by the Senate, on behalf of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I report back the bill, S. 2388—that is to say, the bill as reported to the Senate—with title II stricken out.

May I say to my good friend from Illinois that, so far as I know, all the remaining amendments are on his side of the aisle. I know that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] has one, that the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] has two——

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] has one.

Mr. CLARK. I am not in the confidence of the Senator from Delaware. I am interested to know that he has one. I do not know what it is all about.

Does anyone else have amendments on this side of the aisle? I believe that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has an amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I respectfully suggest that perhaps a time limitation might be contrived on these amendments now that the authors of the bill are in the Chamber.

Mr. CLARK. I regret to advise my good friend from Illinois that I am going to have to answer that on an ad hoc basis.

There are some amendments on which I would be glad to agree to a time limit, but there are others on which I have commitments, to Senators who are out of town, not to allow votes. I think I should, if I can, protect them until they get back from a very important engagement in Boston.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have one amendment the purpose of which is to change the figure in title II of the budget estimate.

Mr. CLARK. Title II has been disposed of.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I meant title I.

Mr. CLARK. That is the very amendment on which I cannot agree to put a time limitation for the reasons I have just suggested. I will say to the Senator from Delaware there are a number of amendments we can dispose of in the meantime.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If the Senator prefers, I will withhold that amendment. Let us dispose of the others first, and then I will offer it later.

Mr. CLARK. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Delaware.

Now, Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK. Is the bill open to further amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

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

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

The amendment offered by Mr. PROUTY is as follows:

On page 91, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following new subsection:

"(h) Title VI of such Act is amended by adding the following new section after section 618:

"'RESPONSIBILITY FOR FOLLOW THROUGH PROGRAMS

"'SEC 619. Pursuant to section 602(d), the Director shall delegate his functions under section 221(b)(2) to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and such functions shall be carried out through the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare,'"

On page 55, line 22, insert the following at the end of the sentence: "Funds for such program shall be transferred directly from the Director to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Financial assistance for such projects shall be provided by the Secretary on the basis of agreements reached with the Director directly to local educational agencies except as otherwise provided by such agreements."

On page 54, line 22, strike the word "subsection" and insert the following: "subsections (b)(2) and".

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

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. HARTKE. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, last July the Office of Education and the Office of Economic Opportunity jointly announced the establishment of a new educational venture—Operation Followthrough. Thirty school districts in 25 States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico were selected to participate in pilot projects. "Graduates" of Headstart and other preschool programs—some 3,000 in all—are now enrolled in the projects.

Research shows that many of the gains made in Headstart are lost if these children do not continue to receive special attention and assistance in overcoming the handicaps imposed on them by poverty. Followthrough will provide that attention and assistance.

The central concept of Followthrough is to bring together the resources of

school, community, and family to help the child. With the special assistance available under the program, it will be possible to provide individual educational diagnosis and prescription to meet the needs of the particular child. The programs utilize instructional specialists and new teaching techniques, teacher aides, psychologists, social workers, doctors, dentists—all services needed to bring the children up to the level of their more affluent classmates.

The amendment now before this body will insure that this program will continue to be administered in the manner currently provided in memorandum of understanding between the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Pursuant to this agreement, the Director has delegated his responsibility for administering this program to the Secretary—who, in turn, has vested the authority in the Office of Education.

This agreement provides in most cases that grants shall be made to local public educational agencies, which are required to make services available on an equitable basis to children in both public and nonpublic schools. If a local educational agency is unable or unwilling to provide services to children in nonpublic schools on an equitable basis, the Commissioner of Education may arrange with an appropriate community action agency to provide such services. Where the school district serves an area which has a community action agency, it is required to consult with such agency in the development of its Followthrough program, and school districts must involve parents both in the development of the applications and in the carrying out of the programs.

Under the memorandum of understanding, applicants are required to maintain current levels of effort in the grade levels in which the Followthrough children are enrolled. They are also encouraged to utilize other available funds, such as those provided under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, in developing the best possible program for the early elementary grades.

In testimony before the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty, officials of OEO and the Office of Education stressed that the programs envisioned by the memorandum of understanding were the best, educationally, that could be devised. Funding through local educational agencies assures that Followthrough programs will be conducted during the school day, as well as after school and in the summer months. It avoids the danger that disadvantaged children in the early grades may be channeled into a second, competitive school system. It guarantees that those who know children best—their teachers and their parents—will devise supplementary programs designed to compensate for the crippling effects of poverty.

This program has already been launched. Children are now receiving these enriching services. To change the concept of Followthrough, as the Committee bill proposes to do, might mean the death of the program for the school year which has already begun. School systems have begun planning programs for next year. If the responsibility were taken away from the schools and given to community action agencies, the benefits of advance planning would be lost. The children would be the ultimate losers.

Even if community action agencies redelegated authority for Followthrough to the school systems, administrative complexity would threaten the success of the program. Community action boards could exercise a veto power over educational decisions. School officials would be confronted with a maze of forms, guidelines, and regulations put out by several different Federal and State agencies. The result could be administrative chaos.

The amendment I propose will simplify the administrative mechanism for Operation Followthrough. It assures that this program, which is primarily a compensatory education program, will be carried out by our educational system. It assures that all the work which has gone into making the program a success will not be lost. I urge the Senate to adopt my amendment.

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

Mr. PROUTY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CLARK. It is my understanding that the amendment of the Senator from Vermont with respect to Followthrough merely writes into law the present administrative practice by which the program has been delegated to the Office of Education.

Mr. PROUTY. That is exactly what it proposes to do.

Mr. CLARK. As I said earlier when the Senator offered the amendment, I am perfectly willing and prepared to accept it. It is a good amendment. I cannot understand why any Senator would want to have a rollcall on it, because I do not know of any Senator who is against it. Therefore, I suggest we vote on the amendment.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I asked for a rollcall vote on the amendment. I asked for a rollcall vote on it previously, and put it off when the amendment was withdrawn. The reason for it is that there is an inconsistency in approach. I have no quarrel with inconsistency, but I think the Senate should go on record as to whether these matters of education belong in an education bill or do not. It cannot divide people at the age of 3 and 4 and say we will put 3- and 4-year-olds under Operation Headstart in the Office of Economic Opportunity and then, when they cross the threshold of the grand old age of 5, say it thinks they should be under the Office of Education. I think they belong in the Office of Education. I think this is a good amendment.

The Headstart program is not a new program or an innovation. I remember when my sister, who was killed in an automobile accident in 1964, had a Headstart operation in Dearborn, Mich., in 1951. So this is nothing new.

The problems of education belong in the schools. That is where they should be handled. Those people should be given the opportunity to handle education matters. That is where the Followthrough program belongs. It is an extension of Operation Headstart. If Headstart and Followthrough mean anything, they are part of the same program and they belong in the same agency.

The Senate went on record in a rollcall vote as favoring taking the operation Headstart and putting it in one agency of the Government. Now it is going to take another program, called Followthrough, which involves only possibly a difference of half a year in the age of these children, and say it should be administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. That is perfectly all right with me, but I think the Senate ought to display consistency.

I personally intend to vote for the amendment, as I did for the amendment which would have placed Headstart in the Office of Education. I am not going to detain the Senate, but I am glad we are going to have a rollcall vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], 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 Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 89, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 277 Leg.]

YEAS—89

Aiken	Carlson	Fong
Allott	Case	Fulbright
Anderson	Church	Griffin
Bartlett	Clark	Gruening
Bayh	Cooper	Hansen
Bennett	Cotton	Harris
Bible	Curtis	Hart
Boggs	Dirksen	Hartke
Brewster	Dodd	Hatfield
Burdick	Dominick	Hayden
Byrd, Va.	Eastland	Hickenlooper
Byrd, W. Va.	Ellender	Hill
Cannon	Fannin	Holland

Hollings	McIntyre	Ribicoff
Hruska	Metcalf	Scott
Inouye	Miller	Smathers
Jackson	Mondale	Smith
Javits	Monroney	Sparkman
Jordan, N.C.	Montoya	Spong
Jordan, Idaho	Morse	Stennis
Kuchel	Mundt	Symington
Lausche	Murphy	Talmadge
Long, Mo.	Muskie	Thurmond
Long, La.	Nelson	Tydings
Magnuson	Pearson	Williams, N.J.
Mansfield	Pell	Williams, Del.
McCarthy	Percy	Yarborough
McClellan	Prouty	Young, N. Dak.
McGee	Proxmire	Young, Ohio
McGovern	Randolph	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—11

Baker	Kennedy, Mass.	Pastore
Brooke	Kennedy, N.Y.	Russell
Ervin	Morton	Tower
Gore	Moss	

So Mr. PROUTY's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 67, line 1, strike "part B of title I and title II", and insert in lieu thereof the following: "part B of title I, title II, and part B of title III".

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

Mr. MURPHY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. As I understand it, the pending amendment is the Governor's veto amendment.

Mr. MURPHY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK. Would the Senator from California be willing to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement for, let us *say, a half* an hour on a side on the pending amendment?

Mr. MURPHY. I would.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, is the majority leader agreeable to that?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on the pending amendment be limited to 1 hour, half of the time to be controlled by the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] and the other half to be controlled by the manager of the bill, and that any amendments thereto must be germane.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Certain Senators want to vote on this amendment, and they will not be back until late afternoon.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, Senators will be coming and going all the time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I renew my unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania renews his unanimous-consent request. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

How much time does the Senator from California yield himself?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. President, at the present time, the Governor of a State in which a Job Corps camp is proposed to be established has the power, under section 109, to prohibit its construction and operation if he believes the burdens created by its operation would outweigh the benefits it might engender.

By the same token, section 209(c) grants the Governor a limited veto power over the title I, part B, and title II projects—the work training and community action programs.

Mr. President, may we have order? I am extremely sorry to ask for order, but it is difficult for me to be heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. MURPHY. It is very difficult for me to be heard. I ask for special thoughtfulness on the part of my colleagues because I think what I have to say is quite important. Otherwise, I would not take up the time of the Senate to bring the matter to its attention.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 10 seconds?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I join in the request of the Senator from California. The Senate owes him the courtesy, in view of the difficulty he has in being heard, of remaining in complete silence while we listen to the Senator from California.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the Senator from Oregon very much.

Mr. President, at the present time, the Governor of a State in which a Job Corps Camp is proposed to be established, has the power, under section 109, to prohibit its construction and operation if he believes the burdens created by its operation would outweigh the benefits it might engender.

By the same token, section 209(c) grants the governor a limited veto power over title I, part B, and title II projects—the work training and community action programs.

The amendment I am sending to the desk would confer this same limited veto power on the Governor for title III, B programs; so that the State's chief executive could prohibit the implementation of a migrant assistance program within 30 days upon receiving a copy of the grant if he did not believe it would result in an effective weapon for battling the symptoms and causes of poverty among migrant workers.

Since 1964, when the Congress inaugurated the war on poverty, the State OEO offices have gained a great deal of technical expertise in the problems causing and perpetuating poverty.

They have also become equipped to deal with the particular problems of their States, and we all know that these problems vary from State to State. While the regional OEO offices concentrate on the poverty program over a three-, four-, or five-State area, we know that the State OEO offices are well acquainted with the entire needs of one specific State. Consequently, it seems to me that the regional and Federal OEO offices ought to look to the State office for the specific requirements, needs and programs that should be generated for that particular State.

The necessity of utilizing this knowledge and advice is underscored in a letter I received from Mr. Ralph Gunderson, chief of migrant programs of the California State OEO, and in a telegram from Governor Reagan. The correspondence ably states the problem which exists in my home State due to the overlapping and uncoordinated activities of the State and regional offices. I ask unanimous consent that the letter and the telegram be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

LETTER FROM MR. GUNDERSON

In answer to your query on migrant adult education programs in California:

(1) On January 1, 1967, the administration's position toward migrant programs was made known to U.S. OEO. The first priority was housing for migrants with associated programs of day care and health. Advise to the Governor came from Dr. Paul O'Rourke, former Director of California's OEO, who reemphasized priorities in testimony in Stockton on May 11, 1967, before the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Farm Labor. This position has not been changed and has the concurrence of the Honorable Theron J. Bell, Director of California OEO.

(2) The California migrant master plan is designed to provide adult education for migrants on a continuing basis in conjunction with other programs, in an integrated frontal assault on migrant poverty. Funding outside the migrant master plan prevents a coordinated and structured effort to eliminate the causes of this poverty, and proliferates programs which contemplate no logical culmination (i.e., jobs).

(3) There is a wide body of criticism at local levels about staffing for these projects not under state auspices. Well known long time proponents of dissention and agitation of means of approaching farm labor problems are all too frequently found on these staff rolls. In our opinion, their very presence mitigates against community acceptance and cooperation which is essential to success in this type of program.

(4) In at least two counties (Kern and Stanislaus) migrant adult education projects were approved without full discussion of the issues. Two members of the Board of Supervisors of Kern County resigned from the Community Action Council because they could not obtain full details on the programs. Although some members of the Stanislaus County CAC insisted on further debate, the project was approved without such discussion.

(5) The stipend system is a source of potential conflict with gainful employment on farms where the school may be competing with the farmer for the time of the worker.

(6) Adult education programs operated in camps under the migrant master plan tend to serve migrants exclusively with the intent of breaking the cycle of poverty. Local grants of this kind operating presumably

only in the off-season tend to serve seasonal farm workers and do little to solve migrant problems.

(7) Ineffective administration is a common charge leveled at these programs; i.e., proposed salary raises for personnel before a project is even begun, early staffing, excessive needs etc. We do not think any of the projects are yet mature enough to evaluate their administration.

(8) Educational programs of this sort are now under consideration in spite of the omni-present controversy.

(9) The programs tend to be extremely dear, particularly in terms of administration changes already at state OEO.

None of these things appear to comply with the spirit of the President's message of November 11, 1966, titled, "Advice and Consultations with State and Local Officials."

RALPH GUNDERSON,
Chief, Migrant Programs, OEO.

SEPTEMBER 26, 1967.

Senator MURPHY: I request that you implement changes in legislation to provide Governors veto power over Title III(B) migrant projects. These are intended to alleviate poverty among farm workers and their families, problems which intimately and profoundly affect this State's economy. This power is necessary to prevent wasteful programs and to provide a coordinated Federal-State assault on existing problems.

RONALD REAGAN.

Mr. MURPHY. The fact that the Governor is unable to veto title III(B) programs leaves the door wide open for the OEO to move any title II program, which the Governor has seen fit to refuse, into title III. To demonstrate this, let me cite one example from California.

The center for community development, known as CCCD, was originally funded in the amount of $280,000 through title II. This organization cosponsored the Watts Social Action Training Center—SATC—which gave 16- to 24-year-old "leaders," mostly from outside Watts, an "intensive social action orientation program" which included the teaching of how to participate in an organized picket line and demonstrations. The CCCD also organized farmworkers through its main headquarters in Del Rey, Calif., by lending personnel to Mr. Caesar Chavez, who was active in the area at that time. It also helped garbage collectors in Bakersfield form a union and organize a strike. Finally, it formed the Los Angeles Welfare Rights Organizing Committee.

Not only did I question the propriety of these actions, but Governor Reagan did also; and when the CCCD requested a $109,000 refunding grant, the Governor vetoed it. This he did by utilizing section 209(c).

Soon thereafter, however, an organization called the Central California Action Associates—it will be noticed that they have substituted an "A" for one "C" and an "A" for one "D"—requested more than $3 million for an adult migrant education program to cover an eight county area and to be funded under title IIIB. Not only was it disturbing to note that the application submitted by the CCAA for such funding contained little description of the consistency of the adult migrant education program it was to encompass, but also that the directors of the CCAA were exactly the same—to the man—as the board of directors of the CCCD, which no longer functioned. This was obviously an action to circumvent the veto of the Governor. The Governor, of course, had no say in approving or refusing this new grant, since it was a title IIIB program.

Today, it is funded in the amount of $1.5 million and it is beginning to operate. Exactly what the program is doing, I have not found out. I am hopeful that it will work effectively in alleviating the needs of the migrant workers and help the poor whom it was intended to help in the first instance. But I have no evidence of this. The directors of the program have since been changed—I am pleased to report—but that is not the point. The accomplishment of such a change took months of concerted effort on the part of the citizens in the eight-county area who were to be affected by this program, and on the part of the Governor's office, this Senator, and other Members of Congress. So that the Members of Congress, the Governor, this Senator, and the citizens of the area are in complete agreement with respect to this matter.

In the meantime, the poor migrant workers, who are supposed to be the ones we are trying to help, were just being told what might be done in the future for their benefit; but, actually, they were getting little, if any, benefit. This could have been averted had the Governor been able originally to review the program. The veto assures the State will have an opportunity to be heard, to improve the program. The veto is only used when necessary and Mr. Sargent Shriver can override the veto, as he could under the other sections. But at least the local representatives of the people of that area should have been given an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. President, this is one of many examples that I could cite which clearly are not the intent of the program, as I understand it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPONG in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MURPHY. I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

I believe, quite honestly, that in the administration of these large sums of money, much improvement could and should be made immediately.

One improvement I strongly recommend is close cooperation between the Federal OEO and the Governors of the several States. The recommendations of the State OEO to the Governor must be concurred in by the Federal OEO, because, as I pointed out in my opening remarks, they are the people in a position to know the actual and practical needs and they should be the people with firsthand knowledge and information and experience to know how best to take care of the needs of the migrants.

Therefore, Mr. President, I strongly recommend that the limited veto which is granted to the Governors for title IB and title II programs be extended to cover projects under title IIIB.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, first, I should like to thank the Senator from California for the courtesy extended to all Senators by distributing the explanation of his amendment. I believe he did so last week. So there is no surprise involved with respect to the proposed amendment.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, may I say that I was prepared to offer the amendment last week, on one very dull afternoon; but at the request of another Senator who wished to be present and to make remarks concerning the amendment, I withheld offering it until the manager of the bill signified that he desired that I bring it forth.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. We are now engaged in debate with respect to the amendment. I oppose the amendment, but I do appreciate the courtesy of having the Senator's speech in advance, so that I had several days to review it.

This is rather an inappropriate time to be talking about migrant workers, when we have the St. Louis Cardinals in Boston. Some of the fellows from Puerto Rico play for Boston, and the score is one to one at this time, I am informed.

Mr. MURPHY. May I say that presently, in my State of California, because of some misunderstandings, which I will deal with in another amendment I shall offer later, we are now short farm labor, so that 20 percent of the crop of tomatoes in the Salinas Valley has already gone to rot in the field. The Governor of the State has had to accept the suggestion which I believe was made originally by former Governor Brown, 2 years ago, to release 400 prisoners to work in the grape vineyards in order to keep the grape crop from rotting on the vine.

I am in great sympathy with what is going on in Boston, and I may say that I have a personal interest, having been a classmate of Tom Yawkey and having been on the Boston season ticket list for many years.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. This is on my time, but it is pleasant to hear, anyway.

Mr. MURPHY. I am most appreciative of the conditions in Boston, but the conditions in California insist that I bring this matter forward at this time. In other words, I would have been glad to wait another few days.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I will say, in connection with pressing prisoners into work for the harvest in California, there are a large number of unemployed people in Texas, particularly now, because of the tragic floods there.

It has been my effort over the years to try to develop communication lines, transportation, and adequate housing that would bring farmworkers who want to work from areas, such as Texas, to California.

Mr. MURPHY. Nobody has been more diligent about this problem than the Senator from New Jersey. I hope that some day we will be able to accomplish all of these things, such as transportation and communication and make a practical approach in getting the workers who want the job to the job so that they may take advantage of the situation and that the economy will not be interrupted by not having workers in the right place at the right time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I agree

with the Senator. I appreciate his conscientious efforts in helping migratory farmworkers. We saw some of the worst of the housing in California. I believe I am correct in what I am about to say. I recall the junior Senator from California, at his own expense, made several trips to California to straighten out that matter.

Mr. MURPHY. It is done.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, returning to the amendment extending the veto power of Governors to title III programs, I am opposed to the measure for many reasons.

Most of the programs that are developed under this title come from private agencies and not State or local government. The list shows the American Friends Service Committee, the bishop's committee for the Spanish speaking, the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, the migratory committee of the National Council of Churches, and the National Consumers League have programs or support groups having such programs. The American Friends also have a self-help housing program.

The amendment proposes that the Governor could veto these privately generated programs that reach down into the real bowels of poverty, the poorest people in this country; and yet the State and its Governor are not charged with any financial responsibility at all in this program. They have no financial responsibility at stake. They do have a competitive stake because the funds for the total of these programs are limited.

The American Friends or the Catholic Rural Life Conference could submit applications and the State might have an application. They would therefore be in competition for funds. It seems to me that if I were a Governor. I would fight for my State program, and if the funds were limited, I would veto the private program so that the State program could go further. This is only human.

I know there is a limited veto in other programs. I was here at this desk about 5 years ago when I accepted the first Governors' veto amendment. That proposal was offered by the then-Democratic Senator from South Carolina, now a Republican from South Carolina, [Mr. THURMOND]. I accepted it, frankly, not because I believed in it, but because I thought it was necessary to pass the National Service Corps volunteers. In fact, the judgment was right. We won by two votes.

Ever since then, the veto idea has been running through several programs. This is a most inappropriate program for it because most of the activities that are generated out of title III come from private generations. It has nothing to do with Governor Reagan and the State of California, or Governor Wallace and the State of Alabama, and yet they are the two Governors who have been most responsible for vetoes where vetoes are permitted. As a matter of fact these two States account for 60 percent of all the vetoes cast.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I answer the Senator by saying that I completely respect his judgment in this matter. In preparing this amendment I thought of all the possibilities that could occur to me. However, I notice that at the outset there was a Governor's veto in the poverty program. Then as it developed, after I came to the Senate, the veto was taken out of the poverty program. Then it was seen fit to restore a temporary veto, an almost veto. It is not a real veto. It merely gives the Governor the opportunity to object and object publicly within 30 days. The director of the program at all times can override the Governor; at all times he can say, as we may say here in our judgment—God help us if we are wrong—this program is good and this program is bad.

All I ask in this amendment is exactly the same potential for the local people, the State people, the people most intimately concerned with this matter, to have a chance to express their desire or object in the limited veto which is now in existence throughout the remainder of the program. I believe it was put there because public feelings were so high that it was better to restore it on a limited basis.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I would yield to the Senator, but this is now on my time. Will the Senator from California give me equal time if I use all of my time?

Mr. MURPHY. I shall.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I ask the Senator to yield to me for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY. I yield to the Senator 5 minutes.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I was the Governor of Wyoming for 4 years before coming to the Senate. During that time we had a number of proposals by the Office of Economic Opportunity for different kinds of programs within the State of Wyoming. I speak particularly of Job Corps programs.

It was not my interest or desire at that time to try to veto, by virtue of the power that was vested in me as the Governor of Wyoming, programs with which I might not have been in complete accord because I differed with the philosophy, but rather to see if what I did would be most helpful, so that the Federal dollar spent would result in the greatest amount of good, and because of my intimate knowledge of Wyoming—as would be true of any other Governor of a State—I was able to call the attention of the Office of Economic Opportunity to certain conditions I thought were important. Had it not been for my exercising the veto that was then vested in me I am certain that some Federal funds would have been wasted.

First, I felt in the establishment of a Job Corps camp in Wyoming, it was important that the camp had the support of a majority of the people in the city which was adjacent or contiguous to that Job Corps camp.

I polled the city of Casper, Wyo., by talking to the mayor, the city council, the county commissioners, and the school people to find out if they were receptive to the idea. After I found that they were I gave my endorsement to the idea.

At another time a camp was proposed in Jeffrey City, Wyo., and I said that a Job Corps camp should not be placed there.

My reasons were, despite the fact a number of people were there and there was a post office present in that little town, it was a town established by a mining corporation and there were no civil officials as would be found in the average city. Without any police protection or any kind of civil authority being exercised, I felt it would not be proper to establish a Job Corps camp in that area.

I suggest that no one knows better than the Governor of the State the specific conditions which may determine the effectiveness with which a program can be implemented, or some of the pitfalls likely to overtake it. For those reasons, I support the amendment of the Senator from California because, it seems to me, it makes good sense to bring to bear the most precise knowledge we can obtain in each of these areas as we attempt to implement Federal programs and spend Federal dollars.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have been deluged with telegrams and letters in opposition to the amendment dealing with the Governor's veto. Many of them come from the State of California, by the way.

Mr. MURPHY. If the Senator will forgive this interjection, I am very certain that he has received many from California. I venture to say that I can almost guess the names of some of those who sent them, and I can almost tell the Senator what they say.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. They are from some of the Senator's very best friends.

Mr. MURPHY. I know a great deal about this problem in California. I have been at it for 20 years now and I know exactly what they have in mind.

Let me assure the distinguished Senator from New Jersey that I would not be putting the Senate and the visitors in the gallery through the discomfiture, if I did not think this was extremely important.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I will say that these letters and telegrams represent a broad geographical expression of opinion. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD.

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

SYNOD OF CALIFORNIA, SOUTHERN AREA, THE UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U.S.A.,
Los Angeles, Calif., September 28, 1967.

Subject: Amendment to title IIIB, migrant section, OEO Act.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: It is my understanding that an amendment to the OEO Act has been introduced by Senator Murphy with regard to Title IIIB, the Migrant Section. Evidently this amendment would

give individual state governor's full veto power over OEO programs related to migrant workers within the boundaries of their states.

I am writing in opposition to such an amendment and urge that you do all that is possible to prevent its adoption.

The United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. called upon its constituents in 1965 to "recognize poverty as a problem which evokes repentance and renewed Christian commitment by . . . continuing all necessary ministries of symptomatic relief while concentrating on the discovery and eradication of the causes of poverty; . . . insisting that the poor themselves be drawn into decision-making participation in the shaping of their destiny, which is none other than our common destiny . . ."

My information indicates that the OEO programs related to migrant workers are indeed trying to give symptomatic relief while researching root causes of poverty and that this is being done with full participation of the poor themselves. Accordingly, they have my support and encouragement although I recognize that any innovative programs will have some failures and create some antagonism.

My belief is that poverty is a national problem and that migrant poverty is, if not national, at least inter-state in scope. For this reason, I believe that full consideration should be given to the views of individual state governors but that they should not have absolute control over the life and death of basic remedial programs which have been deemed essential for the health of the nation by the collective wisdom of Congress.

I am contacting other persons within our denomination on this matter in the hope that they might personally become involved in this issue which I consider vital to the rural poor, not only in California but in other states as well.

Sincerely,

ROBERT F. HERMANSON,
Associate Executive Secretary.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY,
Princeton, N.J., September 29, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: I have been informed recently that Senator Murphy of California is proposing an amendment to the OEO statute concerning migrant labor which would permit a veto or suspension of programs in a given state when the governor disagreed with it. Although I have not had the opportunity to read the amendment, if the description I have had is accurate, then I want to register strong disapproval.

During the last nine months I have become familiar with some of the problems of migrant labor as a result of being on Governor Hughes' Task Force on Migrant Farm Labor. I think the work done by OEO has a great potential to help migrant workers, and I should regret it greatly if some uncooperative governor in any state should decide to delay a project. For delay often means the demise of these projects, as we have all observed. I can see no good that the amendment would achieve, and I visualize much harm instead. A little more compassion for the plight of these people rather than building roadblocks against aid to them seems to be in order.

Sincerely yours,

W. DUANE LOCKARD,
Vice Chairman, Governor's Task Force on Migrant Farm Labor (New Jersey).

SAN ANTONIO, TEX.,
October 2, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS, JR.,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

This is no time to undercut the migrant division of the Office of Economic Opportunity. I therefore oppose most vigorously the amendment offered by Senator George Murphy giving governors veto power over migrant programs please oppose this amendment with your usual effectiveness.

ROBERT E. LUCEY,
Archbishop of San Antonio.

GOLDEN, COLO.,
September 29, 1967.

Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge defeat of Murphy amendment giving State Governors veto power over section 111(b) proposals for OEO programs. Workers are from many States across the Nation. I recommend administration nationally and regionally for more uniformity of OEO programs according to need. Cannot condone situation in some States where OEO programs would be politically segregated by decision of Governor.

REV. JACK H. ALFORD,
National Council of Churches.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
September 30, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SENATOR: We vigorously oppose the Murphy amendment which would give Governor the power of veto over OEO programs for migrant workers. We encourage you to do all within your power to oppose this measure.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. MCCARTHY,
Acting Director, Western Regional Office of Bishops Committee for the Spanish Speaking.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX.,
September 29, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

SENATOR: The Texas Bishops Committee for the Spanish speaking vigorously opposes the Murphy amendment giving veto power to Governor. Please oppose.

REV. PATRICK FLORES,
State Chairman.

BERKELEY HEIGHTS, N.J.,
October 2, 1967.

Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please be advised that the Consumer League of New Jersey stands in opposition to Senator Murphy's proposed amendment of title 3B of the Economic Opportunity Act.

JOHN M. STOCHAJ,
Consumers League of New Jersey.

VISALIA, CALIF.,
September 28, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge opposition to OEO amendment to allow Governors veto of migrant programs. Programs need flexibility and freedom from political interference.

HERBERT FOSTER, Jr.,
Agriculture Labor Representative,
American Friends Service Committee.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX.,
September 29, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The National Bishops Committee for the Spanish Speaking opposes the amendment offered by Senator George Murphy placing veto power over migratory programs of OEO. Please oppose.

REV. JOHN MCCARTHY,
Executive Secretary.

DENVER, COLO.,
September 29, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS, Jr.,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Senator Murphy's amendment to OEO bill should be defeated giving a Governor the power of veto over OEO programs is not in the best interest of the people needing the program. Please do what you can to defeat the amendment.

EDWARD L. WHITTEMORE,
Executive Secretary.
JAS. L. SELMSER,
Director, Migrant Ministry.
FRANKLIN P. WHERRY,
Chairman, Social Action Department, Colorado Council of Churches.

FAIR LAWN, N.J.,
October 2, 1967.

Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS Jr.,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge negative vote, Governors veto over title 3B, Economic Opportunity Act. Regards progressive States.

MRS. LORA LISS,
Member, Governor's Migrant Labor Task Force.

LANSING, MICH.,
September 29, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Biulding,
Washington, D.C.:

Please oppose amendment to title 3B of Economic Opportunity Act which allows State Governors veto power over migrant poverty programs. Services for interstate people are easily dismissed by local opinion as responsibility of someone else.

WILL BENALLACK,
Director,
Michigan Migrant Ministry.

MERCED, CALIF.,
September 28, 1967.

Hon. HARRISON WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I oppose amendment requiring the Governors signature on title III–B OEO programs because it delays the program.

SARA GRACIA.

MERCED, CALIF.,
September 28, 1967.

Hon. HARRISON WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I oppose the amendment requiring Governors signatures on title III–B OEO program.

MRS. INEZ L. VALDEZ.

MERCED, CALIF.,
September 28, 1967.

Hon. HARRISON WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Please do all you can to defeat the amendment which would require the signature of the Governor on title III–B Office of Economic Opportunity project in many States. This amendment would stop many of the more meaningful projects for migrant and seasonal farm workers.

Mr. and Mrs. WILLIAM H. STOCKARD.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
September 30, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Washington, D.C.:

Centro Social Obrero, vigorously oppose the Murphy amendment which will give veto power to any Governor concerning migrant worker programs.

CENTRO SOCIAL OBRERO
Mexican League of the Construction Workers of North America.

MERCED, CALIF.,
September 28, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: I am against the amendment proposed by Senator Murphy to title III–B migrant education. With such an amendment it would only delete or delay funds and programs for migrants.

DENARD W. DAVIS,
Coordinator, Adult Education, Merced County.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
September 30, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Mission Economic Opportunity Council vigorously opposes the Murphy amendment which would give veto power to Governors over migrant worker programs.

Respectfully,

RAYMONJ R. ACOSTA,
Chairman, Mission Area Community Action Board.

MERCED, CALIF.,
September 28, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I have been associated with programs for migrant workers and I am opposed to the amendment which would require the Governor's signature to title IIIB OEO projects. This would cost undue delay in programs designed to help migrant farm workers. I feel that the Governor of California is not in sympathy with meaningful programs for migrant farm workers.

MARIA RODRIGUEZ,
Director, Planada Migrant Programs.

MERCED, CALIF.,
September 29, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SENATOR HARRISON WILLIAMS: I have worked in this program for 3 years. Migrants need this program very much. I oppose amendment requiring Government signature on title 3B OEO programs. I urge you to oppose defeat amendment will only cause delay of program.

DORA BUSTOS.

MERCED, CALIF.,
September 29, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to defeat the amendment title 3B OEO program. This program is very much needed in spite of opposed opinions. If not, it would only cause delay of program.

JUANS RAMIREZ.

MERCED, CALIF.,
September 29, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I oppose the amendment requiring Governors signature on title 3B OEO programs.

DELORES BENABIDEZ.

MERCED, CALIF.,
September 29, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS.

I oppose the amendment 3B OEO program for delay.

JUANITA MARTINEZ.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
September 29, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Reagan veto prerogative over California OEO 3B programs disastrous. Farm workers urge opposition Murphy amendment.

RALPH KENNEDY,
President, Los Angeles Presbyterian Interracial Council.

MIAMI, FLA.,
September 28, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I oppose the placing of title 3B under Governor veto.

WILLIAM BLACK.

LANSING, MICH.,
September 29, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We vigorously oppose any amendment in title 3B which would give to governors veto power over the OEO migrant program. Many governors, including Michigan, have demonstrated little concern for migrant workers and are likely to prevent much needed programs for these disadvantaged people.

MIDWEST OFFICE BISHOPS COMMITTEE FOR SPANISH SPEAKING AND LANSING DIOCESAN MIGRANT APOSTOLATE.

MERCED, CALIF.,
September 29, 1967.

Hon. HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

This program is in great need for the migrant and seasonal workers. I oppose and urge you to defeat the amendment requiring Governor's signature on title 3b OEO program. It will only cause delay of EOC program.

MRS. VERA SALEIDO.

MERCED, CALIF.,
September 28, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Washington, D.C.:

I oppose the amendment requiring governor's signature on title III–B O.E.O. programs.

SAMUEL VLADIMIRSKY,
Director-Teacher, Planada Migrant Child-Care Center.

MERCED, CALIF.,
September 29, 1967.

Hon. HARRISON WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you defeat amendment title 3B OEO. Migrants seasonal workers need this program in spite of opposed opinions. If not this will cause program delay.

FLORA R. MARTINEZ.

HANFORD, CALIF.,
September 29, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly oppose EOA rider sponsored by Senator George Murphy to provide Governors' veto power over Title III–B projects. Believe this power would prevent many good programs from proving themselves.

JERALD L. WEBSTER,
Executive Director, Kings County Community Action Organization.

LANTANA, FLA.,
September 28, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge Senate reject Senator Murphy's amendment to OEO appropriation OB bill allowing Governor's Veto title 3B.

FLORIDA COUNCIL OF CHAPTERS, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SOCIAL WORKERS.

MIAMI, FLA.,
September 28, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge against placing 3B under Governor's veto.

AUGUST VANDENBOSCHE,
Coordinating Committee for Farmworkers.

VISALIA, CALIF.,
September 28, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We appreciate support you have given self help housing programs. Feel it would be a mistake to provide for Governor's veto in the OEO bill to title III–B programs as recently proposed by Senator Murphy. This could impede the development and expansion of this and other worthwhile programs to migrant and seasonal farm workers.

ROBERT MARSHALL,
Executive Director.

COATESVILLE, PA.,
October 2, 1967.

Hon. HARRISON WILLIAMS,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Migrants often ineligible state benefits. Title III funds should not be under Governors' veto.

CHARLES S. HEARNE,
President, Chester County Migrant Commission.

KENNETT SQUARE, PA.,
September 28, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS, Jr.,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Object to placing title 3 OEO Act under Governors' veto.

ALAN HARDY,
RITA HARDY,
ALICE MOULTON,
HENRIETTA SHOLARS,
ALLEN CROMMER,
JAMES HORGAN.

MERCED, CALIF.,
September 29, 1967.

Hon. HARRISON WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Please do all you can to defeat the amendment which would require the signature of the Governor on title 3b Office of Economic Opportunity project. This amendment would stop many of the more meaningful projects for migrant and seasonal farm workers.

ROBERT W. JONES,
Central Labor Council AFL–CIO.

TRENTON, N.J.,
October 1, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Wish to express strong opposition to amendment proposed to title 3B.

Dr. PAUL T. WILLIAMS.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD some tables on Governors' vetoes which were prepared by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

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

GOVERNORS' VETOES

Grantee	Funds and OEO approval	Governor's action	OEO action (or further action by Governor)
		REGION III	
Alabama (9):			
New York Grant No. 8443, National Sharecroppers Fund, Inc., New York, N.Y.	$229,767 (jointly with Georgia), training-technical assistant, Dec. 21, 1966.	Vetoed Jan. 9, 1967, by Gov. George Wallace. Veto sustained Mar. 13, 1967, by Gov. Lurleen Wallace.	Pending decision (as of Mar. 29, 1967). Decision not to override per letter, May 8, 1967.
Grant No. 3037-A/O, Mobile Area Community, Action Committee, Mobile, Ala.	$43,519, program development, May 14, 1966.	Vetoed June 17, 1966	Resubmitted Oct. 3, 1966. 30-day waiting period passed without signature or veto. Funded.
Grant No. 3453, Antipoverty Coordinating Committee, SCLC, Inc., Wilcox County, Ala.	$123,282, summer Headstart	Vetoed	Sustained.
Grant No. CG-8798-A/O, Wilcox County, Ala	$180,152, emergency family loan	Vetoed Aug. 7, 1967	Pending.
Grant No. 3250, St. Clair Child Development Program, St. Clair County, Ala. (Ashville).	$47,790, summer Headstart, May 26, 1966	Vetoed June 30, 1966	Overridden Aug. 12, 1966.
Same program vetoed this year	$57,000	Vetoed June 1967	Overridden July 1967.
Grant No. 657, Birmingham Area Committee for Development of Economic Opportunities, Inc., Birmingham, Ala.	$66,349, program development, Apr. 13, 1965.	Vetoed May 7, 1965	Sustained.
Grant No. 464, Elk River Development Council, Fayetteville, Tenn.	Program development for 9-county area but Limestone County only one in Alabama.	Vetoed Alabama portion Apr. 23, 1965	Sustained. (There was no veto of Tennessee portion.)
Grant No. 706-A/10, Huntsville Madison County Community Action Committee, Huntsville, Ala., community organization and training.	$48,565, approved Mar. 15, 1967, people-for-people program.	Vetoed Apr. 28, 1967	Withdrawn.
Grant No. 8881-A, Southwest Alabama Farmers Cooperative Association (SWAFCA), farmers' cooperative, Selma, Ala.	$399,967, demonstration grant, May 11, 1967.	Vetoed June 8, 1967	Overridden.
Florida (3):			
Grant No. 119, Economic Opportunity Program, Inc., Miami.	$957,503, child development program, day care.	Vetoed	Governor withdrew veto May 9, 1967.
Grant No. 3035, Economic Opportunity Council, Inc., Tampa.	$203,882, Headstart, day care	do	Do.
Do	$1,133,383, full year, Headstart	do	Do.
Mississippi (1): Grant No. 3155-A/1, Southwest Mississippi Opportunity, Inc., Woodville.	$713,300, Headstart, Oct. 7, 1966	Vetoed Nov. 1, 1966	Overridden Nov. 16, 1966.
South Carolina (1): Grant No. 316, Council of Southern Mountains, Berea, Ky.	$252,119 to 9 States, sec. 206	Declined South Carolina's participation Mar. 15, 1965.	Sustained. (Continues in other 8 States.)
		REGION IV	
Indiana (1): Grant No. 343, Indiana Office of Economic Opportunity, Indianapolis.	$72,000, refunding application for State technical assistance (sec. 209) (grant was never sent to Governor so this is actually not a veto).	Withdrawn February 1967 and STA closed by Governor.	Sustained by regional office.
		REGION V	
Louisiana (2):			
Grant No. 5103 (St. Mary's Parish), Southern Consumer Education Foundation, Lafayette.	Full-year Headstart	Vetoed June 6, 1966	Governor rescinded his veto June 6, 1966.
Grant No. CG-5103-A-3 (St. Mary's Parish), Southern Consumer Education Foundation, Lafayette.	do	Vetoed June 1967	Pending (?).
		REGION VI	
Missouri (1): Grant No. 8825, St. Louis Human Development Corp., St. Louis.	$346,000, technical assistance (206), Feb. 17, 1967.	Vetoed Mar. 6, 1967	Resubmitted Mar. 16, 1967, for training portion only. Governor approved by letter Mar. 24.
North Dakota (2):			
Grant No. 6315, Legal Aid Society of North Dakota, Bismarck.	$292,385, legal services, Apr. 25, 1966	Vetoed May 13, 1966	Sustained.
Grant No. 776/2, Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians, Belcourt.	$40,226, legal services	Vetoed May 23, 1966	Do.
Wyoming (1): Grant No. 6261, county of Natrona opportunity development, Casper.	$24,816	Vetoed Apr. 1, 1966	Do.
California (8):			
Grant No. 8837-A/O, California Center for Community Development, Del Rey.	$109,520, demonstration grant (207) funded.	Vetoed Mar. 30, 1967	Partial override to reimburse grantee for operating expenses incurred during Governor's consideration.
Grant No. CG-6764-A/O, Yolo County Emergency Migrant Loan Program, Economic Opportunity Committee of Yolo County.	$15,000, emergency loan funded, July 11, 1967.	Vetoed Aug. 11, 1967	OEO action under consideration.
Grant No. CG-7167-A/O, Alameda County Legal Aid Society.	$32,314, on-campus legal services funded July 20.	Vetoed Aug. 23, 1967	Objections presently being reviewed with Governor's office.
Grant No. CG-0656-B/4, Community Action Council of San Joaquin County.	$69,911, adult basic education	do	OEO action under consideration.
Grant No. OG-0629-B/6, Solano Economic Opportunity Commission.	$92,992, legal services	Vetoed July 6, 1967	Veto verbally withdrawn by Governor's office; withdrawal not as yet confirmed.
Grant No. BWPM-7-7234-05, Ventura County Community Action Commission.	$63,270, job placement (U.S. Department of Labor program).	do	OEO action under consideration.
OEO contract (part) No. 4110, May 11, 1967, Los Angeles Neighborhood Legal Services Society.	12 VISTA volunteers	Vetoed July 5, 1967	Veto sustained.
Grant No. CG-705-B/7, Economic Opportunity Commission of San Diego County, Inc.	$13,074, neighborhood service center	Carbon copy, Governor's letter of Aug. 21, 1967, recommending disapproval received by regional office. Governor announced veto at subsequent press conference.	Awaiting official action by Governor.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Texas such time as he may require.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas will state it.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. How much time does the distinguished Senator from New Jersey have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would advise the Senator from Texas that the Senator from New Jersey has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. As much time as the distinguished Senator needs, he has.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, the provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act affecting migratory labor are among the most important in the act. Much more must be done in this area, and programs should not be unnecessarily hindered by the adoption of an amendment which would add the Governor's veto to title III(b) programs. More than 7½ million Americans in many States are affected by this provision, for it seeks to give assistance to the families as well as to the workers involved in migratory and seasonal farm labor.

Presently the Office of Economic Opportunity programs have reached fewer than 2 percent of the migrants. Our fu-

ture programs should reach more migrants with aid particularly in three areas. Housing remains a continuing and degrading problem among migrants. Education must be increased for both adults and youth so that they can prepare themselves adequately for their futures. And day-care assistance must be used to prevent even worse deficiencies among the children left unattended while the rest of the family must labor in the field.

Persons trapped in this means of employment have long suffered inattention in many States. State governments have certainly not been leaders in developing programs for their assistance. Now that the Federal Government has taken the initiative, it would be counter to the basic objectives of the war on poverty, and this act, to place the migrants' fate again in the hands of the Governor.

This is an important question for State government as well. Where there is direct Federal activity, such as the VISTA program, the consent requirement may be justified. It does not transfer to the Governor control over any matter normally assigned elsewhere in State law.

But many types of migrant assistance will count on programs using local agencies and organizations. These local organizations want to help, despite the State government's opposition—this has been true in my State, Mr. President—and they are the key to a comprehensive attack on this problem. Under State law, the Governor would normally have no direct control over such local programs and he would not be expected to be directly responsible for them. This amendment would give him that control and would, therefore, confer more power over a federally assisted program than the Governor enjoys with respect to State action.

In addition to opposing such an amendment in principle, I oppose it because of the way such veto power has operated in practice. It can provide a license for abuse and harassment of programs.

I believe that the Senator from New Jersey has already placed in the RECORD the tables regarding the Governors' vetoes; is that not correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Yes. Let me mention that Alabama had 10 vetoes and California eight. It runs through seven other States.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I believe that California had 60 percent of the vetoes; is that not true? Or is it true that California and Alabama combined account for 60 percent of the vetoes?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The Senator's latter statement is correct.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. And seven more vetoes are pending in California now?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That is correct. I will say that these are recent figures. I think we can name the Governors: Mrs. Lurleen Wallace, of Alabama, and Governor Reagan, of California, were the vetoers.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield for a question?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from California, provided the time is taken out of the time of the proponents of the amendment.

Mr. MURPHY. Just 10 seconds. I should like the RECORD to show that insofar as I can ascertain, there has been no collusion between the Governor of California and the Governor of Alabama.

Mr. CLARK. There will be next year, though. [Laughter.]

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, to continue, frequent letters from my own State have indicated that the hindering effects of the politically motivated activities of the Governors under their veto power are in contradiction to our purpose in this act to move forward. Even when not overtly exercised, the veto power has great coercive force. Under threat of veto, program content can be altered, friends can be appointed to projects, enemies of the Governor can be forced to resign, and seemingly endless frustrations and delays can be caused. The main argument for adding veto power to title III(b) is that similar veto power is included in other parts of the act. But if we look at the effect veto power has had on operation of other parts of the act, then one can see precisely why it should be opposed.

In discussions about this amendment, the comment is sometimes made that without veto power under title III(b), programs that were vetoed elsewhere can be resubmitted through this loophole. I would be against any clever reworking of a program merely to sneak it through. But I am even more opposed to the clever ways that a Governor would be able to use this veto power, with all its coercive potential, to render ineffective our plans and attempts to provide this much needed assistance to migrants.

Mr. President, in closing, let me say to the Senator from California that I sympathize with the problems of the tomato growers in California.

Tomatoes are grown in my State also, as the Senator knows. But it is a crop which comes on later than in California, and our plants were placed in the ground just before Hurricane Beulah hit. The crop was utterly destroyed. Now our workers are unemployed.

Last Friday, I addressed a letter to Secretary of Labor Wirtz, requesting that we get some transportation to California for the tomato and farm workers in my State so that they could help to harvest the crops in California. My letter is printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Friday, September 29, on page 27384.

I call the attention of the distinguished Senator from California again, in answer to his plea for the admission of workers from other countries, that he does not have to go to other nations for his help, that Texas is ready, able, and willing to go to work and help to harvest the California crop, if a means of transportation for them can be found.

I thank the Senator from New Jersey for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I certainly appreciate the forceful statement of the Senator from Texas. I do want to say this which I overlooked in response to the Senator from California: there was a title II program which had application in California by the CCCD. Is that correct?

Mr. MURPHY. According to my information, yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. What do those initials stand for?

Mr. MURPHY. California Center for Community Development.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That was the program, under title II, that was vetoed by Governor Reagan?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes; a refunding grant was vetoed. Then another organization applied for the program, and it was called CCAA.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That was for adult education. Is that correct?

Mr. MURPHY. Basically; yes. I have not been able to find out exactly what it is.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That came under title III, which does not carry a veto by the Governor as of this date.

Mr. MURPHY. That is right. It proposed to have the same directors, which made me believe that there was a capability provided to circumvent the provisions of the other part of the Act.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That is why I raised this question, because I knew this was in the Senator's prepared remarks. I had a check run on the board of directors of the first organization and the board of directors of the second organization, and there was only one man who was on both the first and the second.

Mr. MURPHY. That was a new board of directors. The original board of directors of the second organization was changed and a new board was appointed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The first project was an application for $109,000, as I recall.

Mr. MURPHY. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The adult education program under title III was for about $1.5 million.

Mr. MURPHY. It was $1.5 million.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California does not have the floor. The Senator from New Jersey has.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Oregon has asked for time, and I would like to yield to him at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. What we need and what we have.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as floor manager of the bill, I yield 3 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that the Senator from California and I have been together on almost all farm migratory problems. Last year a series of amendments sponsored by the Senator from California and other Senators on the Labor and Public Welfare Committee were adopted, after a considerable amount of opposition. But on this one I cannot join the Senator from California, because I have always opposed the Governor's veto power under the legislation and I oppose its extension in this case.

I do not think we can have a program that involves national problems such as

are involved in the migratory work program and then segmentize the program.

The bracero program, in the first instance—which I have always defended—came out of my Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs of the Foreign Relations Committee. I thought we made a great mistake when it was abolished. I opposed its abolition.

As the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] knows, he was on the other side of that one, as he was last year on the migratory labor amendments I offered in committee.

I think it is a mistake to give Governors the veto power. I opposed it in the original bill. I oppose it today. I speak respectfully, but I speak in disagreement with the policies of the Governor of California as announced in a Associated Press dispatch of October 3. I recognize his reasons for doing it, but I do not think they justify the course of action he took. The dispatch reads as follows:

Over the objections of organized labor, California convicts were out in orchards plucking figs to avert what Gov. Ronald Reagan said would be a disaster for growers.

Last week the Governor authorized the use of about 200 prisoners from the minimum-security Deuel Vocational Institution at nearby Tracy to lend a hand in harvesting the ripe fig crop. The men are being paid prevailing wages. Thomas Pitts, secretary-treasurer of the California Federation of Labor, AFL–CIO, protested the action. He contended growers hadn't made full efforts to find domestic help.

I think there is a clear duty to do what can be done to provide the workers to meet crop labor emergencies. It has been done in most instances, as far as I know. I do not think that a Governor, instead of going along with a program, would have the power to veto it and then resort to convict labor, is very desirable. It is likely to create more tension between the growers and labor than already exists. I think it is completely unacceptable to do that. I do not believe in this veto power being given to the Governors. I believe in making the Federal program work and in adopting whatever reforms are necessary to make it work, but not by giving the Governors veto power.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for 1 additional minute.

Mr. CLARK. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. A Governor, by utilizing the veto power could have a bad effect on the national program and on national legislation. I do not think we should segmentize it that way.

I wish to place in the RECORD at this time statistics in regard to Governors' vetoes. We have found, for example, that in the community action program, there were 10 vetoes out of Alabama, eight out of California, and three out of Florida out of a total of 30 vetoes.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire material be printed in the RECORD at this point. Time does not permit me to go into detail, but it illustrates the point of the Senator from Oregon's argument that to give power to individual Governors to exercise a veto can jeopardize the entire program.

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

GOVERNORS' VETOES

I. Community Action Program: 30 Vetoes out of over 16,600 grants; of these, 9 were sustained; 4 were overridden in whole and 1 was overridden in part; 2 were accepted as resubmitted; 6 went forward due to the veto being withdrawn or rescinded; 1 was an imperfect veto not recognized by OEO; and 7 are still pending (6 in California). Thus, of the 30 vetoes, 23 have reached final disposition, and of these 23, only 5 were overridden and 8 programs have gone forward without use of the override (besides the one imperfect veto).

The CAP vetoes occurred in these States:

Alabama	10
California	8
Florida	3
Louisiana	2
North Dakota	2
Mississippi	1
Kentucky	1
Indiana	1
Missouri	1
Wyoming	1
Total	30

Thus, Alabama accounts for 33⅓% of all CAP vetoes, and Alabama and California together account for 60%. Four Deep South States (Alabama, Florida, Mississippi and Louisiana) account for over 50%. Those four plus California account for 80%. All CAP vetoes have occurred in 20% of the States (10 of 50) in 80% of all States, there have been no CAP vetoes.

II. VISTA: There have been 2 VISTA vetoes, one in Mississippi, and one partial veto of a 5-State project under OEO Contract #4110: California and Ohio refused participation in a VISTA Associates project (N.Y., N.J., and Pa. accepted). VISTA vetoes are not subject to override. There are currently 420 VISTA Projects.

III. NYC: There have been 2 NYC vetoes, both in 1965 prior to the override authority, one in Texas and one in Montana—as far as we know.

IV. Job Corps: No Job Corps Center has ever been vetoed.

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

Mr. MORSE. I ask for 1 additional minute.

Mr. CLARK. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I do not want to see extended this afternoon the veto power of Governors over such programs, and I shall vote against the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I reserve the balance of my time for the time being.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, how much time does the Senator have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has 5 minutes remaining on his side, and the Senator from California has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I wish to point out to my distinguished friend from Oregon—and I find myself uncomfortable to find him in opposition to me on this, because I generally agree with him wholeheartedly on this—that the amendment I am presenting here really has nothing to do with convict labor in the fields of California to meet an emergency.

If I recall correctly, it was only a year ago that the then Democratic Governor of California suggested the use of convict labor. I do not recall that Mr. Pitts made any loud objection at that time.

I do not favor convict labor. I spoke out at that time. I do not think it is right. But there are many times when farmers face an emergency, when their crops are rotting in the fields. That is an emergency equivalent to that of a house burning down. Those crops have to be gotten out. It must be done quickly. Sometimes things are done which should not be done. Knowing the Governor of California and having been involved in labor organizations over the last 25 years, I know this goes against his beliefs. But, as Governor of a State, he must put the interests of the entire State first, and the desires of organized labor second.

I yield now to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much times does the Senator yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. MURPHY. Five minutes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I should like to direct an inquiry to the sponsor of the amendment, so that I can be sure I understand it.

The impression may have gone forth, based on some of the remarks that have been made, that the amendment of the Senator from California will give the Governors of the States an absolute veto over projects under title III.

I am aware of the fact that the veto under title I and title II is a very limited veto, which can be overridden by Sargent Shriver, the Director of the poverty program.

The Senator from Oregon referred to a number of instances where Governors' vetoes have been exercised. I would assume that in every one of those cases, Sargent Shriver could have or did override the veto of the Governor in those situations, if he believed the Governor did not have good reason to exercise the veto.

I ask the Senator from California whether or not his amendment would be consistent with the limited veto power that is now available under title I and title II, and whether or not Sargent Shriver, the director of the poverty program, could override the Governor's veto if he believed it was without justification.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, my distinguished friend from Michigan has made an excellent point, and has cleared up what might have been a misunderstanding.

The veto provided in this amendment is a limited veto, conferring exactly the same power, under exactly the same definition, as the vetoes which exist in the other parts of the program.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Then there is no arbitrary right of the Governor to kill a program, or discriminate against it because of racial motives, for example?

Mr. MURPHY. None whatever.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Reference has been made to Governor Wallace of Alabama.

The impression may have been left that it might have something to do with race if there were a veto exercised by a Governor. In a situation where that might be the case, is my understanding correct that Sargent Shriver could override such a veto?

Mr. MURPHY. The Senator is correct; he could override the veto. Actually, the Governor's veto is not a veto at all. It merely provides an opportunity for him to object. Sargent Shriver has the right at all times to override the veto.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The Senator has correctly stated that it is not a veto at all. That is not even an appropriate name for it. All the Governor can do is say, in effect, "Just a second, here, let us take a look at this; if you want to override my veto, that is your privilege, but here are things I see wrong with it as Governor of the State"; is that correct?

Mr. MURPHY. That is exactly correct.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. MURPHY. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield?

Mr. MURPHY. Three minutes.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I support the amendment of the Senator from California, because I feel that it brings a better balance to this important program. I know that every Senator who has spoken today has a desire to assist in bringing about better coordination between the Federal and State Governments. I also know, from having had experience with OEO programs subject to the Governor's veto—although it was a full veto and not a limited veto at that time—that with it the program had greater flexibility. The veto gave the Governor a meaningful say in programs vitally affecting his State. The Governors of most States have migratory labor committees or commissions that they work with, consequently, a veto authority would assure his local committee the opportunity to investigate any migratory programs to effect their improvement.

We all realize that no Governor is going to take an action that is detrimental to the people involved, nor an action that is detrimental to the voters, if he can avoid doing so.

Therefore, I emphasize that this is an amendment that will bring about the balance so badly needed. I think having the matter arbitrarily determined by a Federal official is not in the best interests of the migratory worker. This is a good amendment, and should have the support of my fellow Senators.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank my distinguished friend from Arizona. I am certain that the position of the Governor as he has stated it is generally the case. There may be instances, in some States, where Governors, Senators, and Congressmen do not always see eye to eye. But I think in the overall picture, it should be a matter for the decision of the voters of those States who is right and who is wrong, and I do not think we should write legislation in this Chamber to take care of one or two particular instances. I think rather we should write it with the idea of the general good and the general performance.

I point out, Mr. President, that one of the vetoes the Governor of California exercised had to do with a project in which there were 17 workers, 17 poor people to be benefited, and seven supervisors were assigned to the project—seven supervisors to look after 17 workers. The Governor of California vetoed that project, and I think quite rightly; and I am sure that, after he brought the matter to the attention of Sargent Shriver, he did not insist on overriding the veto.

I yield now to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield?

Mr. MURPHY. How much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. MURPHY. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I support the amendment offered by the Senator from California. I do so because I believe the adoption of it will insure a better and more efficient administration of the entire program.

Written into the act already is the right of the Governor of a State to express his opinion about the merits of a proposal coming out of the office of Sargent Shriver. With reference to two of the titles, the right of the Governor to express himself as the chief of his State is already in the law.

The amendment of the Senator from California contemplates giving to the Governor the right of expressing himself on the merits of a proposal with respect to title III, as he has the right to do with respect to title I.

Mr. President, why should the Governor of a State, chosen by the people, living within it, not have the right to express himself on the merits of a proposal made by the Federal Government in the administration of this program? Should he not at least be accorded the dignity of saying, "I believe this program is good" or "I believe it is bad"? That is all he can do, as has been pointed out by the Senator from Michigan. He has no absolute power of veto. All he can do is express an opinion. Sargent Shriver thereafter can finally say, "My judgment shall prevail; the Governor's judgment shall be cast aside. This program must be adopted, whether the State wants it or does not want it."

Are we to adopt a policy of placing tyrannical and absolute powers over the States, without the right of their Governors to complain? I do not think it should be done. Governors have a great responsibility. I assume that they will act with integrity. If they do not, Sargent Shriver, sitting here in Washington, can say, "I reject your thinking; your State must accept this program whether you want it or not."

I commend the Senator from California for sponsoring this amendment.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

I point out that at the outset, when this program was first instituted, it is my understanding that it contained an absolute Governor's veto. I ask my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania to correct me if I am wrong. The next time it came around for action, the veto was taken out.

One of the weaknesses of the program has been its unpopularity, its lack of acceptance in local situations. Were I in Sargent Shriver's position today, I would recommend this veto. He has done it in the other areas of the act. Were I in his position, I would recommend it today, because it would give me a reflection of the feelings of local groups and the feelings of the elected representatives of the people of a given area. It would give me a chance to further ascertain whether or not the judgment of the people setting up the program was, in the final analysis, in the best interests of the poor who are supposed to be helped, the poor who are supposed to be getting the benefits from these tremendous amounts of money we in the Senate have voted to expend.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may I have 1 minute?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Oregon. Then I reserve the remainder of my time for myself.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, very briefly, in answer to the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from California, what we sought to do in the first place was to get arrangements whereby the Governors could make known or have an opportunity to make known to Mr. Shriver their views in regard to a project. We did not try to give them the so-called veto power because the veto power does provide for another step in the administration where a review commission is set up to determine whether a veto should stand.

What has happened is that too many times this has been used for a political battleground. We have a Federal policy and a Governor is politically against the administration of the whole program. So he capitalizes on it politically. That provision ought to be removed from the program.

I said when we were fighting the veto battle in the first place that I was for a program whereby a Governor would be given an opportunity to make known his view to Mr. Shriver.

But I do not think it ought to be done through the procedure of a veto to require a veto commission to have the Governor overruled on the recommendations. That is where politics enters, and we ought to keep all politics out.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President the committee has wrestled with this problem of the Governor's veto now for the better part of 3 years. It is a very controversial

subject, and the importance of the veto varies to a certain extent with the nature of the program.

The Murphy amendment is very restricted in that it applies only to migratory labor projects under title III(b) of the pending bill.

This in turn affects migratory labor programs in about 30 States. There are only about three States in which this has occurred. They are California, Alabama, and Florida.

The difficulty with accepting the amendment is that it throws the whole migratory labor problem right into the middle of partisan politics, because those Governors who are opposed to any reasonable regulation of migratory labor practices within the States are the very ones who want this veto.

It is for that reason that the committee felt it was unwise to change the present situation as it concerns the veto with respect to the migratory labor problem.

If we were able to handle the situation in Alabama, California, and Florida, there would be no problem. However, the fact of the matter is that the Governors of those States are not receptive to modern working conditions, such as wages and the like, for migratory labor. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], as chairman of the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has told me that this amendment would be very difficult for those who would like to see the working conditions of migratory labor improve. I believe him.

I therefore hope that the amendment will be rejected.

I think the Senator from California has made a pretty good legal argument. However, the fact of the matter is that the amendment will be defeated because migratory labor, in at least those three States, would be prejudiced.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, do I have any time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that the Senator from California has no time remaining.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from California may have as much time as he desires.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, how much time will that be?

Mr. MURPHY. Three minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, recently in the Senate Chamber I successfully restored a temporary housing project which had been taken out of the OEO. It had strong support of the State of California.

It is a housing project which our committee visited. We looked at this housing project. However, the OEO, being 3,000 miles away, had taken it out.

I believe we all concurred that it was an excellent project.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from California and I just put it back in again.

Mr. MURPHY. That was the exact point of my argument.

There is no absolute veto here. This merely gives a Governor a chance to point out matters with respect to a project.

This project with 17 people certainly should not have seven supervisors. The Governor wants the chance to point out that it is a waste of the taxpayers' money to put this money into administration and into all sorts of programs with which we are not familiar. That is the only reason I put the provision in.

I know that it is not an absolute veto. It is merely a procedure by which the Governor can say, "Well, look, Mr. Shriver. I don't think this is in our best interest."

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

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I think we are about out of time. I suggest that we vote. The persuasive argument of the Senator from California has not persuaded me.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, is there any more time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no time remaining.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Arizona may have 2 additional minutes.

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

The Senator from Arizona is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I merely want to correct an impression that perhaps was given when the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania was discussing the wages paid farmers in California. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that it is a low wage scale?

Mr. CLARK. I think the Senator misunderstood me. What I intended to say was that California, Alabama, and Florida are States in which, if we give the Governors even a qualified veto, we will not get much in the way of favorable treatment of working conditions and other conditions for migratory labor that we have tried to achieve in 30 States.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I think the Senator realizes that California, from the standpoint of competitive conditions, has the highest farm labor wage rates in the Nation.

When I was Governor of Arizona, the minimum wage for the country went to $1.40 an hour, while Texas was paying $0.75.

Mr. CLARK. I have no basis for disagreeing with the statement of the Senator from Arizona about the wages in California. I only add that California has one of the most unusual Governors among the 50 States.

Mr. FANNIN. That is the opinion of the Senator. I would not agree with the Senator on that. I think Governor Reagan is one of the outstanding Governors in the United States.

Mr. CLARK. I think the word "unusual" is quite complimentary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having expired, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum for not to exceed 2 minutes.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, with one possible exception, there be a time limitation of 30 minutes on each amendment, the time to be equally divided between the Senator who offers the amendment and the floor manager of the bill, the agreement to begin after the conclusion of the vote on the pending amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator restate that?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that there be a time limitation on each amendment of 30 minutes, the time to be equally divided between the Senator who offers the amendment and the floor manager of the bill, with one exception which we are still working out.

Mr. CLARK. That means 15 minutes to a side?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK. I hope that if we agree to the unanimous-consent request the majority leader will, and I shall, be lenient with Senators who urge us to give them a minute or two more.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Of course.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCGOVERN in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California. 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. HATFIELD (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE]. If he were present, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

The assistant legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], 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 Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator

from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The pair of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] has been previously announced.

If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 45, as follows:

[No. 278 Leg.]

YEAS—41

Aiken	Griffin	Murphy
Allott	Hansen	Pearson
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Percy
Boggs	Hill	Prouty
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Scott
Carlson	Hollings	Smathers
Church	Hruska	Smith
Cotton	Jordan, N.C.	Sparkman
Curtis	Jordan, Idaho	Spong
Dirksen	Kuchel	Stennis
Dominick	Lausche	Talmadge
Eastland	McClellan	Thurmond
Fannin	Miller	Williams, Del.
Fong	Mundt	

NAYS—45

Anderson	Hart	Monroney
Bartlett	Hartke	Montoya
Bayh	Hayden	Morse
Bible	Inouye	Muskie
Brewster	Jackson	Nelson
Burdick	Javits	Pell
Byrd, W. Va.	Long, Mo.	Proxmire
Cannon	Long, La.	Randolph
Case	Magnuson	Ribicoff
Clark	Mansfield	Symington
Cooper	McCarthy	Tydings
Dodd	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Fulbright	McGovern	Yarborough
Gruening	McIntyre	Young, N. Dak.
Harris	Mondale	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—14

Baker	Hatfield	Moss
Brooke	Kennedy, Mass.	Pastore
Ellender	Kennedy, N.Y.	Russell
Ervin	Metcalf	Tower
Gore	Morton	

So Mr. MURPHY's amendment was rejected.

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

Mr. CLARK. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

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

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 30 seconds to the Senator from Maryland.

SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD, OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, an article entitled "West Virginia's Byrd Gains Key Role in Senate," published in this morning's Washington Post, describes the extraordinary energy, diligence, and devotion which our distinguished colleague, Senator ROBERT BYRD, of West Virginia, has applied to his important duties as assistant majority whip in the Senate and as chairman of the Subcommittee on District of Columbia Appropriations of the Committee on Appropriations. As the article points out:

The indefatigable West Virginian never takes any job lightly and has an almost Victorian concept of "duty."

I commend this interesting article to the attention of my fellow Senators and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

HARD WORKER IN ASCENDANCY: WEST VIRGINIA'S BYRD GAINS KEY SENATE ROLE

(By Robert C. Albright)

Ever so quietly over a brief 9-month span, Sen. Robert C. Byrd (D-W.Va.), has emerged as the recognized though uncrowned deputy leader of the Senate.

The 49-year-old Byrd, in the Senate 9 years now, has converted his once comparatively minor Party post of Secretary of the Senate Democratic Conference into an assignment of major importance. Some already are saying the West Virginia conservative will be the man to beat for his Party's next top Senate leadership vacancy.

Byrd will be in the Senate limelight today, when the chamber debates his motion to kill a $2.8 billion emergency job program added to the anti-poverty bill by the Labor Committee. [For poverty bill developments, see Page A7.]

Byrd's gradual ascent to a leading role in the Senate was achieved by dint of long, lunchless working hours in constant Senate attendance and by full consultation and clearance with the chamber's two top Democratic leaders.

Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield (Mont.), has always welcomed help in his more wearing floor duties. Senate Majority Whip Russell B. Long (La.), No. 2 in command, continues free to step in to relieve Mansfield at any time, but generally yields the assist job to Byrd.

"Byrd is completely loyal to Mike and carries out all of his instructions to the letter," said one Party insider.

Byrd already has become in effect the man who runs the Senate during most of its 9 to 5 normal working hours. In the process he has become the man most fellow Democrats seek out to "protect their interests" and to perform the innumerable other big and small favors expected from a working floor leader.

As some put it, he's made himself "the indispensable man."

WON OUT OVER CLARK

Only last January, Byrd, a conservative on most issues, won out in the Senate Democratic caucus over Sen. Joseph S. Clark (D-Pa.), an outspoken liberal, for the post of conference secretary.

Seldom has a party job been more sharply contested, even though the No. 3 spot was not then regarded as a springboard for leadership and power. It was always potentially so, however, for the conference secretary along with the Party's top leaders are among the Capitol's select who have the ear of the President at the weekly White House legislative conferences.

Byrd's friends say that the indefatigable West Virginian never takes any job lightly and has an almost Victorian concept of "duty".

This has extended to the District Appropriations Subcommittee, which Byrd has headed for the last seven years.

Despite his ever-increasing duties in the Senate, this year he conducted the most detailed, line-by-line, hearings ever held on the city's budget. He has maintained his absolute control over the city's welfare policies, and has continued his strong interest in upgrading education in the District.

When Byrd was elected conference secretary, Mansfield already had four "assistant whips" from the moderate to liberal wing of the Party, ready to sit in for the leaders on a call or standby basis.

They were, and still are, Sens. Philip A. Hart (D-Mich.), Edmund S. Muskie (D-Me.), Daniel K. Inouye (D-Hawaii) and Daniel B. Brewster (D-Md.).

For a time after Byrd's election they offered to assist occasionally when and if the need arose. But with Byrd available on a virtually around-the-clock basis, they have ceased even to make the gesture.

During Mansfield's recent foreign relations study tour "around Asia's rim," Byrd functioned altogether as acting leader of the Senate for an unbroken ten days.

Nor does Byrd confine himself entirely to leadership routine. Last week when he moved to recommit the Senate Labor Committee's $5 billion antipoverty bill, with instruction to delete Clark's $2.8 billion emergency job program, it was clear that he reflected Administration wishes. He said he decided to make the motion on his own.

Before presenting his motion, however, he dutifully cleared it with Mansfield.

From the moment Byrd was elected he regarded his new job as a challenge, moved over to the Senate floor almost full time, and placed himself completely at the disposal of the leadership.

Byrd uses his mornings for office chores, and committee hearings, then generally takes over in the Senate at noon. He seldom leaves the chamber until it adjourns, anywhere from 5 p.m. to 7 p.m. Then he goes back to his office for more homework. He's usually the last man to leave the Capitol, after putting in a 12-hour day.

In his West Virginia "hill" philosophy, it takes a big man and hard work to make a big job out of a little job. Back home he applied himself so assiduously that in 1964 he was reelected to the Senate by the biggest vote ever cast for a West Virginia candidate.

When he set out to bat for Mansfield he boned up on the Senate's strange and often devious rules until he'd mastered them. Whenever in doubt, he goes to school again with Senate Parliamentarian Floyd M. Riddick.

Mansfield heartily approves of his performance.

"Bob Byrd does a first rate job," said Mansfield. "He is of great assistance to me, and he takes a great load off my shoulders. I am glad he is getting a little recognition."

One significant reason for Byrd's growing acceptance is a little notebook he carries around in his pocket.

TO EACH HIS OWN

On separate pages are listed the names of all Senators. Lest he forget, he jots down the requests any one of them makes, no matter how minor.

One Senator is taking a group of constituents to lunch, wants to be called if a given measure comes up.

Another wants to be alerted by a quorum call when there's a business break, so he can make a prepared speech.

Another has an important out-of-town engagement, wants his "position protected" during his absence.

Still another is seeking a "live pair" on the poverty bill while he's away.

Byrd dutifully jots down each request, sees to it meticulously that each is fulfilled. One of these days all those favors will pay dividends.

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

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, there is no pending amendment. I ask unanimous consent that the majority leader may be recognized for not in excess of 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, an order has been entered that on all amendments except one from now on—and that includes amendments to be offered by the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and perhaps others—there be a time limitation of one-half hour, with the time to be equally divided on each amendment. There was one exception at the time and I feel somewhat embarrassed, but no matter which direction the leadership moves, it comes up against a proposition which is hard to find an answer to.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment until 9:30 tomorrow morning.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that there be a morning hour at that time not to exceed 15 minutes.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there are no other amendments to be considered at that time I ask that the Williams amendment become the pending business and that a vote take place not later than 45 minutes after that, the time to be equally divided.

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

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall not object. I do not know yet whether I will be here but I wish the RECORD to show that for personal reasons which are very well known I have asked the majority leader to extend that time to the afternoon. The majority leader and the minority leader find themselves unable to do so. I have the deepest and most devoted feeling about the passage of this bill as being essential to the Nation. That is why I shall not object. I wanted that statement to appear in the RECORD.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, we are fully familiar with the situation confronting the distinguished Senator from New York. I wish it were possible to expedite this matter and at the same time make it possible to accede to his desires and request. The Senator expressed a hope rather than a formal request. It is one of the difficulties with which we have to deal in moving Senate business forward. The RECORD should note that the Senator's reasons are the very highest.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask that the Senator amend his statement to show that I did make the request.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; the Senator did.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I join the minority leader in expressing thanks and appreciation for the understanding of the distinguished senior Senator from New York. His reasons are of the highest which could be found.

Mr. President, I wish that the calendar was such that we could do something to accede to the Senator's request. Unfortunately, we find ourselves in a position, as I indicated earlier, so that no matter which way we turn we come up against an obstacle which is a little difficult to overcome.

Mr. President, has the request been granted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, now that the request has been granted, the Senate will be on notice that not later than 10:30 tomorrow morning, barring unforeseen developments, there may very well be a vote on the Williams amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there will be votes today. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Does the majority leader contemplate that immediately after the Williams amendment is disposed of we will go to third reading and have final passage tomorrow?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would hope for that, but that is up to the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, I had intended to add to the previous unanimous-consent request to which the Senate agreed that 1 hour of debate be allowed on the bill, the time to be equally divided between the majority and minority leaders or whomever they designate.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 853) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 536) to provide that the United States shall hold certain Chilocco Indian School lands at Chilocco, Okla., in trust for the Cherokee Nation upon payment by the Cherokee Nation of $3.75 per acre to the Federal Government; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HALEY, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. BERRY, and Mr. MCCLURE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 117. An act for the relief of Martha Blankenship;

S. 534. An act for the relief of Setsuko Wilson (nee Hiranaka); and

S. 1320. An act to provide for the acquisition of career status by certain temporary employees of the Federal Government, 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. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to state the amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

On page 68, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following: new subsection:

"(d) The Director shall conduct, either directly or through grants or other arrangements, research and pilot projects designed to assure a more effective use of human and natural resources of rural America and to slow the migration from rural areas due to lack of economic opportunity, thereby reducing population pressures in urban centers. Such projects may be operated jointly or in cooperation with other federally assisted programs, particularly programs authorized under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, in the area to be served by the project."

On page 68, line 13, strike out "(d)" and insert in lieu thereof "(e)".

On page 69, line 6, strike out "(e)" and insert in lieu thereof "(f)".

On page 69, line 6, strike out "10 per centum" and insert in lieu thereof "15 per centum".

On page 69, line 8, after the period insert the following new sentence: "Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the sums appropriated pursuant to this Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $50,000,000 shall be available only for projects authorized under subsection (d) of this section."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

This is a revision of amendment No. 348 which we discussed for about 1 hour earlier in the week. It provides for the transferrance of $50 million authorized to be appropriated to OEO to a special program designed to benefit the rural areas and to prevent the flow of vast numbers of rural inhabitants from the places where they are now located to the ghettos of the cities to further complicate the multitude of problems which are there. The $50 million would not increase the cost of the bill but merely earmark $50 million which is already in the bill.

Mr. President, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 contain several helpful provisions which focus on rural poverty. The committee report states that rural programs should be strengthened and expanded and that rural areas should receive a more equitable share of financing than they have in

the past. I commend the members of the subcommittee for reaching these conclusions. They are of utmost importance to the Nation.

I believe, however, that an even greater push is needed. Under my amendment, a new subsection would be added to section 232 of the bill, on page 68 at line 12, stating that:

The Director shall conduct, either directly or through grants or other arrangements, research and pilot projects designed to assure a more effective use of human and natural resources of rural America and to slow the migration from rural areas due to lack of economic opportunity, thereby reducing population pressures in urban centers.

The amendment, in which my colleague, Mr. HARRIS, joins, further directs that:

Such projects may be operated jointly or in cooperation with other Federally assisted programs, particularly programs authorized under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, in the area to be served by the project.

On page 69, line 6, the amount available for carrying out section 232 would be changed from a ceiling of 10 percent of the sums appropriated for any OEO program to 15 percent. A sentence would be added on line 8 stating that $50 million of the funds appropriated pursuant to title II would be available for projects authorized under the new subsection.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield at that point?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Kansas who has pending a bill on tax credit legislation, which I have joined him in cosponsoring, to try to encourage industry to come into rural areas to relieve the migration to our already overcrowded metropolitan centers.

Mr. PEARSON. I thank the Senator for yielding to me. As he commented and observed, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] is a cosponsor of the amendment and joined in introducing legislation which sought to recognize that the crisis in the cities has become almost a slogan for America in the great urban areas of the country over the past 2, 3, and 4 years, that it has a direct relationship to rural problems to develop migration of those seeking to come into the ghettos of the large metropolitan cities which has accelerated and accentuated the problem.

It is not a case of keeping them "down on the farm." It is a case of seeking to develop those potentialities they have not only at the core of our great cities, but also in the rural areas.

I commend the Senator for this particular amendment. I intend to support it, and I thank him for having offered it.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my colleague for his support.

Mr. President, let me emphasize at the outset that this amendment does not increase in any way the cost of the bill. The $50 million for the program, as the amendment is now drafted, would come out of the community action authorization. The amendment as I originally introduced it would have taken the $50 million from the Job Corps authorization. I still have great doubts about the Job Corps program. I think it is one of the least effective programs we have. I believe, however, that it is the will of the Senate at the present time, especially in view of the tremendous capital investment we have in Job Corps camps around the country, that this questionable program be given another chance to prove its worth. It is for this reason that I have redrafted the amendment.

The Economic Opportunity Act calls for an all-out attack against the sources of poverty in the United States. But the main thrust of this attack since the program's inception in 1964 has been aimed primarily at the Nation's urban centers. Little has been done in rural areas. I agree completely with the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], in his introductory remarks on the Rural Job Development Act:

The root cause of many of the problems of the large cities today can be traced to the problems of rural America.

That is where our attack on poverty should begin. That is the real challenge—to reverse the forced migration to the slums and ghettos of the large cities. In order to do this, however, greater opportunities must be provided in the rural areas.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I commend my able colleague from Oklahoma on the introduction of his amendment and the perfection of it. I ask that I be privileged to become a cosponsor.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am delighted to have the distinguished Senator from West Virginia as a cosponsor. The senior Senator from West Virginia has contributed greatly to the Appalachia program and other economic development programs. He has always been in the forefront in aiding rural America. If he will ask for permission from the Chair, I am sure that it will be granted by unanimous consent.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to join my colleague from Oklahoma in cosponsoring the pending amendment.

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

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. I certainly support the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma. I might point out that 5 years ago, at the time we were considering amendments to the Area Development Act, I proposed an amendment quite similar to the one now pending. I regret to say that the leadership did not see fit to accept it. I say that with the clear understanding that I do not mean that the Senator from Oklahoma did not wish to see that amendment adopted. I tried the same thing 3 years ago, and at that time was assured that efforts were being made by the Department of Agriculture under the rural area development program to achieve the objectives that we were seeking to achieve.

I regret to say that those objectives have not been achieved so that the pending amendment is very much in order. It is too bad that something like this was not done a long time ago. Because of my long and continued interest in this very approach to the problem, I wonder whether the Senator would be good enough to permit me to be a cosponsor.

Mr. MONRONEY. I would be honored to have my distinguished colleague as a cosponsor of the pending amendment because of the work he has done so faithfully in this field.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] be added as a cosponsor of the pending amendment.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I wish to thank both the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from West Virginia who have both done so much in the field of rural development and in the struggle to try to improve the economy of the rural areas.

I was interested to read in last week's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that according to a recent report of the Economic Development Agency, it has been the push of hopelessness, of discouragingly poor rural conditions rather than the pull of urban economic opportunities that produced the migration of more than 10 million persons from rural to metropolitan areas in the 1950–60 decade.

Few Americans in our increasingly urbanized society are aware of the abject poverty in rural areas. Today almost half of the Nation's poor live in small towns, on farms, or in nonfarm rural areas. Most of these are the invisible poor. They do not often make headlines. We do not pass them as we make our way from the suburbs into our financial and business centers. They are easy to ignore. But they are there—spread out all across our land. These are truly the forgotten Americans.

Mr. President, we must encourage, we must establish, programs and projects which will enable farmworkers and other rural inhabitants whose jobs have been abolished by increased mechanization and advanced technology to find work near their homes. We cannot afford to continue to drive these people into the ghettos of the cities. Rural America must be reenergized. By harnessing local private initiative together with various State and Federal agencies, much can be done in this effort. But before the problem is compounded any further, we must get started.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, just a few days ago, the Senate voted 77 to 25 to increase the model cities program from $237 to $537 million. I have supported the model cities concept because it is obvious that existing urban renewal programs have been inadequate to halt the cancerous spread of urban blight, and new methods of dealing with the crisis of the cities must be tried on an emergency basis.

But a program of model rural community development is equally important. This Nation cannot develop model cities until it also makes a greater effort to develop model rural areas. That is the purpose of my amendment.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The pending amendment authorizing and directing research and pilot projects to assure a more effective use of human and natural resources of rural America and to slow the migration from rural areas due to lack of economic opportunity is timely and thoroughly meaningful. Congress could not give the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity a more useful and important mission than that of directing research and setting up pilot projects to find ways to make family life in the rural and semirural areas of our country more satisfying and pleasant. Among the actions we must take in the United States are those which will slow down the migration of rural oriented citizens into the already overcrowded cities if we are to solve the problems of the ghettos and the disturbances in city streets.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my colleague and agree with his comments.

I thank the able Senator for his cogent remarks.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute from my time to the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I just wanted to say to the Senator that I think he has now perfected his amendment in such a way as to make it satisfactory to the friends of the program and to do what he desires to do. I am very pleased to see it generally accepted on the floor, and I join in accepting it.

Mr. MONRONEY. I deeply appreciate the remarks of the Senator and his acceptance of the amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] be added as one of the authors of this amendment.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield now to my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my distinguished senior colleague in support of this amendment. I commend him for bringing it before the Senate and for the excellent groundwork he has laid for its passage here today. I hope it will be adopted by the Senate.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my distinguished colleague for his great help on this amendment.

RURAL AGRICULTURAL POVERTY IS NO MYTH

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I commend my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma for proposing this amendment to slow the migration from rural areas to our overburdened cities. I strongly support its passage.

The plight of persons in rural areas often escapes legislative attention. This amendment not only recognizes a critical problem, but meets it in a constructive and practical way.

This problem of migration calls attention once again to the pervasive poverty in rural areas that is so severe it causes persons to flee toward any hope of a better life.

Anyone who thinks present conditions are adequate is a victim of one of the most persistent and unrealistic of American myths concerning poverty in the United States. The myth is that rural poverty is decidedly limited in our country and what there is of it is not severe.

The myth undoubtedly flows from our unwillingness to accept the idea that in the midst of much of the world's richest farmland and surrounded by agricultural abundance there can be thousands upon thousands of poverty-stricken and even hungry Americans.

But the tragic fact is that there are scores of thousands of impoverished men, women and children barely surviving in areas of agricultural affluence and there are hungry people living in a country producing such fabulous quantities of food that it can feed millions of starving people in other lands.

Mr. President, rural poverty is a pressing concern today and is likely to become increasingly urgent in the future as mechanization, and even automation, take over more and more kinds of farming and more and more acres of food production.

For these reasons the pending bill, S. 2388, the Emergency Employment Act it incorporates, and this amendment in particular, are profoundly important not alone in terms of urban poverty but also in terms of impoverishment in farm areas and country communities.

And here, Mr. President, I would like to pay tribute not only to the breadth and comprehension of this legislation but also to the wisdom and thoroughness of the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty, which held hearings on the antipoverty program in nearly all sections of the country, from border to border and from coast to coast. The subcommittee's distinguished chairman, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] made certain that the testimony received by his subcommittee was not confined to the problems—overwhelming as they are—of poverty in our metropolitan ghettos. He insisted on extensive testimony dealing with rural poverty and, in fact, together with other members of his subcommittee personally inspected situations of rural impoverishment. He and other members of the subcommittee personally talked with agricultural workers and migrant farmhands and their families, and inspected the shacks and hovels and dilapidated camps these men, women, and children are forced to live in. This subcommittee's proposed legislation, as a result, is not based merely on hearsay evidence; it is based upon first-hand experience of rural poverty along dusty country roads of the East, the South, the North, and the West.

Therefore, Mr. President, this bill demands our respect as legislation that is based on present and urgent realities, on present and urgent needs that members of the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty are personally familiar with.

With this as background I would like to review some of the accomplishments that have already been registered in the war on rural poverty. It is wise that we engage in such a review in order to understand what kind of a start we have made and how far we have come in the fight to eradicate penury and economic injustice in the Nation's farm areas.

Mr. President, roughly 43 percent of this Nation's poor live in rural areas. The rural poor, who typically exist far from the main currents of American life in deprivation as grim and unrelenting as it is invisible to the affluent majority, are found in the Mississippi Delta and mountainous Appalachia, in southwestern deserts and in northern Michigan, in California's central valley and Alabama's Black Belt, in migrant labor camps and on Indian reservations, sometimes in sizable concentrations but more often in isolated pockets of poverty in hundreds and hundreds of rural communities scattered all across the Nation.

For these Americans—nearly 13 million of them—living in quiet and terrible desperation—the pending bill is of absolutely crucial importance, and a vote against this bill, Mr. President, is a vote against them, at least some of whom are represented by practically every Member of this body.

This bill would continue and slightly expand the economic opportunity programs which have become vital to the hopes and aspirations of our rural poor. In fiscal year 1967, $248.6 million in community action funds were granted to support rural community action programs. This was 32 percent of all community action program money, up from 27 percent in fiscal 1966. During the current fiscal year the figure will climb to about 36 percent of all community action program funds.

Thus from ground zero less than 3 years ago, OEO has assisted in the development of 618 rural community action agencies, covering 1,551 counties, about two-thirds of all U.S. counties designated as rural. This is an especially impressive accomplishment in light of the fact that the struggle against rural poverty is greatly complicated by isolation and a dearth of existing antipoverty organizational structures, as well as a lack of educational, vocational, and social services. For this reason, many rural community action agencies operate on a multi-county basis to assure maximum

use of limited local resources. In fiscal 1968, 50 new rural community action agencies will cover about 350 additional rural counties—if the pending bill is approved.

Mr. President, rural community action programs take many forms. In Tennessee, for example, the Elk River Valley Authority uses Federal, State, and local resources to serve the poor in 10 counties having a combined population of 225,000. Aproximately one-half of this population lives in poverty, and one-fifth of the families earn less than $1,000 per year. In this community action agency, the neighborhood center has become the focal point for community action: four primary centers and 28 subcenters offer job placement, consumer education, homemaking and education programs. The community action agency also operates Upward Bound and Neighborhood Youth Corps programs as well as an Outreach program for mothers of Headstart enrollees. Other rural community action agencies offer different combinations of programs to meet particular needs.

In Michigan, an organization called UPCAP—Upper Peninsula Committee for Area Progress—coordinates the activities of six local, multicounty community action agencies. UPCAP, whose origins predate passage of the Economic Opportunity Act, and the community action agencies work jointly to provide an administrative structure by which resources can be mobilized and programs implemented. They are assisted by U.S. Department of Agriculture personnel, particularly the Extension Service, and State representatives of education, housing, and manpower programs. Because of the "umbrella agency" structure and coordination activities, when a suitable program is developed for the Upper Peninsula area, it can be used by all six local areas.

In Leslie, Knott, Letcher, and Perry Counties in Eastern Kentucky, a multicounty Community Action Council with headquarters in Whitesburg has received a grant of $73,733 which will enable it to undertake the first rural housing demonstration project in the Nation. The council will plan and develop realistic programs for eliminating rural slums in Appalachia. An areawide, multicounty nonprofit corporation will be organized under the council's auspices to conduct the 7-month program, which will utilize a low-cost prototype house especially designed for the needs of the area.

In Minnesota, the Mahube Community Action Agency, after a year's operation of an excellent home health aid program, has 23 trained home health aides to serve low-income families in Mahnomen, Hubbard, and Becker Counties. During this year, 1,815 nursing visits have been made to homes of the poor, with 51 percent of them to persons of 65 years or over.

In Oregon, the community action team of Columbia County has launched a truly comprehensive program of self-help efforts, including a smaller communities survey of employment services. This project has produced a countywide listing of employers, jobs available, and skill levels required, as well as employee skills and skills of the currently unemployed. A projection of future employment needs has also been made. A new employment office at St. Helens now has a full-time agent, and each community center maintains a list of small jobs available locally.

Other services on which antipoverty agencies and the communities have worked together are adult education, legal service, and improved service in the surplus commodity distribution program. A survey is now in process looking toward a home help aid program for the elderly.

In Rainier, Oreg., the center has rented an aged two-room building in which it held the first well-baby clinic in Columbia County. It offers a home nursing course, and with the help of the county extension service, nutrition classes are available as well as other homemaking projects.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars in Vernonia donated a building for the community center, and in St. Helens the Odd Fellows gave a building.

Moving on to the rural areas of other States, we find tremendously promising comprehensive health service programs have been launched by local Community Action Agencies with OEO funds in Belmont County, Ohio; Muskegon, Mason, Manistee, Lake, and Newaygo Counties in Michigan; Raleigh County, W. Va.; Alviso County, Calif.; Lowndes County, Ala.; and Bolivar County, Miss. To be set up as health centers in rural target areas, the projects will provide the one door of entry to virtually all health services needed by rural low-income citizens and their families—preventive, curative, rehabilitation, dental care, mental services, home care, drugs and appliances, and, when necessary, hospitalization.

Common to all the comprehensive health services programs is the training of low-income workers as health aides, dental aides, medical clerks and in a variety of other duties related to the running of the health center. One of the most effective jobs these workers do is to go out into the community, inform their neighbors of the center and its services, and get them to participate.

Mr. President, the entire range of Community Action programs is at work in rural America, instilling hope, strengthening communities economically and socially, and providing a wide range of cooperative, self-help exits from poverty. Head Start, Upward Bound, Legal Services, Foster Grandparents, Health Services, and a vast array of locally initiated and directed efforts are moving forward against great obstacles because community action prevails. In testimony before the House of Representatives Committee on Education and Labor in July, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman said:

> OEO's Community Action Programs and the USDA's Technical Action Panels are working together to help create a new dimension in rural life. Community Action Agencies are making it possible for rural people to share in the benefits of many Federal programs which formerly were out of reach because the people did not know they existed or lacked the know-how to take advantage of them. They are reaching and stirring hope in the poor who otherwise were hopeless and forsaken.

Mr. President, other Economic Opportunity programs are making significant contributions to the war on rural poverty. As of the end of fiscal 1967, at least 13,200 rural youth were enrolled in Job Corps Centers, and a total of about 26,000 rural youth had been in the Job Corps since its inception. And many Job Corps Conservation Centers are performing an enormously valuable service to rural America through work in conservation projects.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps has provided jobs for 250,000 high-school-aged rural youth since the program began. They may work in a school cafeteria, or as an aide to a home demonstration agency, or help build a community water system, such as the one the Reverend Billy Graham and Sargent Shriver visited recently at Blevins Creek in North Carolina.

In January of this year, 52,000 rural young people were enrolled in Neighborhood Youth Corps, receiving wages of $2.8 million per month. This represents 31.6 percent of the total Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollment. The work experience program under title V of the Economic Opportunity Act is reaching into hundreds of rural communities. Forty percent of all funded training spaces have been allotted to rural America. Since the inception of the program, almost $50 million in work-experience funds have gone into projects in the 182 poorest counties in the Nation.

Nearly one-third of the strength of VISTA is in rural areas, with more than 1,000 volunteers assigned to 135 projects in 34 States, as of the beginning of this fiscal year.

Through the OEO program of rural loans, administered through the Farmers Home Administration, nearly $80 million has gone to 37,900 low-income families and 740 cooperatives. These loans are financing investments in farming and about 350 different types of nonfarming enterprises. The money is made available to rural men and women who never before could have qualified for a loan, giving them now an opportunity to become self-sufficient and to rise out of poverty.

Mr. President, all these programs, as well as the highly successful employment programs administered by the Labor Department under the Economic Opportunity Act—including the Nelson amendment, Project Green Thumb, and Operation Mainstream programs of such great benefit to rural antipoverty efforts—all these would be extended and expanded under the pending bill. But the bill places a new sense of urgency and priority on rural programs, and requires the Director of OEO to undertake special efforts to increase the effectiveness of rural antipoverty programs. In particular, the committee report on the bill urges the Director to act under the Community Action title to establish pilot projects in rural areas, to give preference to rural areas in providing technical assistance and personnel training, to develop model programs easily adaptable to rural communities, and to use simplified procedures, forms, and guidelines for rural areas.

Mr. President, the importance of the

pending bill to nearly 13,000,000 Americans living in rural poverty cannot be exaggerated. The bill will not wipe out poverty overnight—in rural areas any more than in urban areas—but it will permit the very encouraging efforts launched less than 3 years ago to be continued, and in many cases expanded.

It will constitute a ringing reaffirmation of the commitment this body made in 1964 to eradicate poverty in the United States. Mr. President, I strongly urge the prompt passage of S. 2388. And this amendment by my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma provides a strengthening of the tools we will have to help rural Americans lift themselves out of poverty.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma has modified the amendment he originally proposed, so that it now calls for a useful and salutary program to devote $50 million to rural undertakings with emphasis on jobs, which one hopes will slow down the rush to the cities from rural areas.

I am happy to accept the amendment, having talked to many members of the subcommittee about it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I want to express my absolute support of the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma.

I regret that there were not more Senators present to hear the proposal made by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma. It has been my distinct impression also that we are aggravating the problems of metropolitan communities by excessive feeding of money into them, thus encouraging increasing immigration from rural areas into the cities.

The city of Cleveland now has a population of 37 percent of the primary minority group. The more money we feed in there, the greater the immigration will be. A policy should be adopted, and an effort made to put it into effect, that will discourage inmigration and aid the solution of employment problems in the local communities, which differ from those in the metropolitan centers.

Mr. President, if the Federal Government feeds $5 billion into the metropolitan communities for the purpose of aiding the poor, what will that $5 billion do toward inducing excessive immigration to the big cities? And, if the immigration is motivated and induced among those that are told that there is $5 billion available there, will that produce increased population and thus aggravate the problems of the big cities?

There is a natural trend of the people in the rural areas to move into the metropolitan communities. The metropolitan communities have not been able to digest satisfactorily the great immigration that has occurred.

The error of what we are doing is accentuated by the natural tendency of the rural people to move into the metropolitan areas because billions of dollars have been fed into the metropolitan communities and have enhanced the reason for moving there.

Mr. President, Cleveland has been labeled as unfair to the primary minority group. The fact is, however, that in the last 3 years 75,000 more members of the primary minority group have moved into the city. They believe it is good for them and that they will find comfort, economic advancement, and salvation there. The fact is, however, that eventually trouble will be experienced.

I subscribe heavily to the proposal of the Senator from Oklahoma. Let us do something to induce industry to establish itself in the rural communities and not in the big communities. If we do, we will, to a substantial degree, solve the problem of the metropolitan area.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] be added as a cosponsor of the amendment.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield back my time.

Mr. CLARK. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma, offered for himself and other Senators.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I desire to call up another amendment, which I send to the clerk's desk, for myself and my colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS].

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. 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 is as follows:

On page 74, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following new paragraph:

"(7) No financial assistance shall be extended under this title in any case in which the Director determines that the costs of developing and administering all of the programs assisted under this title carried on by or under the supervision of any community action agency exceed 15 percent of the total costs, including non-federal contributions to such costs, of such programs. The Director, after consultation with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, shall establish by regulation, criteria for determining (i) the costs of developing and administering such programs, and (ii) the total costs of such programs. In any case in which the Director determines that the cost of administering such programs does not exceed 15 percent of such total costs but is, in his judgment, excessive, he shall forthwith require such community action agency to take such steps prescribed by him as will eliminate such excessive administrative cost, including the sharing by one or more such community action agencies of a common director and other administrative personnel. The Director may waive the limitation prescribed by this paragraph for specific periods of time not to exceed six months whenever he determines that such a waiver is necessary in order to carry out the purposes of this title."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, this amendment, in which my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] joins, would put an absolute limit on the administrative overhead costs of Community Action Agency programs. It provides that no financial assistance shall be extended under title II for any program where the cost of developing and administering the program exceeds 15 percent of the total cost. By total cost we include non-Federal contributions and participation in all such programs.

This amendment is consistent with an earlier amendment which was adopted to this bill which provides for an investigation and evaluation by the General Accounting Office of Office of Economic Opportunity expenditures in order to determine the efficiency of the administration of OEO programs.

The GAO, at my request, has been examining Community Action Agency spending in Oklahoma for several months. More than a year ago, it became apparent that the Community Action program was being established in such a way that a continuing high overburden would be required in many areas to keep it going. This is not the case in every locality by any means. Speaking generally, it is my observation that Community Action programs can be operated more efficiently and with less overhead in the more populous areas than in nonmetropolitan or rural areas.

Inevitably, administrative costs are going to be high in the beginning of any new program of governmental action. To launch a program of public works where only brick and mortar or structures or roads or buildings are to be the end results necessitates heavy administrative outlays in the beginning. This is no less true when we seek to establish and implement programs directed to the far less indefinable but tremendously more important objective of human resource development.

Therefore, criticism of administrative costs which have been encountered up to this point in the war on poverty should be tempered with an understanding of the extremely difficult organizational problems involved. Nevertheless, rigid and severe cost accounting methods must be adopted by OEO and it is incumbent upon Congress to provide specific guidelines as to what administrative and developmental costs should be.

The GAO has told me that in its preliminary inquiries in rural areas in my State of Oklahoma administrative costs up to this point have run as high as 25 percent. This is largely a result of decisions made either at the State or local level under terms of the 1964 act which provided for maximum local initiative in the establishment of community action agencies. Far too often the Federal administrative structure of the war on poverty has been blamed for administrative or supervisory conditions which actually were generated largely on the basis of technical assistance provided in most States from the office of the Governor. In Oklahoma, OEO funds in excess of $300,000 have been spent through the Governor's office in order to provide a degree of local initiative far greater than is generally recognized.

Administrative costs in community action programs have been established on the basis of local decisions, and it is

my firm opinion that the OEO as a Federal agency has not had sufficient control over such costs.

This amendment would remedy that situation. It would provide that the Director shall consult with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and then establish by regulation criteria for determining the developmental and administrative costs of such programs. In addition to the flat 15-percent limitation, the amendment provides that even if such costs do not exceed 15 percent and yet are, in the judgment of OEO, excessive, the Director can require community action agencies to reduce administrative expenditures. This includes the right of the OEO Director to require one or more such community action agencies to share a common director and other administrative staff people.

Senator HARRIS and I propose in this manner to strengthen community action administration in nonmetropolitan areas where up to this time many of the administrative units have been too small and too limited by budget to be effective. A staff-sharing program already has been tried on a very limited basis, I am advised. Also, I have personally examined, in Oklahoma, community action agencies of varying sizes. It is my opinion, on the basis of firsthand examination, that the multicounty administrative unit often proves more efficient in the less populous areas.

Mr. President, it is the purpose of this amendment to make community action agencies as cost-efficient as we would want any business to be. We must make certain that community action agencies do not turn into patronage refuges for a lot of useless people who hold down desk jobs and drain money off from the real business of helping the poor. If ever there was a program that ought to stay lean and hard, it is the war on poverty.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I am glad to yield to my distinguished colleague, who is a cosponsor of the amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I am honored to have joined with my distinguished senior colleague in the preparation and presentation of this amendment. He and I share a feeling, which I am sure all other members of the Senate share, that, most of all, we intend that this program get results and that it help the poor and that we cut down in every way possible unnecessary overhead and administrative expenses so that good results and action for the poor can be obtained.

Therefore I commend my senior colleague for the work he has put into this amendment and for his offering it today. I hope it will be adopted by the Senate.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my distinguished colleague for his help. I feel we can certainly justify efforts to try to abolish poverty if we are watchful and careful in keeping administrative expenses and costs to the very minimum. Dollars spent on duplication of effort, wasted personnel, and other sources that unnecessarily consume dollars, ought to go to help to eliminate poverty. We can ill-afford to spend too much for the employment of high officials at high salaries.

I thank my distinguished colleague for his cosponsorship.

Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

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

As I understand the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma, it puts a limit of 15 percent on all administrative expenses of community action agencies; is that correct?

Mr. MONRONEY. Except that the Director may waive the limitations prescribed by this paragraph for specific periods of time not to exceed 6 months, whenever he determines such a waiver is necessary in order to carry out the purposes of this title.

Mr. CLARK. My understanding is that the Senator from Oklahoma has discussed this matter with Mr. Shriver, the Director of OEO.

Mr. MONRONEY. I have discussed it with him. I would not say that he agrees 100 percent with it. I believe he does, however.

Mr. CLARK. He at least agrees with it 99 percent, does he not?

Mr. MONRONEY. I would say so. The question we were in slight disagreement upon, and I do not recall its being definitely settled, was as to the non-Federal contributions to such costs, and whether the 15 percent would apply to them.

Mr. CLARK. It is my understanding, having checked with the OEO Director's office, that he has no serious objection to this amendment. I cannot say I am enthusiastic about it, but I am prepared to accept it, and I do accept it.

Mr. MONRONEY. May I say to the Senator, I was under the impression that the Director was quite enthusiastic about having some limitations written in, to give him greater authority to say no to over-ambitious community action groups that felt it was necessary to establish a very high overhead.

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

I say again that generally speaking, I am opposed to writing what ought to be administrative regulations into legislation; but since the Director of the OEO has indicated that he sees no particular objection to this amendment, and since the Senator from Oklahoma feels so strongly about it, and is a very difficult Senator to oppose, I am prepared to accept the amendment.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator reserve 1 minute, and yield to me for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I reserve 1 minute of my time, and yield it to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished occupant of the chair, the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], be listed as one of the sponsors of my amendment.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Special Committee on Aging, I have been pleased to note the provisions regarding elder Americans in the proposed Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967. Those who developed this bill deserve much credit for the imaginative approach of their bill to the problems and opportunities of our older compatriots.

One provision greatly strengthens section 610 of the Economic Opportunity Act, which since 1965 has declared the intention of Congress that whenever feasible the special problems of the elderly poor shall be considered in the development, conduct and administration of programs under the act. It would spell out in more detail the obligations of the Office of Economic Opportunity to carry out a plan for the participation of the elderly poor in war on poverty programs and to help the elderly poor to achieve self-sufficiency. Further, it would require the Director to include in his annual report a description of the ways in which this mandate has been implemented.

A provision which is not limited in its effect to the elderly but which would be especially helpful to elderly public assistance recipients is the proposed revision of title VII on "Treatment of Income for Certain Public Assistance Purposes." Heretofore, title VII has required that of the income received by a participant in Economic Opportunity programs, the first $85 per month of such amounts plus one-half of the excess over $85 must be disregarded in computing his public assistance benefit. The proposed treatment of Economic Opportunity income is designed to encourage the public assistance recipient to bring himself up to a minimum standard of economic adequacy instead of penalizing his efforts to do so. Furthermore, the participant's public assistance would not be reduced if the sum of his income from all sources, including public assistance, is insufficient to bring him out of poverty. This proposal would stimulate America's older public assistance recipients to take maximum advantage of the Economic Opportunity Act to launch themselves out of poverty and dependence.

The bill proposes a comprehensive revision of the title on Volunteers in Service to America, known as VISTA. As part of the revision, language is included to state a stronger congressional intention that the fullest participation of older persons as volunteers be encouraged. This is in accord with my efforts and those of

the Special Committee on Aging to make available to older Americans opportunities to continue to be active and useful. We are convinced that this would benefit both the older individuals who serve and their communities, which have myriad needs for services they could perform.

Another provision to benefit the elderly is section 126 of the bill. It is an amendment to part B of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act, which part relates to the provision of useful work and training opportunities for youths and adults. Section 126 makes it clear that part B is to help relieve long-term unemployment among persons 55 years of age and older as well as unemployment among other age groups.

Employment of the elderly would also be encouraged by a provision requiring that the Director of OEO "encourage the employment of persons 55 years and older as regular, part-time and short-term staff" in OEO programs.

Finally, the bill would make Project Find a national emphasis program. Project Find is a program administered by OEO to identify the needs and problems of the elderly poor, to refer them to existing health, welfare, employment, housing, legal aid, recreation and other needed services, and to provide some of the elderly poor with employment and volunteer opportunities. Making this program a national emphasis program would express strong congressional support for it and would encourage OEO to lend additional emphasis to it.

I am confident, Mr. President, that I reflect the sentiments of the Senators on the Committee on Aging in expressing appreciation for the emphasis upon the needs of the elderly poor which has been given by the Senator from Pennsylvania and other Senators who have developed this bill. These provisions to assist our older compatriots deserve the support of all Senators, and I hope they can become law.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I know of no better way of helping disadvantaged people to become self-sustaining and stabilizing elements in our society than by making it possible for them to become proprietors of their own small businesses.

Under section IV of the Economic Opportunity Act, the Small Business Administration has the responsibility of providing loans and management training to help these people become business owners and thus acquire a stake in society.

This program of assistance is now available to disadvantaged people in every State of the Union. Under the able direction of Administrator Robert C. Moot, the SBA is actively seeking to extend the program in areas that are sometimes difficult to reach.

It was with great pleasure, therefore, that I read in the September issue of South Carolina Education News, an announcement by Arthur J. Glick, SBA Regional Director in Columbia, that low-income and disadvantaged persons in South Carolina are eligible for these long-term loans.

I was particularly impressed by SBA's statement that it will go into the poor sections of cities and into depressed rural areas actively seeking business owners, or potential business owners, who can benefit from this program.

To carry this work forward, SBA's office in Columbia is cooperating with educational associations and other groups in South Carolina to reach the people who can be helped by this program.

I congratulate the SBA and the editor of Education News for their cooperation and request unanimous consent that the article be inserted at this point in the RECORD:

SMALL BUSINESS LOAN PROGRAM AVAILABLE IN SOUTH CAROLINA

The Small Business Administration's Economic Opportunity Loan Program is now available throughout South Carolina, it was announced by Arthur J. Glick, SBA Regional Director.

Applications for loans will be accepted to existing and new businesses by SBA's Regional Office at 1801 Assembly Street, Columbia, S.C., and by 72 other SBA field offices throughout the Nation.

To find those low-income and other handicapped people with the best potential to successfully operate a business, SBA will work closely with Educational Associations, Community Action groups, neighborhood centers, regional organizations and other groups throughout South Carolina, Glick said. These organizations will also be asked to assist in providing volunteers from the business community to work with SBA personnel in providing management assistance to loan recipients. In this regard, Glick said that "America has always relied upon the voluntary efforts of its community leaders to help those less fortunate and the people have always responded."

He further stated that "We do not intend to make bad loans under this program, but neither do we intend to set up inflexible road blocks. Our people are going into the poor sections of cities and into the depressed rural areas. We are looking for loans that will expand viable businesses, exploit new ideas, establish small manufacturing plants—the kinds of businesses which can have a healthy effect on the community, which can expand employment opportunities, which can stimulate the economy and be in concert with our National goals.

"In addition, SBA will make available to EOL recipients all of our management assistance tools in a combined effort to assure the success of these small businesses."

A key feature of the expanded EOL program is that it will also seek to assist for the first time those who are above the poverty level, and yet cannot qualify for SBA's regular business loan program.

Glick said that "One of the basic problems in any program of this type is reaching the people we are attempting to help and our educational leaders and teachers can render an additional public service in carrying this message to the grass roots of our communities."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, since no amendment is pending, and the proponent of an amendment has not arrived in the Senate Chamber, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] may be recognized to speak on another subject.

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

MILITARY PROCUREMENT PRACTICES

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, on September 19, 1967, I delivered an initial floor speech concerning questionable military procurement policies and procedures. It concerned two Army contracts. Both were awarded to big business firms although substantially lower bids were on file from small business firms. Specifically, one award was given to Northrop Nortronics—a division of Northrop Aviation—the high bidder, over Custom Packaging Co., the low bidder. The other award was given to Radio Corp. of America, the high bidder over Decitron Electronics Corp., the low bidder.

The first contract involved a shoulder-borne portable flame weapon. The other contract involved a portable walkie-talkie radio set. In both transactions the procedures used to justify the excessive cost to the taxpayers seemed to me to be so highly questionable that I urged that Congress proceed with a thorough investigation of our military procurement policies.

The case involving my constituent, Custom Packaging Co., Aurora, Colo., clearly pointed out a serious shortcoming in our ability to properly review transactions involving millions upon millions of the taxpayers' dollars. Congress has depended upon the Comptroller General of the United States to accomplish the technical aspects of this review. The Comptroller General has acknowledged that this is not being done.

In response to the protest filed by my constituent, the Comptroller General responded in part as follows:

> Your claim of improper use by the procuring activity of proprietary information contained in Custom's unsolicited proposal is categorically denied by responsible and knowledgeable technical personnel of the Department of the Army. And while your rebuttal and other correspondence dealing with this allegation strongly disputes the conclusion reached by the Army Technical Personnel, we have no alternative but to accept the facts as reported by the Army. In factual disputes, such as here, which are technically beyond the competence of our office because of the scientific or engineering concepts involved, we must accord a significant degree of finality to the Administrative position.

In other words, Mr. President, the Comptroller General is saying that no review was made of the charge beyond asking the Army whether it disagreed with the assertion made by my constituent. Of course, the Army responded in the manner it did in order to protect those responsible for this questionable transaction in the first place.

The Small Business Administration also questioned the Comptroller General about the award of the contract to Nortronics at more than twice the amount bid by Custom Packaging Co. In his response to the Small Business Administration, the Comptroller General hedged the question posed by the Small Business Administrator that, under the Small Business Act, provision is made that where a small business concern is certified by SBA to be a competent Government contractor with respect to capacity and credit, the procuring officers of the Government must accept such certification as conclusive. After having admitted in his letter to my constituent that in actual fact no review was made, the Comptroller General goes on to say:

On the basis of the record before us, we are of the view that Custom's proposal was technically non-responsive to the Army's requirements as detailed in the statement of work accompanying the request for proposals. In reaching this view, we are aware that some of Custom's deficiency disclosed in the technical evaluation related to its capacity and credit.

And then he revealed the following:

However, Custom received only a rating of 2 on its technical approach to the government's requirements out of a possible weighted factor of 40.

This "weighted average" method of eliminating the lowest bidder struck me as being familiar. Upon checking, I find that this very same gambit was used to eliminate the low bidders on the development of a portable radio communications set which has the official nomenclature AN/PRC-62( ). The Army Electronics Command awarded a contract to the Radio Corp. of America—and here we go again with RCA. This is the third time I have brought them up—for $1,073,150 in spite of the fact that the Army had received substantially lower bids from such companies as Bendix Radio, General Motors Delco Radio Division, Raytheon, General Dynamics, Magnavox, Sylvania, and others. The lowest bid received for this AN/PRC-62 radio came from the International Telephone & Telegraph Co. We all know these are the giants of the electronics industry.

It is a well-known fact that the United States—and we can say this again after today's debate—is not a profitmaking organization. But, when we have procurement officials who can throw out low bids from firms such as I.T. & T., who are enormously well qualified to develop any kind of radio we could think of, then I think it is high time we took another look at the regulation the Army cited as justification for its actions. The Army justified these actions under section IV, part 2 of the Armed Services Procurement Regulations. Just how does this work?

The Comptroller General's report No. B-160809 explains how the Army did this in the case of my constituent, Custom Packaging Co. First, they completely ignored the price of the item to be procured. Then the Army proceeded to assign an arbitrary set of "values" to the various bids. The Army said that technical approach to the problem was to count 40 percent; technical personnel 20 percent; background experience only 15 percent; facilities 15 percent; and schedule—whatever that is—was to count 10 percent.

Having established this approach, the Army then contrived a new set of numbers having nothing whatever to do with price, and lo and behold, Nortronics got the highest rating, while Custom Packaging Co., which conceived the flame weapon, developed it at its own expense—and demonstrated it to the Army—got a rating of two points out of a possible weighted factor of 40. This, I might say, is despite the fact that SBA had certified the company's capacity and credit ahead of time.

Mr. President, the case of the AN/PRC-62 radio procurement was well documented by GAO report B-152884. There again the weighted average was used. The report shows that in awarding the contract to the Radio Corp. of America for an amount in excess of $1 million, the Army Electronics Command ignored the following lower bids:

I.T. & T., $421,140.

Bendix Radio, $434,627.

Advanced Communications, $470,445.

Electronics Communications, $489,155.

General Motors Delco Radio Division, $556,152.

The report contains the following incredible admission:

We could not independently evaluate the technical aspects of the proposals, nor could we determine from an engineering standpoint whether the Agency's technical evaluations were reasonable. Furthermore, many of the Agency's technical evaluations were not adequately documented. However, our review disclosed that the Agency's engineers responsible for evaluating the proposals were in general agreement that RCA's proposal was the best.

Of course, they would.

Mr. President, I think we ought to think about this for a second. Here is the Office of the Comptroller General which is designed to be at least Congress agency to determine whether the executive departments of the Government are operating in the best interests of the taxpayers and in the best interests of the country. Yet, they have said now on three consecutive occasions that they were not qualified to analyze the scientific and other material which forms the basis of the Army's decision. Consequently, the only thing they can do is accept the Army's decision, even when in the Comptroller General's report it says it is not documented, and the Army's opinion has been based on the claimed lack of technical competency of companies like International Telephone & Telegraph.

Can we conceive of any more ridiculous position than having the Army come up and try to tell the Comptroller General or anybody else that ITT or Bendix or Advanced Communications or General Motors cannot build a portable radio? It is the most ridiculous thing I have ever heard of.

Here we have another $500,000—that is not a great amount in the present budget—thrown down the drain solely because the Army wants to deal with RCA to the exclusion of everybody else. I say it is amazing indeed.

I am informed today that the Army is right this minute scheduling $8.5 million in this fiscal year into sole-source noncompetitive production for the AN/PRC-62( ) radio set that I have just finished talking about, where we have bids from five perfectly competent companies that are far lower than the bid from RCA. In view of what has transpired, it will come as no surprise when RCA is announced as the lucky company that is going to get this "urgent" award—much to its happy surprise.

I would not be surprised next month to learn that the Army has generated another of its classic "urgent" requirements—this time for shoulder-borne flame weapons to be produced by Nortronics on a noncompetitive basis, because the Army will say they need them in a hurry, even though they have a 2-year development program already in operation.

The Senate Select Committee on Small Business, of which I am a member, has recently held hearings, during the course of which I was assured by Mr. Robert Moot, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, that SBA is going to be far more vigorous in seeking corrective action in this area. We have been promised a report on the cases which I have previously reported to the Senate. I am looking forward to receiving these reports.

Mr. President, I believe that this free ride on the taxpayers' back has gone on long enough. Surely, not every research and development program has to come up devoid of manufacturing drawings, precisely in point of time to coincide with an overpowering, overriding demand for immediate delivery. Certainly, we should be capable of orderly planning that would allow open competitive bidding for our military requirements. As it is today, less than 15 percent of all the money spent by the Pentagon—the billions of dollars that we spend—is awarded under contracts based on competitive bidding and public opening of bids. This situation exists in spite of the fact that it is common knowledge that competitive bidding reduces the cost from 30 to 50 percent under noncompetitive costs.

Mr. President, as I have said, this is the third speech I have made on this subject, and the third series of contracts I have brought up. I hope to bring up more such instances in the future, because the point I am making is that somewhere something is wrong in the Army procurement system. One result of this wrong is that tax funds are being spent at a rate far in excess of what is needed. Another result is that the low bidder, time and time again, has been knocked out as the eventual procurer of the contract, and it is given to the big companies that already seem to have a great number of defense contracts. This situation raises questions in my mind and, I believe, in the minds of all of us.

I do not wish to accuse anybody of wrongdoing. But it seems to me that the cases I have already developed are sufficient in nature and in scope to warrant a thorough-going congressional investigation into what is happening in the military procurement policies as they are being administered today under the Secretary of Defense.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 853) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an im-

proved 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, there are many and varied approaches which can be made to the training provisions under this act. There are many areas in which training can be accomplished which have not been explored to the full extent that they can be.

The national system of libraries is a case in point. It seems to me that training programs through the local library system might be a very worthwhile project.

Librarians in public, professional, and school libraries have in many cases direct lines of communication to the disadvantaged communities and the disadvantaged adults and children in those places. Many libraries are in or close to the heart of impoverished areas, and librarians perform yeoman service in efforts to stimulate participation of all people in the community in the wonderful experience of learning.

I would hope, Mr. President, that the Office of Economic Opportunity might make extra effort to involve more closely libraries and librarians with the various aspects of the poverty program. Theirs is a unique situation which we would do well to use to the fullest extent possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

LABORATORY ANIMAL WELFARE ACT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, yesterday the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] made certain comments and introduced certain editorials in regard to the bill which I have introduced with a number of cosponsors, which is called the Laboratory Animal Welfare Act, which deals with medical experimentation, which is a matter of great importance in the field of health, and which is a part of the work of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Subcommittee on Health, of which I am the ranking minority member.

Mr. President, I believe that the questions raised deserve reply and, therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks answers to questions most frequently asked about the so-called Rogers-Javits bill, together with a brief analysis of the bill, so that Members may have both sides of the story presented to them at this rather preliminary stage in relation to the bill.

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

(See exhibits 1 and 2.)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I point out that the bill I have introduced has the support of the Humane Society and the doctors' organization which deals with experimentation of this character, which is so very important to health, to the future health, and to the care and cure of disease in our country.

The fundamental idea is to try to reconcile the views of all concerned consistent with the traditional humane outlook of our country toward animals. I joined in the enactment of one bill which took the animal care to preexperimentation stages. This is an effort to extend that measure to the experimental stage.

I hope that common ground may be found between the two views. I am not opinionated about the matter, but I believe in reply to the Senator from Oklahoma this information should be available to show the other side of the case.

EXHIBIT 1

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS MOST FREQUENTLY ASKED ABOUT THE ROGERS-JAVITS BILL

Q. What effect would this legislation have on P.L. 89-544 (The Dealer's Bill passed in 1966?)

A. None immediately. P.L. 89-544 will remain in full force *for two years* after the new bill is passed in order to insure continuous protection for animals. After that, the work of the Department of Agriculture in enforcing standards within dealers' premises, regulating the procurement of animals, and searching for lost animals both outside *and inside* laboratories will continue as it is being done at present. But at that time, the care of animals within laboratories will be stricken out of 89-544 and transferred to the extended program.

Q. What effect will the introduction of the new bill have on the current appropriations for P.L. 89-544?

A. This bill should make no difference whatever on appropriations for P.L. 89-544 for at least two or three years. After the care of animals in laboratories ceases to come under that law, the appropriations may be adjusted to whatever is necessary to continue the dealer operations.

Q. How will the care of animals be changed when they are taken away from the protection of P.L. 89-544?

A. P.L. 89-544 protects only 6 species of animals in about 1,400 research laboratories out of a possible 10,000, and then only when the animals are not under experimentation. The new program will cover all warm-blooded animals in nearly all laboratories, including commercial plants making drugs, cosmetics, detergents, etc. where some of the most painful work is performed. The standards set up for P.L. 89-544 will serve as a basis for the new standards, with many additions. For example, P.L. 89-544 is strictly limited to regulating only 8 categories of care and housing, whereas the Rogers-Javits Bill will allow the Secretary to make regulations on all matters pertaining to bodily comfort, such as provisions for exercise which are excluded by law from P.L. 89-544. And, of course, there will be many regulations for keeping pain to a minimum in different situations.

Q. If P.L. 89-544 had enough funds and enough time, couldn't it do all this?

A. No. More money would only allow for more frequent inspections of the same animals under the same limited circumstances. Coverage for more animals in more laboratories for more purposes can only be done if a new law is passed.

Q. Shouldn't we wait to see how the present law works before branching out into something new?

A. P.L. 89-544 has proved itself to work extremely well in the limited field it covers. What more will a few more years prove while 95% of all laboratory animals get no protection at all?

Q. Why should a laboratory appoint its own committee to implement the standards and regulations? Isn't this just self-policing?

A. It would be administratively almost impossible for any government agency to appoint committees for 10,000 laboratories. These committees do not take the place of outside inspections, they merely serve between inspections to be responsible for seeing that the laboratory is in compliance with the regulations of the law. They will also see that all persons using or caring for animals are adequately qualified to do so, and to review painful procedures in order to protect the animals from unnecessary pain and suffering.

Q. How can we be sure that these committees perform these duties?

A. The bill provides that at least one member of the committee must be a veterinarian, because a veterinarian can give advice on the proper care of various species of animals. Not only the compliance with regulations, but the judgments which are made by the committee will be periodically reviewed by inspectors who are professionally qualified to evaluate these judgments.

Q. If the "professional body" which is chosen to inspect is the American Association for Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care, a body which is sponsored by the major bio-medical scientific societies, wouldn't this allow laboratories to be inspected by their own colleagues who would tend to be too lenient?

A. The Secretary may use any accrediting body of his choice to serve only as his agents to make reports on whether a laboratory is complying with regulations and to make recommendations for accreditation. It will have no power to change or ignore these regulations in making its reports and recommendations. If the Secretary suspects that his appointed agents are not making proper judgments, he may send his own employees to review the situation, and any laboratory found not in compliance will face a fine of $500 a day plus loss of the privilege to receive grants or contracts from the government. Nor does any professional body have any power to accredit on its own. Only the Secretary can determine if a laboratory merits accreditation and confer it. Actually P.L. 89-544 has a much more lenient self-policing clause than any in this bill. Under that law any laboratory may totally exempt itself from allowing any inspections at all simply by asserting that all its animals are in some stage of experimentation (as most of them are). The fact that these laboratories have not done so, but rather have complied admirably with the spirit of the law, attests to the high integrity of the scientific community. Why, then, should we fear these same people will have less integrity in an expanded program?

Q. Wouldn't it be better for the Department of Agriculture to administer the expanded program since they have already done such a good job under P.L. 89-544?

A. This is the area on which there is the least agreement. The medical men prefer H.E.W. because an applicant for a grant must fulfill certain requirements for H.E.W. and it would be simpler for the grantee to work through only one agency which would set up all requirements. On the other hand, many humanitarians feel that a check by another department would be extra insurance for the welfare of the animals. The consideration which may have tipped the scales in favor of H.E.W. may be contained in Sections 8 and 9 of the bill. The administrator must do more than just enforce minimum requirements. He must also make studies in, and collect and disseminate information about, improved techniques for reducing pain, for getting better scientific results with fewer animals if possible, to promote the use of

less sentient or non-sentient models and many other related subjects. He must also seek more efficient ways for exchanging information about research as to reduce the duplication or near-duplication of experiments. All of this is somewhat more in the field of H.E.W. than Agriculture. Nevertheless, the program will be so broad that any Department getting the assignment will doubtless have to set up a new "office" with a new staff hired for its competence in these things. Certainly either Department would make a conscientious effort to carry out the intent of Congress in administering this law. The choice of the best Department for this task lies with the Committees who will consider these bills, and who will certainly be glad to receive opinions at the time of the hearings.

EXHIBIT 2

THE ROGERS-JAVITS BILL

ENDORSEMENTS

The Rogers-Javits bill is endorsed by The Humane Society of the United States and the American Humane Association. Through their members and through their branches, affiliates and member societies, these two organizations represent 90% of the organized humane movement. The Rogers-Javits bill is also endorsed by the New York State Society for Medical Research and by the American Society for Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics.

EFFECT ON PUBLIC LAW 89-544

P.L. 89-544 covers only dogs, cats, hamsters, guinea pigs, rabbits and monkeys in two thousand of the 11 thousand research laboratories in the United States and this coverage only applies during the period prior to the commencement of research. Thus, only a small percentage of animals used are covered and only for a minor portion of their stay in laboratories.

In contrast, the Rogers-Javits bill covers at least 95% of the hundreds of millions of animals used and the coverage applies throughout the stay in the laboratory.

The Rogers-Javits bill will not void any of the standards established by the Secretary of Agriculture under P.L. 89-544. In fact, it will add to these standards and will extend their coverage greatly.

SUMMARY OF PRINCIPAL PROVISIONS OF ROGERS-JAVITS BILL

Administrative Officer—The Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare.

Inspection—Inspection of laboratories to be made by designated agents of the Secretary including qualified employees and scientific bodies officially approved for the purpose.

Standards—Humane standards of care, housing and other environmental factors and the proper use of anesthesia and pain-relieving drugs in post-operative care.

Laboratory Committees—Each laboratory shall establish a committee of scientists and at least one veterinarian as a committee on animal care and utilization. This committee will be responsible for the policies and procedures in its laboratory. However, standards promulgated by the Secretary must be complied with and inspection by agents of the Secretary will verify compliance.

Other Objectives for the Secretary—Money will be made available and the Secretary shall otherwise encourage various programs of assistance to research as well as programs designed to reduce animal suffering. Among the latter, the substitution of less sentient or non-sentient material wherever possible as the biological model is specifically included.

Scientists' Research—Each scientist is individually responsible for the welfare of the animals he uses.

Enforcement—Compliance will be assured on the part of the individual scientist by the penalty of ineligibility to use animals and, on the part of laboratories, by fines and withholding of Federal funds.

DISPOSITION OF FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO PAY A JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF THE UPPER AND LOWER CHEHALIS TRIBES OF INDIANS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I submit a 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. 678) to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Upper and Lower Chehalis Tribes of Indians in Claims Commission docket No. 237, 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 legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 678) entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Upper and Lower Chehalis Tribes of Indians in Claims Commission docket numbered 237, 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: Strike out the first sentence of section 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sums payable to enrollees or to their heirs or legatees who are less than twenty-one years of age or who are under a legal disability shall be held in trust by the Secretary of the Interior with use limited to emergency medical care and direct educational expenses, until such minor becomes of age or disability ceases."; and the Senate agree to the same.

HENRY M. JACKSON,
GEORGE S. MCGOVERN,
PAUL FANNIN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JAMES A. HALEY,
ED EDMONDSON,
ROY A. TAYLOR,
E. Y. BERRY,
GEORGE V. HANSEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

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. MORSE. Mr. President, as passed by the House on June 5 this year, H.R. 678 provided that sums from the per capita distribution fund payable to enrollees of the tribe who were minors or under legal disability were to be held in trust by the superintendent of the western Washington agency. Thus, no part of the money could have been used on behalf of the minors or the disabled.

In the Senate, we amended the measure on July 31 to provide that the Secretary of the Interior would be the officer responsible for the money, and authorized expenditures for the needs of the beneficiaries.

The committee on conference of both Houses met and agreed upon a compromise provision by which the Secretary would hold the funds in trust, but that expenditures from them would be limited to emergency medical care and direct educational expenses until the minor becomes of age or the disability ceases.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the report of the conferees on H.R. 678.

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

The motion was agreed to.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION INVESTMENT IN FARM COMMODITIES REACHES 15-YEAR LOW

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, it has recently come to my attention that the Commodity Credit Corporation investment in farm commodities is the lowest in 15 years. This is proof of progress toward solving the difficult farm surplus problem.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture informs me that CCC investment in commodities under price-support loan and in inventory was down to $3,361,000,000 at the end of the 1966-67 fiscal year on June 30. This is nearly $2 billion less than a year ago. And it is less than half the investment level of more than $8 billion when the grain surpluses were at their peak in the early 1960's. With the cotton surplus fast vanishing, the investment total will drop further, particularly as the 3.3 million bales of cotton sold for delivery after June 30 are recorded in the CCC books.

The end of the wheat and feed grain surpluses and the substantial decline in cotton holdings account for most of the CCC investment decline. Commodity acreage diversion authorized by legislation since 1961 and particularly by the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 have brought the surplus down. As a result, grains are a much smaller proportion of the total CCC investment than in the past. Wheat and feed grains, which made up 70 percent of the investment a few years ago, now comprise about 30 percent of the total.

The reduction of surpluses should permit the CCC price-support loan operation to return to its basic function of helping farmers to market their commodities in a more orderly manner. Even though the surplus threat has been removed from farm markets, the large quantities moving into market channels, particularly at harvest time, can force prices down. The price-support loan gives farmers an alternative to immediate marketing. They can get cash through the loan and hold their crops for later marketing when the harvest price pressure has lessened. This permits a more even flow into market channels over a longer period. Thus, the price-depressing effects of a temporary oversupply are avoided.

Greater use of loans for orderly marketing is shown by the records for the past fiscal year when a record $1.1 billion in loans were repaid by farmers. This high repayment of loans is in sharp contrast to the surplus years when farmers

settled a major proportion of loans by turning commodities over to CCC because market prices were below loan levels. Then, cash repayments were much smaller than now and CCC acquisitions of farm commodities much greater.

The value of CCC acquisitions dropped below $1 billion during this past year for the lowest total in 15 years, and much of this was 1965-crop cotton produced before the new cotton program began to make inroads in the surplus. In several years in the past, CCC yearly acquisitions went well above $2 billion.

The removal of the surplus and the improved financial condition of the Commodity Credit Corporation provides a solid basis to move forward toward a much-needed improvement in farm income. It is a tribute to the well-informed farmers of America and to their willingness to cooperate in the interest of the public and themselves.

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. MURPHY. Mr. President, I send to the desk and amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] proposes an amendment as follows:

On page 56, line 3, delete the period, substitute a semicolon, and add the following: "*Provided,* no project under such program may grant assistance to bring any action against any public agency of the United States, any State, or any political subdivision thereof."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield to himself?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I yield myself 12 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 12 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I have sent to the desk an amendment to section 221(B)(3). As written, this section designates the legal services program as a national emphasis program in our Nation's battle to eliminate poverty.

In waging this war to help the poor to rise out of living conditions which offer little or no hope for the future and into a world which offers a real economic opportunity, the Office of Economic Opportunity has designed, and the Congress has approved a frontal attack on many conditions which have kept these people living in a world without a ray of light or hope. Some facets of the program are designed to be immediate cures. Other projects are designed to prepare the person to face the challenge he will encounter as he hopefully walks out of poverty's door into a brighter sunlight in the future.

Increased educational opportunities do this. So do job skill training programs and the providing of jobs. Still other programs are designed to attack community problems and personal problems if you will. The OEO has concluded that it is not enough simply to educate and train a man for a job, but, rather, it must also help him confront some of his other social problems.

To this end, the OEO has established a legal services program in order to make the law an instrument which could work for the poor as well as work against them. In the past, persons of low income have had great difficulty in receiving competent legal guidance and assistance. I know this, because at several periods in my lifetime I could very well have used the good offices of a competent lawyer, but I could not afford to hire one. Oftentimes the cost has been prohibitive. The legal services program seeks to remedy exactly this condition.

In June, the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty received testimony from Orison S. Marden, the president of the American Bar Association. In reviewing the accomplishments of the legal services program during the last 6 months of 1966, Mr. Marden told us that based on reports received from 104 legal services programs throughout the country, legal assistance had been rendered in 92,000 cases and an additional 15,000 persons received nonlegal help or interviews. He also stated:

By June 30th the total clients served will have exceeded 300,000. The great bulk of these cases has been settled by advice or negotiation. Only 15 percent required action in the courts. Yet the court record is impressive: they won 75 percent of their cases and prevailed in 62 out of 71 appeals filed. In addition, more than 2 million of the Nation's poor have received education in their legal rights and obligations.

I think that is a most remarkable record.

The work they have done is good and the dedication they have exhibited is moving, indeed. But, legal services attorneys are not only working as defense council, they will also bring a cause of action as well as defend an indigent in a suit. They will do one thing more. They will institute test cases. Recently, in this manner, they have begun to challenge our laws all too often.

While there is nothing wrong with this, we must remember that the taxpayers of our great Nation are paying for the services of these attorneys and, consequently, I question the propriety and the enormous expense to the taxpayer of a legal service program bringing suit against an agency of the Federal, State, county, or local government. In such instance, the taxpayer is paying the legal fees of both the plaintiff and the defendant—which does not seem quite right to me.

It has come to my attention that last April the California rural legal assistance program began an all-out assault on the Sutter County, Calif., welfare office rounding up potential welfare recipients and taking them to the county welfare office. The director of the office, in compliance with the regulations, granted immediate payments when she considered the application "to be in immediate need." In other cases, aid was denied at the immediate moment pending evaluation of the complaint. As a result, the California rural legal assistance program has filed some 30 appeals based on the fact that some applicants were denied on-the-spot aid as well as the fact that other applicants deserved retroactive reimbursement for denied payments. Concurrent with these 30-odd appeals, the CRLA has filed a law suit against the welfare director which has occasioned the Sutter County board of supervisors to hire an attorney to defend her. This suit has now gone from the local superior court to the district court of appeals and to the State supreme court. While all courts have refused to hear the case, the taxpayers will be forced to bear the burden of the cost of both the plaintiff and the defendant.

I assure you, Mr. President, that this was not in my mind when I stated I was greatly in favor of the rural legal services program.

In another example, this same group, the California rural legal assistance program, brought suit against the Department of Labor. Earlier this year, I alerted the Department of Labor to the forthcoming need for a minimum of 10,000 Mexican farmworkers to harvest tomatoes and other crops in the northern San Joaquin Valley of California. On September 7 Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz approved the importation of 8,100 Mexican supplemental workers after California growers and the California Department of Labor issued a formal request. The next day an attorney for the California rural legal assistance program on behalf of 26 California farmworkers filed suits in U.S. District Courts in San Jose and San Francisco seeking to enjoin temporarily the importation on the ground that the certification order by Secretary Wirtz violated procedural regulations.

Once again the taxpayers financed the legal expenses of both parties to the suit—really a ludicrous and ridiculous situation. In this case however adjudication was forestalled by an agreement between the CRLA and the Department of Labor.

Included in this agreement is a formal procedure for California worker representatives to protest the admission of foreign workers and the establishment of an independent panel of citizens to review the entire system which permits growers to use foreign workers as well as an increase in the number of compliance officers. Furthermore it is my understanding that this panel will consist of seven members three of which will be CRLA attorneys.

I further submit that this was never envisioned by the members of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 12 minutes have expired.

Mr. MURPHY. I yield myself another 4 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has only 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. MURPHY. I yield myself 3 minutes.

I cannot for 1 minute believe that this was the original intent of the legal services program. I cannot believe that af-

fording legal advice, counsel, and representation to persons unable to afford it in order to promote justice should include the right to bring suit against a Federal, State, or local agency supported by taxpayers' money when the party is represented by another agency or program which is financed by the same funds.

Although I will not dwell on this subject, I cannot believe that in either case the welfare recipient or the farmworkers went to the CRLA for assistance. It is far more likely that the CRLA drummed up clients to come and do battle. This is the problem of Mr. Shriver and Mr. Earl Johnson, the Director of the legal services program, to determine whether the attorneys employed by this program are working and conducting themselves in a proper manner.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope that my colleagues will consider this amendment which will prohibit legal service lawyers from bringing suit against any Federal, State, county, or local agency. This program is not designed to be a demonstration project or a "trial and error" program. We are funding it presently in the amount of $47 million, and we should not treat its implementation lightly. The program was designed to aid the poor in achieving the legal rights and privileges which the rich can afford. It was designed to make them equal to the average citizen in the courts of our Nation. And I cannot believe that the average citizen goes to court with a test case which is of a spurious nature. He does not have the money to do so and he certainly does not have the money to give it to the poor person to use in such a questionable fashion. The disadvantaged should be helped, but we must remember the burden which is being placed on the taxpayer in providing benefits under this program. There are too many cases for legal service attorneys to handle without involving themselves in these test cases.

Therefore, I urge the acceptance of this amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, this amendment, which would prohibit the spending of any money for legal services to support any action against any Federal, State, or local agency would, in effect, repeal the first 10 amendments to the Constitution of the United States if a poor person is involved. In effect, this amendment says that if such a person is having trouble with his welfare payments and needs a lawyer to help him, he cannot have that help. He has to do with his own lawyer, assuming he can get one. If the chief of police picks him up on an illegal arrest, and he wants to have a lawyer to defend him, he cannot do it. If the police break into his house without a warrant, he cannot do anything about it, because that is a local agency, and he, therefore, cannot be allowed to have help from the legal services division. If any official from welfare, the chief of police, the building inspector, or anyone else violates his constitutional rights, the legal services section of the OEO is not allowed to receive 1 cent for defending him.

To me the issue is simple. Does the Constitution of the United States, so far as the first 10 amendments are concerned, apply only to those who can hire their own lawyers, but not to anyone who must depend, because of his economic circumstances, on a lawyer from the Legal Services Division of the OEO?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question before he leaves that point?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. MURPHY. I would like to ask the Senator, most respectfully, how has this problem been handled before in this Republic up to the institution of these services? Have the poor had to handle it themselves?

Mr. CLARK. Pretty much. In my city we have a voluntary service, badly supported by the community, barely able to handle more than 10 percent of legitimate cases.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the answer to the question of the Senator from California is "Yes." We have not only had volunteer services; we have had a voluntary defender, given very little money out of the city budget. We have had a legal services division paid for, quite inadequately, by the communities themselves. But the overwhelming majority of the people in Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and other cities in my State never have had adequate legal services until this program started.

By his amendment the Senator is saying that if an automobile dealer takes illegal action to take back his automobile, the poor person can take action against him; if a loan company wants to take illegal action, he can present his case; but if the chief of police engages in police brutality or other illegal action, he has no recourse.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, there is the Civil Liberties Union.

Mr. CLARK. Yes, there is the Civil Liberties Union.

I plead with the Senator not to press the amendment. It denies the poor their constitutional and legal rights, and I would have to strongly oppose it.

Mr. MURPHY. What I am trying to do is really preserve the actual rights of the poor and place the services where they are needed. I brought up a case, which was absolutely a rigged case and the case was settled out of court. The Government's representative could have won the case, but he was embarrassed to be representing the growers and farmers——

Mr. CLARK. The Senator told me about that case. I think he is quite right in that case, but what the Senator is doing is throwing the baby out with the bathwater by his amendment.

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

Mr. MURPHY. I think our concern is exactly parallel. I had one of these lawyers in my office last week. He said these fellows are all over the place and they are doing this kind of representation. In the State of California the purpose of this legal assistance is not being used for the poor; it is being used by organizations for an entirely different purpose, never envisioned by me, at least.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have no particular quarrel with the cases the Senator from California brought out. I am saying, the way this amendment is drafted, I think it is unconstitutional, and it certainly is going to remove from the poor most of the protections we hope to get them under the Constitution of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, may I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] may have 1 minute?

Mr. LAUSCHE. No; I had better not.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 30 seconds to propound a unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the agreement which was entered into as a result of the unanimous-consent request earlier today by the majority leader be printed in its usual form and that immediately after the conclusion of morning business on tomorrow the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] be recognized for the consideration of his amendment.

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

The unanimous-consent agreement reduced to writing is as follows:

Ordered, That during the further consideration of 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, debate on any amendment (except one amendment to be offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]), motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]: *Provided*, That in the event the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him. *Provided further*, That on the amendment to be offered by Mr. WILLIAMS following the routine morning business tomorrow (October 5, 1967), which is not to exceed 15 minutes, debate shall be limited to 45 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. CLARK.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders or someone designated by them: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Sen-

ator from California. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], 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 Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 52, as follows:

[No. 279 Leg.]

YEAS—36

Allott	Fannin	McClellan
Bennett	Fong	Miller
Byrd, Va.	Hansen	Mundt
Byrd, W. Va.	Hickenlooper	Murphy
Carlson	Hill	Pearson
Cotton	Holland	Sparkman
Curtis	Hollings	Spong
Dirksen	Hruska	Stennis
Dominick	Jordan, N.C.	Talmadge
Eastland	Jordan, Idaho	Thurmond
Ellender	Kuchel	Williams, Del.
Ervin	Long, La.	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—52

Aiken	Hartke	Muskie
Anderson	Hatfield	Nelson
Bartlett	Inouye	Pell
Bible	Jackson	Percy
Boggs	Javits	Prouty
Brewster	Lausche	Proxmire
Burdick	Long, Mo.	Randolph
Cannon	Magnuson	Ribicoff
Case	Mansfield	Scott
Church	McCarthy	Smathers
Clark	McGee	Smith
Dodd	McGovern	Symington
Fulbright	McIntyre	Tydings
Gore	Metcalf	Williams, N.J.
Griffin	Mondale	Yarborough
Gruening	Monroney	Young, Ohio
Harris	Montoya	
Hart	Morse	

NOT VOTING—12

Baker	Hayden	Moss
Bayh	Kennedy, Mass.	Pastore
Brooke	Kennedy, N.Y.	Russell
Cooper	Morton	Tower

So Mr. MURPHY's amendment was rejected.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The PRESIDING OFFICER announced that on today, October 4, 1967, the Vice President signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

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.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS ETC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS PROGRAM EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES PURSUANT TO SUBSECTION 201(i), FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ACT OF 1950, AS AMENDED

A letter from the Acting Director of Civil Defense, Department of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of Federal contributions program equipment and facilities (reporting symbol OCD-CONG(Q)2), for the quarter ended June 30, 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS PURSUANT TO SUBSECTION 205, FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ACT OF 1950, AS AMENDED

A letter from the Acting Director of Civil Defense, Department of the Army transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of Federal contributions—personnel and administration (reporting symbol OCD-CONG(A)3), for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

SECOND REPORT ON HIGH-SPEED GROUND TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1965

A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the second report on activities carried out during the fiscal year 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

DUTY-FREE ENTRY OF GIFTS FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend for a temporary period the existing provisions of law relating to the duty-free entry of gifts not exceeding $50 in retail value from members of the Armed Forces serving in combat zones (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

PETITION

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Upper Great Lakes Regional Commission, Washington, D.C., endorsing the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. MONRONEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, dated September 25, 1967, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 2501. A bill for the relief of Dr. Fernando Rafael Boudet-Esteban; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 2502. A bill for the relief of Ping Kan Hui, Yun Sung Tam, Shui Wong, Po Fat Cheng, Yuen Chun Cheuk, Chun Ho, Cheung Wu, and Yiung Shing Cheung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 2503. A bill for the relief of Vassilios Tsibukis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 2504. A bill for the relief of Dr. Martiniano L. Orta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

S. 2505. A bill for the relief of Gregorio De Santis; and

S. 2506. A bill for the relief of Dr. Julio Epifanio Morera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 377 AND 378

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate referral two amendments to H.R. 12080, the Social Security Amendments of 1967, recently transmitted to the Senate by the House of Representatives.

The first seeks to raise the present earnings limitation under social security from the present $1,500 per annum to $2,400, or to put it in monthly terms, from the present $125 per month to $200 per month. Unfortunately, the House-reported bill only raises the earnings limitation to $1,680 per year, or $140 per month. This amendment would allow those people on social security to earn up to $2,400 per year without reduction in benefits.

Mr. President, I believe it is most important that we enact a meaningful increase in the earnings limitation. Many of our older citizens, who are retired, find it well nigh impossible to live on the expected maximum benefit payment of $189 per month. However, if allowed to earn $200 extra per month, they could maintain an adequate living standard.

To my mind, it is paradoxical that we enact all sorts of Federal programs to help the senior citizen, yet we seem to do nothing to support any initiative on the part of these same citizens; in fact, we seem to penalize it.

These people possess many skills, skills learned over a lifetime of work. In my own State there is a shortage of skilled workers. The Rhode Island State Employment Service has had great success in placing older workers who have the needed skills. The one drawback to the success of this job placement program is the fact that the limitation on earnings and its attendant reduction on benefits puts a damper on initiative.

The second amendment calls for a cost-of-living adjustment for social security benefits, an adjustment that would rise or fall with the movement of the consumer price index.

Economists preach that this cost-of-living adjustment is, in the long run, a bad feature which would eventually work *against social* security. However, the long run is of no interest to those people of 65 who would have to struggle to earn a decent living on the expected maximum of $189 per month.

It is quite clear that living costs are constantly rising. It is manifestly unfair that those people with the least amount of money should have to wait for Congress to act every 2 or 3 years in order to live in a market of rising costs. A cost-of-living adjustment will, of its own accord, insure that social security benefits truly reflect the consumer market.

I urge the Senate Finance Committee to consider these amendments to H.R. 12080, for I feel that they will be of great aid to our senior citizens.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendments (Nos. 377 and 378) were referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT NO. 379

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, action is needed, as it has been over these years, to remove a longstanding inequity in the social security law. There is no penalty for those who in retirement receive investment income. It is possible to have $5,000, $10,000, or any other amount of income so long as it does not come from wages. But for many a worker, particularly *those* whose lives have been spent in low-paid employment resulting in no savings and investments as they struggle daily to make ends meet, there is a need, so long as health and circumstance permit, to continue working. Social security alone is insufficient to meet the need for income in retirement, yet many have no other resources. In fact, a study by the administration on aging shows that those over 65, 9 percent of the population, comprise 16 percent of all our poor. Put another way nearly a third of all retired persons fall in the poverty class.

Administration recommendations to raise the income limitation are inadequate. The limitation should be removed completely. We should make the desire to work a desire that is rewarded instead of penalized. Let us not continue to make it unprofitable for a worker to want to continue to contribute to his own and the Nation's economic betterment.

Mr. President, on May 2 of this year I introduced S. 1665, a bill to remove completely the earnings limitation on income of social security beneficiaries. Today I offer the bill in the form of an amendment to H.R. 12080, the omnibus social security bill now before the Senate Finance Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 379) was referred to the Committee on Finance.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT, DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL

AMENDMENT NO. 380

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 10345) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 48, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following:

"That section 2 of the Subversive Activities Control Act is hereby amended by adding immediately following paragraph (15), a new paragraph, as follows:

"'(16) The findings of fact contained in paragraphs (1) through (15) of this section are reiterated. Recent court decisions involving the registration provisions of this Act make it necessary to enact legislation to accomplish the purposes of such Act without the requirements of registration. Disclosure of Communist organizations and of the members of Communist-action organizations as provided herein is essential to the protection of the national welfare.'

"SEC. 2. Section 5 of the Subversive Activities Control Act is amended as follows:

"(a) By changing that part of subsection (a) thereof beginning with the first word of the subsection and continuing down to subparagraph (1) thereof, so as to read:

"'(a) When there is in effect a final order of the Board determining any organization to be a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization, it shall be unlawful—'

"(b)) By changing that part of subparagraph (1) of subsection (a) thereof which precedes (A) so as to read:

"'(1) For any member of such organization, with knowledge or notice of such final order of the Board—'.

"(c) By changing that part of subparagraph (2) of subsection (a) thereof precedes (A) so as to read:

"'(2) For any officer or employee of the United States or of any defense facility, with knowledge or notice of such final order of the Board—'.

"SEC. 3. Sections 7 and 8 of the Subversive Activities Control Act are hereby repealed.

"SEC. 4. The caption to section 9 of the Subversive Activities Control Act is amended so as to read: 'RECORDS OF FINAL ORDERS OF THE BOARD; PUBLIC INSPECTION; REPORTS TO PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS.'; and

"Section 9 of such Act is amended so as to read:

"'SEC. 9. (a) The Board shall keep and maintain records, which shall be open to public inspection, giving the names and addresses of all organizations as to which, and individuals as to whom, there are in effect final orders of the Board issued pursuant to any of the provisions of subsections (g) through (j), inclusive, of section 13, or subsection (f) of section 13A.

"'(b) Copies of the reports and orders of the Board so issued shall be furnished by the Board to any person upon request and upon the payment of the reasonable costs thereof as then currently fixed by the Board.

"'(c) The Board shall submit to the President and to the Congress on or before June 1 of each year (and at any other time when requested by either House by resolution) a report giving the names and addresses of all organizations as to which, and all individuals as to whom, there are in effect such final orders of the Board.'

"SEC. 5. Section 10 of the Subversive Activities Control Act is amended as follows: the first sentence thereof preceding subparagraph (1) is amended so as to read:

"'SEC. 10. (a) It shall be unlawful for any organization with respect to which there is in effect a final order of the Board determining it to be a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization—'.

"(b) The phrase following the colon at the end of subparagraph (1) thereof is amended to read: 'Disseminated by ———, an organization determined by final order of the Subversive Activities Control Board to be a Communist- ——— organization;'.

"(c) The phrase following the colon at the end of subparagraph (2) thereof is amended to read: 'The following program is sponsored by ——— an organization determined by final order of the Subversive Activities Control Board to be a Communist- ——— organization.'

"SEC. 6. Beginning with (j), all that of subsection (a) of section 11 of the Subversive Activities Control Act down to and including the end thereof is amended so as to read: 'there is in effect a final order of the Board determining such organization to be a Communist-action or a Communist-front organization.'

"SEC. 7. Beginning with (j), all that of subsection (b) of section 11 of the Subversive Activities Control Act down to and including the end thereof is amended so as to read: 'there is in effect a final order of the Board determining such organization to be a Communist-action or a Communist-front organization.'

"SEC. 8. Paragraph (2) of subsection (e) of section 12 of the Subversive Activities Control Act is amended so as to read:

"'(2) upon application made by the Attorney General under section 13(a) of this title, or by any individual under section 13(b) of this title, to determine whether any individual is a member of any organization as to which there is in effect a final order of the Board determining such organization to be a Communist-action organization.'

"SEC. 9. Section 13 of the Subversive Activities Control Act is amended as follows:

"(a) By amending subsection (a) thereof so as to read:

"'(a)(I) Whenever the Attorney General has reason to believe that any organization is a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization, he shall file with the Board and serve upon such organization a petition for a determination that such organization is a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be.

"'(II) Whenever the Attorney General has reason to believe that any individual is a member of an organization which has been finally determined under this section to be a Communist-action organization, he shall file with the Board and serve upon such individual a petition for a determination that such individual is a member of such organization. Each petition under part (I) or part (II) of this subsection shall be verified under oath, and shall contain a statement of the facts upon which the Attorney General relies in support of his prayer for the issuance of such order.'

"(b) By amending subsection (b) thereof so as to read:

"'(b) Any organization as to which there is in effect a final order of the Board determining it to be a Communist organization, and any individual as to whom there is in effect a final order of the Board determining him to be a member of a Communist-action organization may, not more often than once in each calendar year, file with the Board and serve upon the Attorney General a petition for a determination that such organization no longer is a Communist organization (in the case of an organization which has been determined under subsection (a) of this section to be one of the types of Communist organizations) or that such individual no longer is a member of a Communist-action organization, as the case may be. Each petition filed under and pursuant to this subsection shall be verified under oath, and shall contain a statement of the facts relied upon in support thereof. Upon the filing of any such petition, the Board shall serve upon each party to such proceeding a notice specifying the time and place for hearing upon such petition. No such hearing shall be conducted within twenty days after the service of such notice.'

"(c) By amending that portion of paragraph (2) of subsection (d) thereof which precedes the last sentence thereof so as to read:

"'(2) Where an organization or individual declines or fails to appear at a hearing accorded to such organization or individual by the Board in proceedings under subsection (a) of this section, the Board shall, nevertheless, proceed to receive evidence, make a determination of the issues, and enter such order as shall be just and appropriate. Upon failure of an organization or individual to appear at a hearing accorded to such organization or individual in proceedings under subsection (b) of this section the Board may forthwith and without further proceedings enter an order dismissing the petition of such organization or individual.'

"(d) By amending subsection (g) thereof so as to read:

"'(g) If, after hearing upon a petition filed under subsection (a) of this section, the Board determines—

"'(1) that an organization is a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served on such organization an order determining the organization to be a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization as the case may be;

"'(2) that an individual is a member of a Communist-action organization, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served on such individual an order determining such individual to be a member of a Communist-action organization.'

"(e) By amending subsection (h) thereof so as to read:

"'(h) If, after hearing upon a petition filed under subsection (a) of this section, the Board determines—

"'(1) that an organization is not a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served upon the Attorney General an order denying the determination sought by his petition, and shall send a copy of such order to such organization;

"'(2) that an individual is not a member of any Communist-action organization, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served upon the Attorney General an order denying the determination sought by his petition, and shall send a copy of such order to such individual.'

"(f) By amending subsection (i) thereof so as to read:

"'(i) If, after hearing upon a petition filed under subsection (b) of this section, the Board determines—

"'(1) that an organization no longer is a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served upon the Attorney General and such organization an order determining that the organization no longer is a Communist-action organization or Communist-front organization as the case may be;

"'(2) that an individual no longer is a member of any Communist-action organization, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served upon the Attorney General and such individual an order determining that such individual no longer is a member of a Communist-action organization.'

"(g) By amending subsection (j) thereof so as to read:

"'(j) If, after hearing upon a petition filed under subsection (b) of this section, the Board determines—

"'(1) that an organization is a Communist-action organization or a communist-front organization, as the case may be, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served on such organization an order denying its petition for a determination that the organization no longer is a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization as the case may be;

"'(2) that an individual is a member of a Communist-action organization, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served upon such an individual an order denying his petition for a determination that the individual no longer is a member of a Communist-action organization.'

"(h) By amending subsection (k) thereof so as to read:

"'(k) When any order of the Board issued under subsection (g), (h), (i), or (j), of this section becomes final under the provisions of section 14(b) of this title, the Board shall publish in the Federal Register the fact that such order has become final, and publication thereof shall constitute notice to all persons that such order has become final.'

"SEC. 10. The seventh sentence of subsection (a) of section 14 of the Subversive Activities Control Act is amended so as to read: 'If the court shall set aside an order issued under subsection (j) of section 13, it may, in the case of an organization, enter a judgment requiring the Board to issue an order determining that such organization no longer is a Communist-action organization or Communist-front organization, as the case may be, or in the case of an individual, enter a judgment requiring the Board to issue an order determining that such individual no longer is a member of a Communist-action organization.'

"SEC. 11. Section 15 of the Subversive Activities Control Act is amended so as to read:

"'SEC. 15. (a) In the case of any organization which by proceedings under section 13(a) prior to the date of enactment hereof has been finally determined by the Board in carrying out its duties under subsection (e) of section 12, to be a "Communist-action organization" or a "Communist-front organization", and as a result of such determination has been ordered to register, the Board shall forthwith modify its previously issued registration order as may be necessary to conform such order to the provisions of section 13(g) hereof, and shall forthwith include such organization on the record maintained under section 9: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this subsection shall be construed so as to prevent any such organization from filing a petition as provided in subsection (b) of section 13.

"'(b) In the case of any proceeding pending before the Board on the effective date of this enactment the Board and the Attorney General are authorized to proceed in accordance with the provisions of this Act as herein amended. No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced prior to this enactment in any court of the United States shall abate by reason of this enactment. The court in any such case may allow such motion or supplemental pleadings as may be necessary to conform the litigation to the provisions of this Act as amended'."

Mr. DIRKSEN also submitted an amendment (No. 380), intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 10345, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 381

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware (for himself and Mr. THURMOND) proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes, which was ordered to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1796) to impose quotas on the importation of certain textile articles.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing, the name of the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1073) to remove arbitrary limitations upon attorneys' fees for services rendered in proceedings before administrative agencies of the United States, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2043) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that a farmer (or fisherman) shall have until March 15, instead of only until Febru-

ary 15 as at present, to file an income tax return which also satisfies the requirements relating to declarations of estimated tax.

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

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF AMENDMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of amendment No. 307, an amendment to S. 1125 which would allow a minimum annual allotment of $100,000 to each State for the education of the handicapped, that the name of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] be added as a cosponsor.

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

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations be discharged from further consideration of S. 2186, a bill to establish a National Consumer Service Foundation as an independent agency in the executive branch of the Federal Government, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

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

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 4, 1967, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 117. An act for the relief of Martha Blankenship;

S. 534. An act for the relief of Setsuko Wilson (nee Hiranaka);

S. 1320. An act to provide for the acquisition of career status by certain temporary employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes;

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 at Fort McDermitt, Nev.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ERWIN N. GRISWOLD, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE SOLICITOR GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, October 11, 1967, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, before the Committee on the Judiciary, upon the nomination of Erwin N. Griswold, of Massachusetts, to be Solicitor General of the United States.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the above nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent.

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

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

By Mr. COOPER:

Statement by Senator PERCY before Committee on Foreign Relations on Senate Resolution 151, August 21, 1967.

INCORPORATION OF THE JUNIOR NAVAL CADETS OF AMERICA

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I have introduced, for appropriate reference, a bill authorizing the incorporation of the Junior Naval Cadets of America. I introduced this legislation at the request of a distinguished constituent, Mr. Mario R. aRussilo of Johnston, R.I., who holds the rank of captain in the Junior Naval Cadets of America, and who is the commandant of the Rhode Island State Command, JNCA.

The purpose of this excellent organization is to drill and instruct young people between the ages of 12 and 18 in the tradition and science of the naval service. My own State, with its long and honorable nautical heritage, has had a great interest in the Junior Naval Cadets from the beginning. From their origin in nearby Connecticut with only a few hundred members, the Junior Naval Cadets now claim several thousand members in a dozen States across the Nation.

Because of their growth to national status and because of the consequent need to centralize and consolidate their legal status, the Junior Naval Cadets have decided to seek a congressional charter through the legislation which I have introduced. I do hope that the excellent Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations, which is headed by the distinguished minority leader, may see fit to consider this bill favorably.

THE CONTRIBUTION OF COOPERATIVES

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, Vice President HUMPHREY has written an excellent article for the October News for Farmer Cooperatives on the importance of cooperatives to the United States. During this 1967 Cooperative Month observance, the Vice President points out that the contribution of cooperatives both to the United States and to the underdeveloped world will be limited in the future only by the vision and energy of those in the cooperative movement. Mr. President, 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:

[From the News for Farmer Cooperatives, Oct. 1, 1967]

COOPERATIVES: A NATIONAL ASSET

(By HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Vice President of the United States)

Cooperatives are built of bricks and mortar, glass and steel, wood and iron.

But they also are built with hands and hearts, with hopes and visions of men.

The Mortar.—We can see and touch the bricks and mortar. We can grasp the vast cooperative structure as a physical asset which enriches the Nation.

Farmers market and buy about $15 billion worth of goods through their cooperatives each year.

Over the past three decades 20 million rural people have been getting light and power through rural electric cooperatives. Each year rural power users buy over $1 billion worth of electrical appliances and equipment.

Farmers and their cooperatives borrowed $8 billion through the cooperative farm credit system last year. With this they kept a bounty of food flowing in the United States and to many of the hungry of the world.

To help produce this food, they also used cooperatives to water about 25 percent of all the irrigated land in this country.

Some 18 million people have built up assets of $11 billion in their credit unions.

Others live in housing cooperatives, get group health and insurance protection, and unite to obtain many other services.

These are matters of proud record for cooperative business in the United States.

The Men.—But it is more of men than mortar that I want to write. For the genius of cooperatives lies in its people, the greatest asset of any Nation. Thus a matter of even prouder record is a self-reliant people going about its business.

During this century cooperatives have given us a generation of agricultural leaders. Their voices are heard effectively in joint counsels between Government and citizens, as well as in their own business environments.

I watched cooperatives begin to develop this body of men—the early giants who had persuasive powers, high vision, and great business ability.

I watched too as new leaders began to emerge—the next generation who now stand beside their elders in high agricultural circles. Their names go on rosters of national commissions, national advisory committees, and other influential groups.

Five from cooperatives served with diligence on the National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber. They have just completed 18 months of intensive exploration into agricultural policies' effects on our economy's performance and our foreign relations—a task assigned by President Johnson in January 1966.

I watched also as hundreds of thousands of people with little business background applied themselves diligently to learning their jobs as directors. Here, too, cooperatives molded a great body of better informed and more capable people. They add to this country's wealth of able citizens.

Took Daring and Resolution—The early cooperative builders knew no easy times—just as we know none today. One of our great Midwest cooperatives started in the twenties with one man and a few farmers who knew there had to be a better way. Today this cooperative stands among *Fortune* magazine's top 500 businesses, as do four other cooperatives.

This Midwest farmer business had no vertical takeoff. Just as most of the successes in today's cooperatives, it struggled through early lean years, started to grow, fell back a time or two, and then began to really move.

It took the master builders and the resolute will of determined members and directors to erect the major cooperative structure in American society. People often had to muster untried resources, untapped courage, just to keep going.

Strong Support by Government—But it also took something else: A recognition within the structure of Government that these men had high purpose and high potential and deserved support the Government could appropriately give.

That is why we have statutes and policies

that make clear the rights of men to form cooperatives and do business through them.

That is why Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman has firmly stood up for the cooperatives' place in our economy.

That is why he and others in the Federal Government are again this year lending strong support to cooperatives by recognition of October as Cooperative Month.

That is why Governors of more than half our States this year issued Proclamations signaling recognition of cooperatives' importance to their States.

Others Starting To Build Today—But man can never rest on his accomplishments. Much as he likes to settle back after he reaches one peak of success, some inner spark keeps him moving. And behind him others come, also striving to lift themselves up.

It is to these people, just beginning their long struggle upward, that I now want to turn—to the low income, the minority, the disadvantaged of our own and other lands.

Many of these are looking toward cooperatives as a peaceful and productive way to bring about a better life for themselves and their families.

It is these people at home and overseas that now need the strong helping hand. So today the Government is focusing major efforts for them in cities and rural communities across the United States and throughout the world community.

Our Communities of Tomorrow.—The crisis in our cities is upon us. I have walked the streets that spawn revolt, seen the desperation of such environments. The chance to break out, to emerge into brighter opportunities must be given.

And yet we know that merely offering a chance is often not enough. People must first rouse themselves both to hope and to try. Some have made a start.

A housing cooperative in New York City points proudly to its no-crime record. None of its 300 middle- and lower-middle income members has ever been convicted of a felony. Yet the rate of crime in surrounding neighborhoods, filled with people of similar racial and cultural backgrounds, is no better and no worse than New York City as a whole.

In other housing co-ops in other parts of New York and other cities, the crime rate also is significantly lower than in housing in comparable neighborhoods.

Today's active programs to increase credit unions among low-income people are giving many their first grasp of money management and their first release from excessive interest costs. They are getting a taste of what they can do by joint effort.

Simple buying clubs also are teaching ways to live and work together for a common purpose. Some groups are moving on to get their food and other necessities by opening cooperative stores.

Cooperative enterprises on our city streets, whether formal or infomal, are one of the staging areas where the individual's sense of responsibility and belief in his own ability can be developed.

In addition, people usually do not destroy what they own and share in. We must find more and better ways of making such ownership and involvement possible to the millions of our own needy. Cooperatives, of course, aren't the whole answer. But they are part of it, often the first start toward finding sensible solutions.

Rural Communities Under Stress.—The rural community is no longer a place where even bare subsistence is possible with that "little piece of land." The crisis has been building there just as it has in the cities.

The Food and Fiber Commission reports: "We may be poised on the threshold of an even greater technological revolution on the farm." It then warns, "Unless the United States can provide employment by 1980 for the equivalent of 40 percent of the people now working on farms, returns to farm labor will continue to be depressed, and a substantial number of farm families will continue to live in poverty."

The Commission sees the task ahead in the rural areas as enormous—"a reorganization and reorientation of the rural community."

Certainly the rural town is so closely intermingled with farming that it cannot prosper when number of farmers is down drastically, and their income is not on a par with the rest of the economy.

Together farmers have established in their own home towns thousands of thriving small businesses—their cooperatives. These add to the money base of the community with jobs, taxes, and money paid others for services.

Cooperatives are the one mainline business, the one bright business spot in many small towns. They stand beside other businesses as generator of jobs and added income in many others.

But the job is far from finished. The future holds the further urgent challenge for building communities of tomorrow. This is a job we must do while we still have time for sensible transition from the old-line, on-farm economy to an increasingly more complex agricultural business system.

Local, State, and Federal energies now are wrestling with finding help for rural people with no opportunities for farm land, for other jobs, or for training. Many programs already are in action.

Cooperatives need to be more a part of this action if they are to fulfill their promise. They must not be considered, however, as mere survival kits, something to be tried only *in extremis*. Neither must they be considered a miracle cure, whatever the ailment.

The Federal Government is providing loans and grants and technical advice as aids. Its participation in this year's Cooperative Month gives meaning to our firm commitment for a creative effort to help people lift themselves up—be they sharecropper, small farmer, large family farmer, or city resident.

Some early-stage co-ops now starting will have the same growing pains as the successful cooperatives of today. They won't have time to wait to simply outgrow them on their own. But they need more than time; they need sound advice and help; and they need the benefit of others' experiences.

The International Community of Tomorrow.—I have long proclaimed the need to lend cooperative knowledge overseas as a basic part of our international programs to help the needy of the world. I spoke of this again this past February at a conference on the Fifth Anniversary of the Amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act that bears my name.

There I expressed my pleasure that the Agency for International Development (AID) had been carrying out the mandate of the Amendment to step up development of cooperatives overseas. I said the people at this conference were "mobilizing resources under the banner of cooperatives and helping in the business of nation building."

Cooperatives in these needy areas are the seed centers from which can grow the people and the principles every nation of free men needs.

We have made a start in setting down these seed centers in the vast continents where our poor would be their rich. Cooperatives have been generous of their time, skills, and people—sending all three across vast distances to other less favored people.

The rural electrics have been helping bring light and power to rural communities of other lands, and ultimately expect 1.25 million people in 50 countries to benefit from United States pioneering with electrical cooperatives.

That you can build cooperatives under real adversity has been demonstrated in Viet Nam.

The first of three pilot electric cooperatives a few months ago started bringing electricity to 90 of the eventual 12,000 families it will serve.

An Army Colonel helped set up several cooperatives to increase local production of fresh vegetables and fruits to help feed allied forces and the Vietnamese. About 2,700 farmers formed the first of these 165 miles north of Saigon.

These cooperatives now have started their own processing and packaging businesses. Reports are that the farmers have greatly increased their incomes as well as their crops.

Cooperatives are lending their men to help India develop fertilizer systems for a land that must produce more and do it quickly to feed its hungry millions.

Our own cooperative people are well accepted in almost every area, and bring more of the true picture of the United States to these people than they have seen before.

Many parts of the world will be in a food crisis in all too few years. Whatever we can do to help the farmers of the needier nations improve their productivity and their efficiency is vital for the good of us all. We are learning that the United States and today's other food exporting nations cannot feed all the hungry of the world.

Cooperatives bring better prices for products and lower costs for fertilizers and other supplies; better assurance of places to market what farmers produce and direct advice on improved farming practices—all incentives to produce more.

Cooperatives are one of the lifts people are using in trying to reach up—too often with high hopes only and no solid foundation on which to build for their own countries.

We need more people to give them a hand, people grounded in basic business facts the United States cooperatives have had to learn in day-to-day operations. We need people with a deep commitment to the struggling at home and overseas, those with compassion as well as pride of accomplishment.

We need people who do not "go gentle into that night" when faced with death of their hopes and plans. We need people who not only can pick themselves up, but can lift others with them and once again move fiercely into changing things for the better.

We are a people in the United States who seldom write Mission Accomplished if there is more to be done on the road ahead. We are a people of discontent, but not of malcontents.

Cooperatives are a response to discontent, a way to channel this urge for better things into a positive asset for the common good.

J. EDGAR HOOVER SPEAKS ON THE RIOTS THIS SUMMER

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the October edition of the Law Enforcement Bulletin of the Federal Bureau of Investigation contains an excellent statement by Director J. Edgar Hoover on the rioting this summer.

Mr. Hoover takes the position, as I do along with a great many others, that much of the mob violence we have seen in our city streets has resulted in part from the so-called civil disobedience movement.

It has long been my feeling that civil disobedience was degenerating into an outright criminal action in all too many instances. One cannot go about the country preaching disrespect for law and order, urging people to take the law into their own hands, or advising people on what laws they ought to obey and which ones they ought to disobey without inviting chaos and anarchy, and in many of our cities this summer we have seen just that.

I feel as does Mr. Hoover that "if our system of law is to survive, then the law must be enforced."

Mr. Hoover's statement on this problem is one of the finest I have read. I invite the attention of the Senate to it and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE DIRECTOR

In a riot there are no victors. The losers include everybody—the rioters, the victims, law enforcement, the community, the State, and the Nation.

Causes of riots can be counted by the score. A study of the overall problem indicates, however, that the widespread violence in our country to some degree is a direct outgrowth of the civil disobedience movement. In recent years, some leaders of dubious stature have made a grandiose gesture of willfully violating laws they deem to be unjust. For the most part, these individuals, although admittedly guilty of breaking the law, have gone unpunished. Young thugs and misguided teenagers, seeing others defy authority and the courts with impunity, have been led to believe that any crime under a banner of complaints is justified. Consequently, they ignore the law and roam through their communities creating violence and terror. Certainly, those who espouse the theory of civil disobedience and authorities who free guilty violators must share a portion of the blame and responsibility for the turmoil in our streets. It should be abundantly clear that the doctrine of civil disobedience is a doctrine of self-destruction.

Stern, decisive action is needed when a street disturbance begins. Justice is not served when a growing horde of vandals and looters is appeased and their pillage overlooked lest "a show of force might provoke them to greater violence." Quiescence does not satisfy rioters. Procrastination or uncertainty on the part of authorities denotes weakness or concession to a mob. Thus, the offenders are encouraged, and their violence gains momentum.

A judicial self-appraisal by the news media of their riot coverage might also be in order. Some media have already taken action in this regard. There can be no quarrel with the all-important role of keeping the public informed as quickly and as completely as possible. No one rightfully expects riots to be played down or salient facts withheld.

On the other hand, militant agitators, hatemongers, and publicity-seeking rabble rousers who incite riots have no fear of overexposure. They know that television, radio, and front-page news stories are the best and quickest means of getting their views before the public. Thus, they seek attention from the news media. In riot reporting, objectivity and balance, always key factors of responsible journalism, help expose distortion and reduce the special treatment of those who advocate violence. Strict adherence to high journalistic principles is a valuable public service in matters affecting public safety.

Many proposals have been advanced to help eliminate the causes of riots. Just as there is no single cause, there is no single remedy. I do know, however, that the answer will not be found in sociological remedies alone. If our system of law is to survive, then the law must be enforced. Those who break the law, acting alone or in concert, must be detected and arrested, promptly prosecuted, and given proper, substantial punishment. In halting riots and removing crime from our Nation's streets, this should be the first order of business.

October 1. 1967.

JOHN EDGAR HOOVER,
Director.

CONSIDERATION OF FISH, WILDLIFE, AND RECREATIONAL VALUES IN PLANNING FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, during the 87th Congress and again in the 88th, I introduced legislation which would assure the consideration of fish, wildlife, and recreation values in the planning and development of Federal-aid highways. It was my conviction that great stretches of valuable stream as well as areas of recreation and scenic value were being damaged or completely destroyed by a shortsighted Federal highways development policy which considered only the economic and engineering criteria in the routing, location, and design of roads. To illustrate the severity of the problem I launched a Save Our Streams campaign citing case after case where fish, wildlife, and scenic resources were being sacrificed to the highway builder.

Fortunately, there are encouraging signs that much of this is changing. The enabling legislation of the new Department of Transportation specifically directs the Secretary to give special consideration to the preservation of scenery, recreation, wildlife, and waterfowl in the development of transportation plans and programs. The move, however, from generalized statements of national policy objectives to the specifics of locating a particular segment of highway, is not one which occurs automatically. Without specific implementing procedures at the working level where the route selections are actually made, well intended statements of national policy become empty phrases. For this reason I read with particular interest the recent recommendations made to the President by the Citizens Advisory Committee on Recreation and Natural Beauty. The recommendations on the selection of highway routes by this Committee, of which Laurence S. Rockefeller is the chairman, offers specific suggestions for the protection of fish, wildlife, scenic, and recreational resources. These are thoughtful and worthwhile considerations. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE SELECTION OF HIGHWAY ROUTES

Recent proposals for new highway construction have raised storms of feeling from Franconia Notch in New England to the coastal redwood forests of California. Many people are deeply concerned, not only about the threat to great natural treasures but to the open spaces in their own local areas. They charge that only lip service is paid to environmental values; that route selections are arbitrary and based on narrow grounds; that the public can express itself only after the decisions have been made; and that once they are made, there is no deflecting the engineers from their inexorable course.

People have reason to be concerned. Many valuable open spaces have already been lost to highways, and the pressure on what is left is sharpening. With more people and more cars to be served, the demand for highways goes up as the space available for them goes down.

The situation is aggravated by archaic methods of choosing locations for highways. The methods were devised when the overriding need was to provide safe and efficient transportation. The chief concerns in deciding on route locations were engineering considerations and costs; preservation of open space or scenery were hardly factors. Road building agencies were made nearly immune from outside pressure.

Since then, America has moved forward to a different set of needs. The pioneering era, when new routes were punched through fields and forest, is largely over. Experience has taught us that we require more uses from the land than can be considered in the simple cost-benefit formula. Highways have effects that reach far beyond those who drive on them; yet our present devices for choosing locations are still based mostly on requirements of the highway user rather than the community at large.

But this is not the national policy. The President and Congress have declared that our highway programs should seek to preserve our countryside and our park lands. The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966 and the Department of Transportation Act of 1966 clearly establish these concerns as not only desirable but mandatory.

But these concerns have yet to be made an integral part of the highway planning process. They should be.

New techniques are being devised so that the selection of routes can be made on qualitative, as well as quantitative, grounds. These techniques, which attempt to translate social needs in terms as tangible as engineering costs, hold great promise for highway planning.

We recognize that any change in existing procedures involves risk. If the public is allowed a larger role in making decisions, and if the decisions of highway officials are subjected to more appeals and more review, highway costs may rise and construction time may be slowed. We also recognize that route selection will always be a matter of reconciling many different needs. Adding further steps to the highway planning process will increase the lead time from concept to construction. Understandably, those charged with seeing that the concrete is poured will not like the idea of further procedural complications.

But these are secondary considerations. Highway planning is not going to be improved unless procedures are changed. In 1965, the Assembly Interim Committee on Natural Resources, Planning and Public Works of the State of California under the chairmanship of Edwin L. Z'berg, studied this problem and published an outstanding report. The basic conclusion of the Z'berg report was that highway agencies ". . . should be specifically directed to consider, in a formalized procedure equivalent to that devoted to engineering and cost considerations, all factors, translated into costs whenever feasible, affected by the location of a highway or freeway, including but not limited to such factors as community values, recreational, aesthetic, and park values; historical values; adjacent land values; impact on local tax roles; and total projected regional transportation requirements . . ." This recommendation has now become law, if not practice, in California.

We believe that these goals should be incorporated into the regulations of the Department of Transportation governing federal highway aid to all the states. We realize that the Bureau of Public Roads has already made some moves in this direction. We think a stronger effort is in order and offer these recommendations to that end. They are limited to highways, but the principles may apply to problems raised by other forms of transportation as well.

1. The Department of Transportation should make federal aid for highways contingent on route selection procedures that guarantee consideration of natural resources, recreation and natural beauty. The procedures should include early involvement of all interested public agencies, two full pub-

lic hearings, a complete and public record, and greater consideration to natural values in competition with economic and engineering considerations.

2. The Secretary of Transportation should establish a Route Selection Review Board. We suggest a five member review board, which would include representatives of the Departments of the Interior, Housing and Urban Development, and Agriculture as well as the Department of Transportation.

3. Similar review boards should be established by the governors of each state. The state planning offices might serve as the coordinating agency.

ROUTE SELECTION AT THE STATE LEVEL

In the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966, Congress directed the Secretary of Transportation to work with the states in developing highway programs that make maximum effort to preserve parks, historic sites and places of natural beauty. As an aid to the development of such programs, the Committee recommends that the Bureau of Public Roads amend its procedures for the granting of aid to highways to establish the following requirements:

1. Coordination with resource agencies from the beginning

Environmental factors must be worked into the highway planning procedure—and at the earliest possible opportunity. As soon as a state highway department begins considering an area as a possible location for a new highway, the department should be required to communicate that information to the state's resource and recreation agencies, the relevant federal agencies, and the agencies of the local governments of the area affected.

The state planing agency could bring the various agencies together. It should request them to advise the highway department about the specific resource and other environmental factors they believe should be considered in the selection of the route.

This early consultation would help the highway planners. They would be apprised of the potential conflicts when the planning begins, rather than later when it is over.

The resource agencies and the highway department should continue to work closely together throughout the design and construction phases.

2. Early public hearing

As soon as the reports of the resource agencies are on file, a first public hearing should be held. The subject of this first hearing would be the corridor under consideration, the objective of the proposed highway, alternative routes, and the criteria which are to guide the route selection process.

When the highway department has decided on the route, it should make public the decision and the reasons for it. It should note the resource problems that had been brought up and explain how each was considered.

3. Second public hearing

In most cases, it is likely that the first hearing will suffice. However, in unusually difficult or controversial cases, there should be a second hearing.

The subject of the second public hearing would be the proposed alignment within the selected corridor. As in the first public hearing, resource agencies data bearing upon the proposed alignment should be presented along with the state highway department's own presentation.

4. Formal decision on the final proposed alignment

After the second public hearing, the state highway department should make public the alignment it intends to propose to the federal government. The value of this requirement cannot be overstated.

There should be appended to this formal announcement final written statements of approval or disapproval by those resource and planning agencies which had made specific suggestions for modification. These commentaries, together with rebuttal comments by the highway department, would be part of the record sent forward to federal authorities.

5. Impartial hearing forum

In some situations highway hearings become, in effect, adversary proceedings between those who want the route and those who do not, with those who want it having the chair. Hearings would obviously be more equitable if conducted by someone other than the highway agency. Impartial hearing officials are now required by California and Michigan. Other states should follow suit.

REVIEW AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL

When the highway proposal has been forwarded from the state to the Department of Transportation for approval of federal aid, there is another opportunity to consider environmental factors. The provisions of section 15 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966, and sections 2(b)(2) and 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act come into play. These legislative requirements apply most specifically to publicly owned lands; but there is also a strong directive that "special effort should be made to preserve the natural beauty of the countryside . . ."

We recommend that a definite review procedure be established to insure that the objectives of the Acts are carried out forcefully.

To provide a workable procedure, we recommend that the Secretary of Transportation establish a Highway Review Board. It could consist of five members, one each appointed by the Secretaries of the Interior, Housing and Urban Development, and Agriculture, and two appointed by the Secretary of Transportation. One of the last named could be designated as chairman. The members could serve at the pleasure of the respective appointing officials.

A highway project considered to be contrary to the national policy could be referred within a specified time limit to the review board. The review board, of course, would have to lay down rules as to what kind of cases it would consider and who would have standing to initiate them. Eligible cases would be screened to determine whether the case was of sufficient significance to warrant a formal review by the board. The thorough documentation of the background of the case including the written record of the first public hearing, and the detailed explanation of the state highway department giving the reasons for its decision as to the route location, would greatly help the review board to determine whether the case warrants detailed review or not.

The review board would be required to state in writing its reasons for accepting or rejecting each case for detailed review. The series of discussion in such cases would build up a body of precedent and standards, comparable to certiorari in the Supreme Court, that would provide highway officials and the public with understanding of the application of national policy to specific problems.

In those cases which were accepted for review, the members of the board would study the records of the first and second public hearings, and the staff would review the technical issues. The rules for the review would be developed by the board.

Following the detailed study, the review board would forward to the Secretary of Transportation its recommendation as to whether the project be approved or modified. The Secretary would make the final decision which might or might not be in accord with what the board recommended. The recommendation of the review board would be made public together with the Secretary's decision and his reasons for making it.

REVIEW AT THE STATE LEVEL

We recommend that the governor of each state establish a similar review procedure. The state's planning agency might be charged with the task. Typically, planning agencies are charged with the development of statewide comprehensive plans, including those for recreation and transportation. They also report directly to the governor and are well situated to deal with the various other agencies.

Use should also be made of the new metropolitan agencies that have been set up in response to recent federal legislation. These agencies are charged with reviewing applications for federal grants-in-aid, and it is their job to determine whether specific projects are consistent with comprehensive metropolitan area plans. They could help insure that highway plans are geared to the environmental needs of the areas.

In the long run, the states should be the place to settle highway controversies. The state highway department currently sends its recommendations off to the Federal Bureau of Public Roads without review by the governor or other state agencies. Controversy simply follows the project to Washington. In the spirit of creative federalism, we believe that most of the highway controversies should be settled at the state level. This would provide a hearing closer to the people and would relieve the Department of Transportation, the Secretary, and the proposed Federal Review Board of undue and unproductive burden.

WE SHOULD FORTHWITH STOP BOMBING NORTH VIETNAM AND DEESCALATE THE GROUND WAR

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in his speech at San Antonio last Friday, President Johnson again announced that we will cease bombing North Vietnam provided that prior to our doing so the Hanoi government agrees to enter into negotiations.

There is overwhelming agreement among our closest allies and even among those few countries which support our involvement in Vietnam—however token that support may be—that the bombing is a failure, that it prevents effective probing for peace, and that an unconditional cessation of bombing the north and without a time limit would probably lead to negotiations toward a ceasefire and an armistice. This is reflected in the appeals of more than half a dozen foreign ministers at the United Nations General Assembly.

Mr. President, yesterday, the Premier of Laos, Prince Souvanna Phouma, publicly urged the United States to stop bombing north Vietnam. He stated:

> The United States ought to stop bombing North Vietnam, as otherwise the war in Vietnam might easily become the fuse setting alight the third world war.

It is noteworthy that the premier of a nation which was once a part of the French Indochinese colonial empire along with Vietnam, a leader who has usually taken a neutral position on the civil war in Vietnam, now feels impelled to join the leaders of other nations of the world in calling for an end to the bombing. This also, from the leader of a nation which President Johnson claimed is a victim of north Vietnamese aggression.

The appeal made by Foreign Minister Malik of Indonesia before the General Assembly calling for an end to our bombing of north Vietnam is also of particular interest because of the repeated claim

of administration officials that American intervention in Vietnam saved Indonesia from communism. This allegation was most recently alluded to by the President in his San Antonio speech. Foreign Minister Malik, who was one of those who really did prevent a Communist coup in Indonesia, obviously feels that Indonesia's interests and those of Asia as a whole would be best served by a political accommodation in Vietnam and by an end to the bombing of North Vietnam rather than by continuation of this ugly war.

The peace plan put forward by the Canadian Foreign Minister, Paul Martin, is of extreme importance because of continued Canadian contract with the Hanoi government as a member of the International Control Commission created in Vietnam by the Geneva accords in 1954. Mr. Martin has described a halt in the bombing as the "first priority before further steps can be taken toward a ceasefire and an armistice."

Secretary General U Thant has expressed confidence that negotiations could begin within 3 or 4 weeks if the bombing ended unconditionally. There is every reason to believe that an opening of negotiations would follow an unconditional—or indefinite—cessation of the bombing within 3 or 4 weeks. If talks did not begin after several weeks of a bombing suspension, the United States would be in a strong position in world opinion to take whatever necessary action might be deemed desirable at that time.

Mr. President, the risks involved in taking the necessary first step of a bombing pause are much less than those that will result from continued escalation of the bombing and of the ground war. The greater danger of a global war lies in the steady expansion of the Vietnamese fighting.

The risks that are involved are very limited and are worth taking especially in view of the statements by Secretary of Defense McNamara concerning the limited effectiveness to date of the bombing of North Vietnam and in view of the alternative risks involved in the continued escalation of the war. Certainly, we as the most powerful nation on earth can afford to bend a little and venture this minimal risk which could possibly lead to an end to this war which now seriously threatens the peace of the entire world.

Mr. President, I commend the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] on the proposal which he made in the Senate yesterday that we invite North Vietnam to peace talks by announcing a date on which we would halt all military action in the war including reinforcements of our forces. I am hopeful that President Johnson will heed the suggestion urged yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Missouri. I also urge the President to announce that along with stopping all bombing of North Vietnam unconditionally, we will withdraw to Saigon and our coastal bases or enclaves under the protection of our air power and our 1st and 7th Fleets once negotiations begin, provided, of course, that the Vietcong cease offensive action during that period.

Mr. President, there are many paths toward peace in Vietnam available to us. However, before we can begin any of them, it is obvious to all that an unconditional halt in the bombing is the essential prerequisite.

LONG-TERM PLANNING FOR GROWTH OF METROPOLITAN AREAS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I have long been concerned with the need for adequate long-term planning to provide sound plans and projects for the growth of our metropolitan areas. Skilled planning agencies at the local level are necessary to help the Federal Government plan and budget Federal grant-in-aid programs for urban improvement.

Recently, Mr. Charles M. Haar, Assistant Secretary for Metropolitan Development, Department of Housing and Urban Development, discussed this subject in a speech delivered at Columbia University. Titled "Metropolitan Development and Budgeting: A Step Toward Creative Federalism," Mr. Haar stresses the importance of strong local involvement for adequate Federal planning.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Haar's remarks be reprinted in the RECORD.

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

METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT AND BUDGETING: A STEP TOWARD CREATIVE FEDERALISM

(Remarks of Charles M. Haar, Assistant Secretary for Metropolitan Development, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, at Columbia University, New York City, September 21, 1967)

"The heavens themselves, the planets, and this centre
Observe degree, priority, and place,
Insisture, course, proportion, season, form,
Office, and custom, in all line of Order"
—TROILUS AND CRESSIDA.

Substance of programs of an Administration is the first order of public concern. But, as Maitland pointed out, the substance of laws is often to be found in procedural interstices. So, too, may the general approach toward coping with substance mold the very nature of program solutions, and become the key to success or failure. Thinking clearly about goals, relating them to actions, and weaving these priorities together on the third dimension of a National-State-local framework is the assignment given to the present Federal establishment by President Johnson. The establishment of intellectual order is thus the essence of the President's approach to the operation and management of government. Consequently, the achievement of the Administration may be measured in terms of its search for efficiency, its awareness of relating action programs to objectives and of its attainments in meshing the different capabilities of the local and National levels—and how these increase human welfare.

It is these new concepts of scientific management in the Federal Government which have led the Department of Housing and Urban Development to look afresh at the way it implements national urban goals.

For, indeed, Congress has established national goals for housing and urban environments: it has also set forth a practical series of financial programs to help local communities work toward these goals. Thus far, the tendency nationally has been to state these goals in terms of broad national commitments, such as "a decent home and suitable living environment for every American family" (Section 2 of the Housing Act of 1949) rather than as programs for specific action. The grant-in-aid programs, on the other hand, can be little more than a functional way of paying for financing local needs. It is in identifying and measuring the link between the two wherein resides the major task of budgeting and programing.

On November 17, 1966, the President issued a memorandum to the heads of executive agencies, stressing the use of Programing and Budgeting Systems to: Identify our national goals with greater precision, determine priority among goals, develop and analyze alternate means of effectively reaching those goals, obtain accurate information about probable costs for programs, relate analysis to budget requests so that those requests follow and support comprehensive and sound agency planning.

Greater precision in the identification of national goals in the Federal system demands much more than sophisticated budgeting techniques on the Departmental level. The use of systems analysis requires inputs of information which must be both current and accurate, and, in the particular case of urban planning, based on local research and knowledge of local conditions. Comprehensive metropolitan planning must provide perspective on a range of urban problems based on such research and knowledge. The Office of Metropolitan Development seeks to help local governments develop and interpret statements of metropolitan policies in order to better formulate and quantify national goals. For national goals to be effective, they must reflect the plans of the urban areas affected, and be suitable for translation into action by local urban institutions. The problem faced by the administrator of a Federal grant-in-aid program is to establish the essential connections between local problem definition and aggregate national goals so that urban planning can lead to effective action.

Quantification is basic to the use of the systems analysis effort to link programs and goals more closely together. Although there are many factors which cannot now be easily quantified, more of the planning process is amenable to this treatment than was once thought possible. As usable data become available, further goals and more standards can be made explicit and operationally defined. As quantitative information increases, the possibilities of establishing effective cost/benefit ratios for qualitative evaluation also increase. The relationships among such goals as adequate water supply, waste disposal, and stream purification should be clarified by definite characteristics, and the evaluation of combined programs for meeting established goals should be made with objective criteria. On the basis of such analytical series, it is possible to develop priorities among these goals and plan for action to meet them.

The commitment of the Department of Housing and Urban Development toward meeting such goals will require a series of programs, working through the cycle of development and feedback, with specific results to be obtained during each stage. These will lead toward amelioration of the urban environment only by a high level of coordination among federally aided projects, and between these and other development activities. The emphasis on the concentrated and coordinated use of Federal aids which is the guiding principle of the new Model Cities program should also be applied to the planning of other urban development programs.

When the goals and schedules of a series of development programs have been prepared, they can serve as the base for advance programming and as an informed and definite rationale for yearly budget requests.

Use of systems analysis in planning and budgeting Federal Urban programs will institute important changes in present procedures, and, at the same time, make different demands on the planners. Recently, the Department of Housing and Urban De-

velopment prepared projections of national needs for the major facilities funded under metropolitan development programs: water supplies, sewer systems, waste treatment plants, open space and outdoor recreation areas, and mass transportation systems. These projections considered the current backlog of needs which have not been met, future needs arising from an expected population increase, and the continuing need for replacement as facilities wear out or become obsolete. The Department can use these projections to make rough estimates of future Federal program levels. Yet these projections are inadequate in the information they contain.

They do not tell us about the intentions of local communities to make use of Federal aid programs, or about the ability of local governments to contribute to the cost of any facility. Furthermore, these projections indicate only the demand side of the equation, but contain no information by which to measure and compare the benefits. Again, they do not describe the relations among facilities at the local level—such as the possibility of undertaking several projects jointly to meet common needs and achieve economies in accomplishment. Nor do they describe possible indirect impact of Federal investments, such as the extent to which water and sewer programs will contribute to anti-pollution goals, often benefiting other areas in the same watershed as the projects. Furthermore, the national projections do not take into account the special circumstances of individual urban areas—exceptional needs, or opportunities, or unusual problems in the provision of better facilities.

Such national projections, then, have their limitations in their inability to encompass the realities and complexities which are inherent in each individual urban area. Even though they may be based on the best information available at the national level, they may be out of touch with the realities and complexities that can be appreciated only by a closer look at individual urban areas.

Moreover, the structuring of these national overviews is not well matched to the way in which development decisions are made within the Federal system. Decisions to make use of Federal grants-in-aid (and appropriate matching funds where necessary) originate with state and local governments. Although Federal funds provide the impetus, Federal participation must blend with these local activities and with those of the private sector. The development of programs to advance national goals toward attainment requires liaison among all levels of government, and a system of data collection and communication which will adequately reflect the problems and events occurring at the local levels.

Clearly, adequate Federal programming requires very strong local involvement: participation in the full sense of the word. If the tool of systems analysis is to attain full usefulness, the Department of Housing and Urban Development should inaugurate new cooperative arrangements which will assign major responsibility to metropolitan planning agencies for gathering information on the needs and capacities of urban areas and for assisting in planning and budgeting Federal grants-in-aid programs.

The metropolitan planning agencies now operating in almost all urban areas are particularly well equipped to perform these functions. They are in close touch with local governments in the areas they serve, and in many cases their staffs are directly responsible to councils of locally elected officials. Their understanding of local problems gives them insight and perspective on areawide urban development. Their studies of population trends and economic growth supply a realistic context for evaluating the metropolitan impact of local development proposals. As planners of the future metropolis, they are concerned with establishing goals for metropolitan development, and with programs to meet them.

Most of these metropolitan planning agencies are aided through the Federal 701 Planning Assistance program. This permits the Department of Housing and Urban Development to give grants at all levels—city, county, and state—to establish comprehensive planning capabilities, including data collection. Now the Department intends to ask these agencies to assist the Federal government by supplying information needed for the advance budgeting of Federal urban development programs. This contribution from the metropolitan planning agencies will help the Department to perform its role of developing policies for fostering the orderly growth and development of the Nation's urban areas, and assisting the President in achieving maximum coordination of the various Federal activities which have a major effect upon urban and metropolitan development. At the same time, this new function will help to strengthen the metropolitan planning agencies in carrying out their basic responsibilities for planning the development of their own areas.

As a first step toward improved budgeting, we shall ask the metropolitan planning agencies to look ahead two years and give us an estimate of the local applications which are likely to be submitted for Federal grants-in-aid for metropolitan development. We shall ask them to consider the connections between these proposals—that is, which proposals are interdependent, which are closely related to one another, and which are relatively independent. We shall ask them to tell us what they expect to be achieved if these proposals are all funded—how far these projects will advance the area toward its metropolitan goals; what contribution these projects will make in terms of improving standards of public service, reducing environmental pollution, reducing travel times, or expanding the supply of sound housing. By combining these results for a large number of metropolitan areas, the Department hopes to get a relatively adequate picture of the demand for Federal aid in urban development, and the extent to which this level of Federal spending would achieve local and national urban goals.

Concurrently, we shall ask the metropolitan planning agencies to begin converting their own metropolitan development goals into preliminary targets to be achieved by 1970, and into a staged program for meeting these targets. We will want to know what requests for Federal urban development aid will be generated by this program, and what progress can be made by 1970 as a result of this aid.

This new involvement of metropolitan planning agencies in advance budgeting for Federal-aid programs will benefit these agencies as well as the Federal government. It will help move metropolitan planning from a long-range vision to a realistic plan of action. And it will serve the metropolitan area in this descent from the clouds, improving communication among local communities on their development projects, so that these can be coordinated for maximum effect and economy. It can work toward acquiring basic sources of information—information which can be organized on a comparative and operational basis, and organized into coherent, demonstrable propositions.

The Federal government will also benefit by having more realistic information on future requests for Federal aid and a greater understanding of what might be achieved by means of this aid. Our hypothesis is that a higher proportion of metropolitan development decisions can be made on the basis of systematic quantifications than are now being made. Metropolitan planning needs more means of obtaining comparative cost/benefit ratios. The costs of achieving urban goals will become clearer, and goals can be related to different program levels. Meaningful choices are possible. With the help of metropolitan planning agencies, the Federal and local governments will also be able to move beyond general goals for the future of our urban areas into staged programs for getting from here to there. We can have firmer underpinnings for proof and demonstration.

The benefits which this cooperative planning is designed to realize will be still-born, however, in the absence of adequate federal funds to support the metropolitan planning agencies and the grant-in-aid investment programs. To insure that these urban programs can continue to go forward, President Johnson has requested Congress to increase federal taxes through a 10 per cent surcharge. Passage of the additional taxes will be essential if metropolitan planning and the new budgeting system are to fulfill their goals.

Systems analysis and programs budgeting are not cure-alls for the sound and orderly development of metropolitan areas. They cannot, by computerized magic, accomplish the thinking and the work of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and of the many metropolitan planning agencies involved. They are highly serviceable tools, which, if used properly, will increase the effectiveness of both planning and action, at all levels of government—local and Federal. Used with full knowledge of their advantages and limitations, these methods can both improve and accelerate the Administration's efforts in bettering the quality of urban life. For the measure of this Administration's success is not in the number of dollars it spends, nor in the number of projects it manages, but in the positive benefits which its efforts bring to individuals and communities.

GEORGE MEANY COMMENTS ON SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, in his recent testimony before the Committee on Finance, called upon the Senate to make vitally necessary improvements in the Social Security Amendments of 1967 passed by the House.

Mr. Meany said he was shocked when the House of Representatives reduced the overall benefit increases asked by the President, especially as they affect the "most-poverty stricken beneficiaries." He called indefensible House "failure to include the disabled under medicare, its drastic cutback in coverage and services under medicaid, and its harsh and punitive restrictions aimed at destitute mothers and children receiving public assistance."

Mr. President, since Mr. Meany's testimony is worthy of our careful study in considering this important legislation, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT ON SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967 (H.R. 12080)

(Summary of statement of George Meany, president, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, to the Senate Committee on Finance, September 19, 1967)

Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate this opportunity to present the views of the AFL–CIO on H.R. 12080, the amendments to the Social Security Act passed by the House of

Representatives, which your Committee is now considering. I will briefly summarize our position on the major features of the bill. You will find our detailed comments in my longer statement which I respectfully request be included in the record of these hearings. I have also attached the statement on the Social Security bill the Executive Council of the AFL–CIO unanimously adopted just last week.

The AFL–CIO has been frankly disappointed in the Social Security bill the House of Representatives has passed. We welcomed the proposals the President announced earlier this year as a sincere, if somewhat modest, effort to improve the nation's Social Security and Public Welfare programs. In my statement to the House Ways and Means Committee I said that we regarded the President's proposals as a significant down-payment toward the kind of Social Security system this country can and should have.

We were shocked, therefore, when the House sharply reduced the over-all benefit increase the President recommended, especially for some of the most poverty-stricken Social Security beneficiaries who are receiving the lowest benefits. We also regard as indefensible such other features of the House bill as its failure to include the disabled under Medicare, its drastic cut-back in coverage and services under Medicaid—a program which I remind you is just now getting underway—and its harsh and punitive restrictions aimed at destitute mothers and children receiving public assistance.

Let me turn first to needed improvements in Social Security benefit levels. I am sure that the members of the Committee are well aware of how inadequate and out-of-date Social Security payments are today. Social Security benefits have lagged far behind the rise in living costs, to say nothing of the better living standards most Americans enjoy. Since 1940 Social Security beneficiaries have been fighting a losing battle with the cost of living. Although Social Security benefits have been increased five times during that period, those increases have failed to keep pace with the rise in living costs.

If you look at the more recent situation, we had Social Security benefit increases in 1959 and 1965. Neither matched the increase in living costs since the previous benefit increase.

Let me cite an example of what I have in mind. The average monthly benefit today for a worker who retired in 1954 is $76, but it would have to be $82 to purchase the same goods and services that worker could buy with the $76 benefit he got when he retired thirteen years ago. And to keep pace with wages of employed workers, he'd have to get $104, 37 percent more than his actual benefit today.

The fact is that the average individual or couple on Social Security can barely eke out a sub-poverty level of living. The poverty standard is $1470 for a single aged individual and $1850 for an elderly couple. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I'd call it a standard far below the poverty level. But the average Social Security beneficiary is below even that subsistence level. On an annual basis, a single aged person now averages only $1008 and a couple $1716.

Yet when we talk about Social Security we are talking about what is still the main retirement income protection for most elderly Americans. Less than 15 percent of those 65 and over receive private pension payments; even 15 years from now Social Security will be the only pension system for 70 percent.

Clearly, therefore, the 12½ percent across-the-board increase in the House bill is inadequate. It will leave far too many Social Security beneficiaries, and not just those receiving minimum benefits either, in the mire of poverty at incomes far below their own earnings when they were working or those of most Americans still on the job.

We urge your Committee to raise benefits generally by at least the 15 percent the President recommended. Indeed, even an increase of 20 percent would be fully justified since it still would not permit most Social Security beneficiaries to escape from their dreary lives of want and deprivation. In fact, a fully adequate level of payments would require a boost of at least 50 percent. We would regard the increase of 20 percent or more we hope this Committee will recommend as a down-payment toward that goal.

The House was even less generous in its increase for those at the very bottom than for average beneficiaries. The President recommended an increase in the minimum benefit from today's pitiful $44 to $70 (from $66 to $105 for a couple). Instead, the House raised the minimum to only $50, in percentage terms just a shade over the 12½ percent increase for all other beneficiaries. The House completely ignored the President's proposal for a $100 minimum benefit for long-service workers with 25 or more years of coverage.

Mr. Chairman, in a social insurance system, and I stress that word "social," it is entirely right and proper that those most in need of improvement in benefit payments should obtain the largest proportionate increase. If a Social Security system does not help those at the bottom the most, it is not advancing what should be one of its major goals. Therefore, we ask the Committee to recommend enactment of at least the $70 minimum the President proposed, indeed a substantially higher amount if possible, as well as the special minimum benefit for long-service workers.

We have other recommendations you will find in my detailed statement but I should like to briefly mention only one. The House decided to cover disabled widows, a particularly deserving group largely without other sources of income. However, they would be eligible only at age 50 and on a sliding scale of benefits beginning at only 50 percent of the regular amount. We urge full coverage for this group and at unreduced widows' benefits. Moreover, we understand the cost of our recommendation would be minimal, amounting to only .06 percent of payroll.

Now a word on how the benefit improvements should be financed. As we see it, the reason the House cut back so severely on the benefit improvements the President recommended was that it failed to recognize the necessity for the earnings base to keep pace with the level of workers' incomes. This we simply do not understand.

When the Social Security system got underway in 1936, the full incomes of about 95 percent of all workers were subject to the Social Security tax. At $7600, the earnnigs base in the House bill, only ⅔ would be covered to this extent, declining to about ½ by 1974, approximately the proportion today.

We think this is wrong. It is wrong because it puts a disproportionate burden on low-wage workers. It is wrong because as the House bill so clearly demonstrates, it fails to provide the funds required for needed benefit improvements. And it is wrong because it puts an unduly low ceiling on the benefits paid to moderate or high-wage workers, thus forcing them to suffer drastic reductions in their living standards when they retire.

The President proposed raising the earnings base from the present $6,600 in three steps to $10,800 by 1974. We think it could go even higher to $15,000 which would cover about the same proportion of taxable payroll as the $3,000 base did in 1936.

We have no particular quarrel with the moderate rise in the contributions rate called for, with minor differences, in both the President's proposals and the House bill. We do wish to point out, however, that these increases in the rates are probably the maximum workers should be expected to pay. Therefore, you can expect us to urge the next time we come before you gradual introduction of a contribution from general revenues to the Social Security Trust Fund. Indeed, you may want to consider a beginning step in that direction even now to finance this year's Social Security improvements.

Now as to Medicare. We disagree 100 percent with the decision of the House not to include the disabled under Medicare. Instead, the House has proposed that an advisory council be set up to study the question and make recommendations.

Well, Mr. Chairman, there was an advisory council, the Advisory Council on Social Security, which did study this question as recently as 1964 and recommended that the disabled be covered. It made this recommendation for the very good reason that the disabled are a high-cost, high-risk group living on drastically reduced incomes who are faced with far greater than average medical and hospital expenditures.

The House Report on the bill argues that because the disabled are a high-cost group they shouldn't be covered. I think that is putting things upside-down. It is precisely because of the high costs the disabled have to bear to obtain needed medical care out of their very meager incomes that they should be covered under Medicare. We sincerely hope the Senate will correct this glaring omission in the House bill.

I want to register our enthusiastic support for S. 2299 (Amendment 266), introduced by Senator Long, the distinguished Chairman of this Committee, which would encourage prescribing of drugs for Medicare patients by their generic names, as well as S. 17 (Amendment 265), introduced by Senator Montoya, which provides for coverage of drug costs of Medicare patients at home or in nursing homes. These bills represent a sound approach to control of unduly high drug prices. We also request the Committee to give serious consideration to the urgent need to control rapidly escalating physicians' fees and hospital charges under Medicare whose repercussions are having a tremendous impact on the entire health economy of the nation.

One of the outstanding features of the amendments to the Social Security Act of 1965 was the launching of the so-called Title XIX program, or Medicaid. The aim was to make available to low-income families comprehensive quality medical care that they can't afford to pay for themselves.

Medicaid was never thought to be confined to just the poorest families or families receiving public assistance. It was intended to meet the medical needs of not just the needy but the medically needy, those people who can afford to meet everyday living costs but not the added costs of proper medical care.

The House bill completely departs from this fundamental principle. It makes Medicaid just another charity medical program by cutting back eligibility so drastically that only the poorest families will have access to it.

No less than 14 States in various parts of the country would be immediately affected. A lot of publicity has been given to the New York eligibility standards which some people consider too high. But not many people know that the formula in the House bill would have a drastic impact in other States, not just New York. For a 4-person family the eligibility requirement would be cut by $1,100 in Nebraska, $1,200 in Iowa and $1,400 in Rhode Island.

These States established their Medicaid eligibility standards in good faith on the basis of the 1965 law. There is no reason why they should be forced to deprive low-income people from needed medical care even before the program has gotten off the ground.

We also think the House made a serious mistake in eliminating the present requirement that the State must provide to Medicaid patients the five fundamental health care services, namely, in-patient hospital services, out-patient hospital services, other labora-

tory and X-ray services, skilled nursing home services and physicians' services. It makes no sense whatsoever to permit the States to establish Medicaid programs without physician and hospital services but including other less essential services. Congress was right the first time. We urge retention of the requirement for the five basic services.

Just a few words about child health. We endorse 100 percent the child health provisions in H.R. 12080 which would be still further strengthened by adoption of the very worthwhile program for medical screening of pre-school children Senator Ribicoff has proposed in S. 590.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, we come to the provisions of this bill which deal with our Public Welfare program.

This issue has generated a lot of heat. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I think it is time for us to look at it both objectively and humanely.

Let's look at the facts. Let's remember also that we are not just talking about social theories or elaborate statistics. We are talking principally about mothers and their children for they are the overwhelming majority of those receiving aid to families with dependent children. And we are talking about the most deprived, the most disadvantaged, the most poorly housed and generally the most discriminated against group of people in the United States. In fact, the only group which is even more deprived is the 25 million poor people who get no assistance whatsoever.

Now we know the Public Welfare program is a long way from being perfect. Furthermore, the few recommendations the President made for improvements in the Public Welfare program—the principal one being to require the States to meet their own minimum needs standards in their welfare payments—would permit only a slight improvement in the abysmally low level of welfare payments. The President's recommendations were in H.R. 5710 and we urge that they be reinstated in the bill this Committee will report.

But the shocking fact is that the House did not even consider these minimum improvements. Instead, it put its full energies behind what we regard as a seriously misguided effort to pare the welfare rolls by forcing mothers and older children not in school into what I can only describe as a very badly conceived work and training program. And for those who do not conform to the requirements, the penalty is deprivation of assistance for themselves, and in practice also, for the completely innocent and still just as needy small children in their families. All of this is capped by a rigid formula which would hold the proportion of children in broken homes receiving assistance at the level of January 1, 1967.

I do not have time to comment at length on these changes. But let me offer just a few ideas:

1. For some welfare recipients, training for adequately paying jobs for which they might qualify and which they might obtain could be the road out of poverty. But, clearly, this approach is not indicated for all welfare recipients. Some mothers can and should be trained for work. Others, because of either family conditions or personal limitations, would do much better to stay home and take care of their children. This is particularly true if adequate day care facilities are not available, and they are not in most communities. Neither can you set up adequate day care facilities with properly trained staff overnight. Having said this, I want to make it clear that we would support the provisions in H.R. 12080 for long needed expansion of child welfare and day care facilities if they are not tied to the punitive measures in the bill.

2. For those who are to be trained, the worst thing that could happen is to provide inadequate training for poor or nonexistent jobs. This means that the work and training program must be entrusted to a qualified agency that knows training and knows how to place trainees in jobs. Mr. Chairman, that agency, in my opinion, is the Labor Department. It is not the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the State Welfare Departments which are the administrative agencies for work and training under the House bill. We strongly urge that the work and training program for welfare recipients be placed under the administration of the Labor Department which has the skill, knowledge and machinery for effectively training and placing welfare recipients in decent jobs.

3. The House Report indicates that welfare recipients could be assigned for work and training to private employers and it asks the Secretary of Labor to permit this to be done at sub-minimum wages. Mr. Chairman, this would open the door to industrial exploitation of a defenseless group, the kind of exploitation organized labor has long opposed. We strongly urge this Committee to require payment of the prevailing wage to participants in the work and training program and specifically not to permit employment at less than the regular minimum wage.

4. In order to keep families together rather than encourage their dissolution, we have recommended making the program of assistance to families with unemployed fathers mandatory upon the States instead of voluntary. Instead, the House bill ignores this proposal and narrows the possibilities to obtain needed help by making ineligible families where the father has not had a recent attachment to the labor force or is receiving unemployment insurance, no matter how inadequate these payments may be to meet family needs. We urge deletion of these restrictive provisions.

5. The Administration proposed a new provision for grants to the States for temporary assistance up to 60 days for migrant workers and their families. The House bill provides emergency assistance for only 30 days and with only 50 percent Federal matching. We strongly support the original provisions which will more realistically meet the needs of migrant workers.

6. I understand that one of the main aims of the punitive provisions against welfare recipients in the House bill is to cut down on welfare expenditures. But the House Report reveals quite clearly that the very questionable measures it would institute would result in increased, not decreased, costs. This is because the estimated cost of the work and training and day care programs would be five times the savings in welfare payments of those who would be removed from the rolls. We are for sound programs of work and training and day care for those welfare recipients who can benefit from them but we are against expensive compulsory punitive approaches which will harshly penalize mothers and children while entailing huge additional costs.

Let me reiterate that we are concerned that the Public Welfare system is not meeting minimum subsistence needs for most welfare recipients. We are concerned that many of those receiving assistance are forced to comply with complex and often degrading procedures. We are concerned because welfare rules tend to disqualify and discourage people in need from seeking assistance and especially because they often force fathers to desert so that their families can obtain assistance.

It is these glaring deficiencies in our present welfare system which we respectfully suggest deserve the sympathetic consideration of the Congress. The punitive measures the House bill provides contain the seeds for continued deprivation, misery and unrest for decades into the future. Let us not take this backward step.

Mr. Chairman, I won't presume much longer on your patience. It would be presumptuous of me to emphasize the great responsibility which is yours in the actions you will take on this bill.

Through what I have been trying to say runs what I think is a common thread—that is, we should do the most we can for those, who for various reasons beyond their control, cannot unaided meet even their minimum needs. But the rest of us can meet their needs and together as a nation we can help the least fortunate amongst us.

Some of them, as for example those receiving Social Security benefits, are fully entitled to decent payments now because of what they contributed while they worked. Others, usually even less fortunate, simply deserve our help—the most, not the least we can afford—because they are fellow human beings in distress.

This Committee has not forsaken the neediest Americans in the past. I know you will not forsake them now.

ALASKAN INDIANS AND ESKIMOS DISTINGUISH THEMSELVES AS FIREFIGHTERS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, it comes as no surprise that the work by the Alaskan Indian and Eskimo firefighters who were on the frontlines in many of our Western States this summer was outstanding. Let me quote in part what was said about their ability.

Glacier National Park Superintendent Keith Neilson said:

> Their enthusiasm, drive and initiative made them the acknowledged pace setters almost from the time of their arrival.

The assistant fire boss of the Eagle Zone Fire, Prineville, Oreg., Frank Hamerski, noted the Alaskans were:

> Well trained and know what to do with hand tools and pumpers. Highly diversified, very good morale, and they don't poop out.

Fire boss Art Gerity, China Creek, Idaho, said:

> I would certainly want them back again if I had the chance to get them, and there are a lot of crews I wouldn't say that about. They disciplined themselves very well.

And so the comments range—laudatory in all respects for these men who did such a fine job in their work to help save the forests of the West.

A more complete account of their efforts appeared in the Anchorage Daily Times of September 21, 1967. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the article, which was called to my attention by Col. M. R. "Muktuk" Marston, of Anchorage, be printed at the close of my remarks.

Colonel Marston was the man most instrumental in the organization and training of the Alaska Territorial Guard, which at its peak strength during World War II had more than 3,000 members, principally Eskimos and Indians.

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

[From the Anchorage Daily Times, Sept. 21, 1967]

ALASKA NATIVE CREWS WIN HIGH PRAISE FOR FOREST FIRE WORK

The Alaska Indian and Eskimo crews that battled the recent forest fires in the western states earned high praise from the men who supervised them.

Following are quotes taken from reports filed by men who led and worked in the firefighting effort. Most of the supervisors listed here were with crews of Alaskan Indians from Glennallen and Eskimos from Holy Cross and Aniak.

Keith Neilson, superintendent of Glacier National Park:

"I want to tell you what a tremendous job your Eskimo firefighters have accomplished for Glacier National Park. When word first came through that we were to have Eskimo firefighters, there were many expressions of skepticism. However, when the Alaskans arrived, and pitched in, there were no more doubting Thomases. In fact it wasn't long before all the sector bosses and the fire bosses were singing their praises. Their enthusiasm, drive and initiative made them the acknowledged pace setters almost from the time of their arrival. Their extremely friendly approach to everything and everyone only added to their reputation.

When mop-up operations started, the Alaskans proved even more adept at this particular phase of firefighting, which calls for small crews of two and three men who can and will work without supervision. Here again, the drive and the individual initiative of the Alaskans paid off in a big way. Each fire boss was asking for more Alaskans and only offering to release other than Alaskans. In fact, two of our supervisory overhead stopped at park headquarters just to tell us what a wonderful job the Alaskans had accomplished.

The drop-out and quit rate on line firefighters is extremely high. This, however, is definitely not true with respect to the Alaskans. They all have stayed until the job was finished."

Frank Hamerski, assistant fire boss, Eagle Zone Fire, Prineville, Ore.:

"It is the best crew on the Eagle Creek Fire. This was the word I got from the boys on the line (sector bosses). Well trained and know what to do with hand tools and pumpers. Highly diversified, very good morale, they don't poop out. They don't ask to go home after a couple days. These people deserve a real commendation. We have used them as hot shots—we kept them for the hottest and worst spots. They seem to look forward to getting to the worst parts of the fire. They are careful workers and have had no injuries."

Wayne Gearhard, chief warrant officer, 116th Ordnance, National Guard:

"They are a real nice bunch. They are very literate and their politeness was outstanding. They always took time to thank the mess personnel, which was unusual in this situation. They always kept themselves very clean."

Butch Casper, Liaison Officer with Glennallen crew:

"They have a very good attitude. They were working here under conditions that are a little different than they have been used to. They are used to moss, heavy brush, smaller trees, and more water. Here in the mop-up, this is their show. There isn't one that isn't a good nozzle man or pumper man. You don't get complaints. They accepted things the way they were, and we are very satisfied working with these people."

Harlan Smith, Las Cruces, New Mexico, sector boss trainee with the Glennallen crew:

"It is a real good crew. They are very capable in the good thick brush. They go through and find the hot spots that are not even smoking. They have good morale and a terrific sense of humor, which helps in a situation like this. Problems—they are not used to the heat; however, they are rapidly getting used to it and they have not complained. In a show like this (pumpers), they are better than the average. I don't have to tell them what to do—I just give them the tools and they will do the job in the best manner that it can be done. There are many old hands—some of 15 years experience. They have a man in every crew who is a trained timekeeper. They are the most honorable people I have ever worked with—barring none. Not a man in the crews that I wouldn't leave $500 lying in the tent and be certain that it wouldn't be there six months later."

Del Waddoups, Holy Cross crews, Burley District, Idaho:

"Definitely one of the better crews I have worked with on the fire. Conscientious and hard workers. Excellent service and everybody on the fire wanted to use them."

He commented on the organization of the crews, saying it was excellent particularly on their own supervision. He pointed out that if any of their crew steps out of line, the crew boss steps in and gives him a good kick in the rear end. He mentioned that he felt one reason they strive to do such a good job is that they are hoping they might be called back again for fire fighting. He had had absolutely no complaints from them and they were very happy with the food. It was very good for their morale. (Note written by Waddoups' supervisor).

Lloyd Ferguson, service chief at China Creek, Idaho:

"Very cooperative. I hardly knew they were around. They came off the line, ate, and then went to their sleeping area. We have had no problems whatsoever. They were always ready to go in the morning and never complained."

Art Gerity, fire boss, China Creek:

"Performed very well. As matter of fact, excellent. As good as or better than the best. I would certainly want them back again if I had the chance to get them, and there are a lot of crews I wouldn't say that about. They disciplined themselves very well."

Loren Glade, sector boss, Missoula, Mont., District:

"I enjoyed working with them and would rather work with them than any other crew here. They are reliable. Give them something to do, walk away, and the work will be finished when you get back. They don't complain. If I could pick a crew, I would ask for them everytime. They are deliberate in their work, thorough, and steady. They were used primarily on mop-up—which is very boring. But they stick to it better than any other crews. In my opinion, it is well worth the trouble it took to bring them down here. I don't think anybody that ever worked with them has regretted it."

Larry Newman, division boss, Missoula District:

"If I had my choice, I would take the Alaskans and skip the (Lower 48) Indians. They take a lot of pride in their outfit. They have their own organization with good internal control. When you put them on the line, you don't worry.

BETTER UTILIZATION OF FEDERAL PROPERTY

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, there is a growing recognition in this country that we must do a far better job than we have in the past in utilizing our underemployed economic and population resources and particularly we must attempt to bring about a more balanced geographical distribution in our economy.

The growing debate over the past several months has generated a number of proposals. In this connection I invite attention to a recent editorial published in the Wichita Eagle, which argues effectively that we could and should make a more effective use of Federal property sites such as military bases that are now either underutilized or are totally abandoned. I think the point raised by the editorial is well taken and effectively stated. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

POSSIBLE USE FOR OLD BASES

Why not combine the President's plan to check federally owned land for its possible use as sites for low-income housing with Sen. James Pearson's bill to induce industry to locate in underemployed areas?

Pearson, R-Kan., and Sen. Robert Kennedy, D-N.Y., are co-sponsoring legislation to provide tax incentives to encourage industry to locate in underemployed areas, and these areas usually coincide with those which have housing problems.

Obsolete military bases could provide sites which not only would benefit industry and the unemployed, but would also help the cities in which they are located.

Many of these old World War II bases are growing up in weeds now or are only partially utilized.

Take the Hutchinson Naval Air Station vacated by the Navy in 1957 and the Kansas Air National Guard this year. Its hangars could house industries which would provide jobs for the unemployed. Other buildings could be used for manpower training programs, and barracks could be remodeled for housing.

The post exchange building, officers' and enlisted men's clubs and the station's theater could be used for entertainment.

A number of problems could be dealt with. Unemployment would be eased, welfare rolls could be reduced, the area would have new industry and the land now idle would be utilized.

Hardly a city, medium sized and larger, is without some federal land that could be used or at least traded for land that might be more useful.

Many of the old bases have been deeded to the cities, but only partial use has been made of the property in many cases. Where this has happened, it would be in the interests of these cities to donate the land, either to industry or the federal government.

It would be a modern way of beating swords into plowshares.

MILWAUKEE JOURNAL STRONGLY ENDORSES SENATE RATIFICATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Milwaukee Journal, widely recognized as one of America's outstanding newspapers, on September 30 strongly endorsed, editorially, Senate ratification of the Human Rights Conventions on Slavery, Forced Labor, Political Rights of Women, and Genocide.

The Journal not only makes a strong case for our ratification on legal grounds, but also points out quite accurately the strange company the United States keeps through its failure to act. The only nations which have failed to approve one or more of these treaties are Bolivia, the Maldives, Paraguay, Spain, Togo, the Union of South Africa, Uruguay, Yemen, and the United States of America. As the Journal so aptly puts it: "Fine company we keep."

Because I believe this editorial from the Milwaukee Journal will be of great interest and real value to the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE COMPANY WE KEEP

Now that the foreign relations committee has completed hearings on three human rights treaties backed by the United Nations there seems no reason why the senate shouldn't ratify them. This country is certainly against slavery and forced labor and for the political rights of women.

The chief opponent over the years, of these three and of the treaty on genocide, which we have also failed to ratify, has been the American Bar association. Its latest report shows some progress in that it favors ratifying the treaty on slavery, ignoring the one on forced labor and rejecting the one on women's rights. Its stand on the latter two, as on genocide, amounts mainly to legalisms.

There is no reason why the senate, if it is worried about application of the treaties, cannot insert some reservations. The genocide treaty, for example, specifies that persons convicted of genocide be sentenced to death or life imprisonment. This interferes with normal court discretion.

But consider this in connection with all the treaties. The only nations that have not approved one or more are these: Bolivia, the Maldives, Paraguay, Spain, Togo, the Union of South Africa, Uruguay, Yemen—and the United States of America. Fine company we keep!

THE BADLY TARNISHED IMAGE OF KING HUSSEIN OF JORDAN

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, events in the Middle East since May have seriously tarnished the image which King Hussein had sought to build in the eyes of the people of the United States.

The image which his imagemakers had sought to convey was that of a moderate ruler seeking to stave off attempts by his fanatical Arab neighbors to pull him off his throne while the King, in turn, sought only to make economically viable a desolately, backward country.

The truth is that King Hussein has through the years been propped up on his throne by U.S. dollars—over $436 million through fiscal year 1966 to be exact. Without that economic and military aid there would have been no King Hussein sitting on his throne in Amman. Neither would the artificially created nation of Jordan, have continued to exist.

The reason advanced by the State Department for all this aid to Jordan was that King Hussein was a leavening influence in the Middle East—that without King Hussein's moderating efforts in that area of the world the often expressed hostility of the other Arab nations would erupt into a military attempt to carry out their threats to drive Israel into the sea.

That fanciful image was destroyed by King Hussein's actions during the 6-day war in the Middle East.

It can be said, in the light of the events which took place at that time, that whatever grief lies ahead for King Hussein and the people of Jordan was brought about by their own willful actions.

On May 31, 1967, King Hussein went to Cairo to sign a so-called defense pact with Egypt which provided that—

In case of the commencement of military operations, the Chief of Staff of the United Arab Republic Armed Forces will assume the direction of operations in both countries.

In an interview on June 2, 1967, King Hussein, belying the image of moderation which he had sought to project, stated:

Our increased cooperation with Egypt and other Arab States both in the East and in the West will enable us to march along the right road which will lead us to the erasure of the shame and the liberation of Palestine. This is a cornerstone of our policy.

On June 5, 1967, Israel offered King Hussein an honorable way of staying out of the impending military conflagration. The Prime Minister of Israel sent a message to King Hussein through the United Nations representative in the area, General Odd Bull, in which King Hussein was told:

We shall not initiate any action whatsoever against Jordan. However, should Jordan open hostilities, we shall react with all our might and he will have to bear the full responsibility for all the consequences.

Jordan's reply to Israel's conciliatory offer blared forth from Radio Amman on the morning of June 5.

At 9:15 a.m. on June 5, 1967, Radio Amman carried the following call to arms to the people of Jordan:

Free citizens, heroic sons of Jordan. The hoped-for moment has arrived. The hour which you longed for is here. Forward to arms, to battle, to new pages of glory. To regain our rights, to smash the aggressor, to revenge!

At 9:58 that same morning Radio Amman exhorted:

O Arabs, wherever you are! Hit everywhere and hit till the end. The end of Israel is in your hands. Forward, soldiers, to victory. Cooperate wherever you are. Fly, o eagles, o heroic pilots.

Less than an hour later, at 10:45 a.m., King Hussein went on Radio Amman to tell his people:

O brethren, wherever you are stationed along the lengthy front! Be certain that our forces and the whole Arab nation will meet the test and reach the target. The decisive battle has started and I hope it will soon end in the victory which we all pray for.

These are not the words of moderation and peace which the image built for King Hussein in the United States would have led us to expect.

These are the words of an aggressor—of the leader of a nation who had never laid aside his intense determination to destroy the neighboring nation of Israel, the only oasis of freedom and democracy in the desert of Arab backwardness in the Middle East.

Moreover, secret orders to the Jordanian commanders captured by the Israelis called for the extermination of every man, woman, and child in Israel.

And yet this same King Hussein, who spurned the olive branch of peace when it was offered by Israel and chose instead the ways of ruthless war, is seen today fluttering from Moscow to Washington, hat in hand, seeking more weapons to support his continued aggressive intentions against Israel.

The time has come for the United States to view King Hussein realistically and not through illusory, rose-colored glasses. Further economic and military assistance to Jordan should be stopped at once and should not be resumed until Jordan has agreed to sit down at the peace table with Israel. If King Hussein chooses to squander his country's meager economic resources on armed aggression rather than on its economic development, he should not be supported in these rash endeavors by U.S. economic and military assistance.

But above all, the people of the United States should appraise King Hussein for what he really is: a backward Arab monarch more interested in military aggrandizement than in peace and who has forfeited all claims for further support from the taxpayers of the United States.

RIOTS, SLUMS, AND BANKING

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, a highly significant speech was delivered last week to the American Bankers Association convention by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], who serves as the ranking Republican on the Committee on Banking and Currency. His speech is justly receiving wide national attention.

The distinguished Senator struck a vital note in calling upon America's bankers "to assume major, new leadership roles in helping to bring the needy, downtrodden slumdwellers back into the mainstream of American economic life." He rightly pointed out that solutions to the problems of poverty cannot be worked out on a mass basis. Poverty is personal, and the solution must be found one person at a time, one job at a time, one step at a time.

Senator BENNETT—who speaks authoritatively through many years of close association with the banking world—expressed his deep concern that two ways of life have existed side by side in this country for 30 years: the way of free enterprise, and the way of welfare. He said:

We will never solve the problems of the poor of 1967 until we can move them out of the half-world of government support and make them part of the real economic world we call the private enterprise system.

To help to achieve the urgent goal of breaking down the attitudes which separate the poor from the rest of American society, Senator BEENNETT asked for new public relations programs to acquaint the Nation's poor with the proper uses of banks as savings and credit institutions, and to encourage Negro college students in particular to enter the banking field.

I feel that Senator BENNETT's speech, entitled "Riots, Slums, and Banking," should receive the wide circulation of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, together with a complementary article entitled "U.S. Job Training Plan Heartening," written by David Lawrence, and published in yesterday's Washington Evening Star.

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

RIOTS, SLUMS, AND BANKING

(Speech by Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, to the American Bankers Association Convention, September 25, 1967)

Charles Dickens, in the opening paragraph of his classic novel, *A Tale of Two Cities*, gave us with uncanny accuracy an excellent description of America's present domestic dilemma:

"It was the best of times, it was the worst of times," he wrote. "It was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness. It was the epoch of belief, it was the epoch of incredulity. It was the season of light, it was the season of darkness. It was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair."

If you are in the mainstream of our American economic system based on private property, which rewards individual enterprise with the increasing comforts of a growing production of an explosively expanding economy, it is the best of times. But if you consider those who are outside this system's mainstream and the number who are on government welfare, it is the worst of times.

This government-centered program for the care of the needy has been with us for a third of a century, and to its authors and advocates, this promised to be, in Dickens' words, the age of wisdom. Now even some of its friends are admitting its failures, thus branding it as the "age of foolishness."

Thirty years ago, all America was groping in a season of darkness. So far as the value of our private enterprise system was concerned, it was an epoch of incredulity, a winter of despair. This was not our first depression, but in the earlier ones Americans came through on their own courage and resources, and with the help of their families, neighbors and friends plus unorganized county help. Even when the going was rough, they never became separated from the system. But this time, taking advantage of the fact that the faith of many faltered, astute politicians stepped in and offered an attractive alternative—government welfare. Since then the two ways of life have existed side by side, and both have grown.

Our economic indicators record that the benefits of our free enterprise system are at an all-time high, to be shared by those who participate and contribute.

In the second quarter of this year, our gross national product exceeded an annual rate of $775 billion, and disposable personal income reached an all-time high of $540 billion. Distributed equally over our population, this amounted to $2,716 annually for each man, woman, and child in this country. Corporate profits both before and after taxes reached new levels. Non-military employment surpassed any previous mark, as 76 million of our citizens were gainfully employed. Unemployment, according to the latest figures, is at a satisfactory rate of 3.9 per cent on a seasonally adjusted basis. We have more money, more purchasing power, more education, more of the things that make life pleasant, and more savings than ever before in history. Commercial banking has participated in and contributed to this growth and now has a total of $334 billion in loans and investments. Truly, in many respects, this is the best of times.

In the face of this evidence, one might conclude that related problems of social and economic weakness would be at an all-time low. Unfortunately this is not true. The basic problems of the depressed 30's have survived and even flourished in the shadow-world of government welfare.

Although the number of individuals and families with incomes below the poverty level has dropped steadily as prosperity has increased throughout the last three decades, the number of public relief welfare rolls has continued to increase at what is to many an alarming rate. Three decades ago, there were just over 3 million persons receiving government welfare payments. Today, that number has increased to over 12 million. The dollar outlay for welfare payments has increased over eight-fold during the period until today it is over $5 billion annually. What is startling is that some individuals have never known any other way of life. Their parents and grandparents lived on public welfare, and they have been brought up in this same environment, depending on these payments for their livelihood. True, there are among those dependent on welfare many who would prefer gainful employment, but they have been squeezed out of the labor market because their skills and education do not qualify them to earn today's minimum wage requirements.

Along with this increase in the number of welfare recipients, we have seen a tragic increase in crime, divorce, bankruptcy, illegitimacy, slum housing, alcoholism, and drug usage. It is surprising to know that there are six serious crimes committed each minute in this country. Crime has skyrocketed 62 per cent in the last six years alone, while the population has risen by only nine per cent. There is more than a murder every hour, a burglary every 23 seconds, and an auto theft every 57 seconds. Personal bankruptcies in fiscal 1967 were 191,729, compared with about 40,000 per year during the depressed thirties. Illegitimate births were at a rate of 7 per thousand unmarried women in the child bearing years of 15 to 44 years of age, three decades ago. Today, the rate is more than triple at 25 per 1,000 unmarried women in that age range. Alcoholism is increasing annually and drug usage is becoming almost commonplace.

While these earmarks of a corrupt society are not limited to those who are outside of the mainstream of American affluent life, they are more prominent among those groups.

We are beginning to accept the fact that there is a definite correlation between unemployment, lack of education, slum housing, and crime. Latest unemployment statistics indicate that the unemployment rate among non-whites is twice what it is among the white work force. In 1960, 46 per cent of the non-white urban population lives in unsound housing compared with 14 per cent of the white urban population. Crime by non-whites is at a significantly higher rate. On a per population basis, the incidence of murder is 5 times as great among non-whites. Forcible rape occurs 4 times as often; robbery incidence is 5 times as great; prostitution occurs at a five to one ratio and narcotics violations at a three to one ratio. All these sad statistics strengthen the evidence that the recent rioting has been largely by those who are not participating in production and ownership in our system.

In a way, then, we've seen the concept of Federal paternalism come full circle and grow in the process. It has preserved the economic misery of the 30's and added to it the deeper suffering of older and more overcrowded slums, and the breakdown of the family, the current expression of which is hatred, crime, rioting. Even the system's friends are beginning to realize that it has failed, as revealed by these very recent statements made in the Senate and on the record. Let me quote just a few statements from some of the Senate's most liberal members and from one of the most vocal of civil rights spokesmen. Here's one statement by a recently elected liberal Democrat:

"In the midst of these riots, and all this difficulty, one of the problems is obvious, that our promise and our claimed achievements did not match the substance of what we did."

Here are five others, by other liberals:

1. "Thirty years ago, it was the private system, the private sector of the economy, which had failed. But now, after 30 years, it is the government welfare system which has broken down."

2. "For these same 30 years, we have had categorical welfare programs—yet every year we seem less able to help people off the welfare rolls into positions of dignity and independence."

3. "The antipoverty efforts . . . have proven to be an effective curse. I see these paternalists coming into our cities under the guise of community developers, and they are an effective menace."

4. "We have had misplaced good will, misplaced kindness, and programs which bring relief rather than bring rehabilitation and recreation in human terms. They are not answers to our urgent plight today."

5. "I would underscore the fact that massive doses of the same old things will only lead us more aggressively to national self-destruction."

It is hopeful that many in Congress have finally come to realize what has always been obvious to some, that government paternalistic control and handouts, instead of encouraging people to get off relief, actually tend to attract more to welfare as a way of life, and once in this pattern to cling to it. This is particularly true for the program for aid to dependent children, which, for as long as three generations in some families, has made the rearing of illegitimate children a source of income.

With this realization has come a challenge to try to break this vicious circle, and new programs are being suggested for the transitional period. One common concept is to add some form of training to many existing programs, including this same program for aid to families with dependent children. In addition to such other expensive War on Poverty programs as the Job Corps and the Community Action set-up, these mothers are going to be pressured into some sort of training. This idea will require still another government program for the day-care of children whose mothers are being trained.

In theory and in spirit, this training-by-government approach is commendable, but if past experience is any guide, the training will take place in a vacuum, unrelated to a specific job, unless such a job is, in turn, supplied by government.

What I have said about jobs is also true for government solutions to the problem of housing. We have had low-income housing programs for three decades and yet over 40 per cent of housing in many sections of our cities is being categorized as substandard, dilapidated, and unhealthy. Federally-provided public housing was a natural partner of Federally-financed welfare cash income. But neither has met the essential spiritual need a person has to manage his own affairs. This can only be satisfied when those slum dwellers who wish to do so can have a chance to have an equity in their own homes.

At best, all programs initiated by government include some significant degree of continuing Federal control or supervision of the persons needing help, which means that after all we are still only making different patterns in the same old circle. Referring again to my point that we have in the United States two separate economic systems spiraling together, with a minimum of overlapping, it is clear to me that we will never solve the problem of the poor of 1967 until we can move them out of the half-world of government support, and make them a part of the real economic world we call the private enterprise system. That this can be done is demonstrated by the fact that many trapped in the 30's fought their own way back and have shared in the free economy's rewards.

While it is easy to agree that this is desirable, it should also be clear that government can never provide the leadership needed to bring it about. In the first place, many men in government have themselves never been a part of the productive side of our free system, and therefore do not understand or trust it. This is evident from the criticism which has been leveled against the student loan program that banks have tried so hard to make successful even at some cost in profit. Yet it is being assailed as a bonus to bankers and it is suggested that direct government loans should replace the guarantee program. Another example of this mistrust is a flood insurance program which has been approved by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. The program is set up to

use private industry to the maximum extent with Federal Government reinsurance for catastrophic losses. There were accusations that the program represented a guaranteed profit to industry with government taking all of the risk and that the program should be replaced with an all government program. Moreover, there are also many whose political careers have been built on the concept that the votes of people who are dependent on government can be mostly easily controlled.

So the responsibility falls upon the men whose faith in our free system, and understanding of its processes, have made them leaders in it. Only these men can actually develop programs which will bring the outcasts in—provide the jobs, the specific training, and the proof that the free system can provide greater incentive, security, and satisfaction than the government sheltered one.

It is a sad commentary that life in the government welfare compound has produced one or more generations of economic illiterates, economic cripples, and economic agnostics. The so-called self-appointed authorities on consumerism, including many in government, instead of helping people to understand how our system works, have deliberately concentrated their efforts to try to prove that it *does not* work, and that government controls are necessary. Perhaps we ourselves are partially to blame for that, because we haven't tried very hard to explain the system either and prove that it can best overcome our nation's problems and bring in those who are not participating in productive efforts and their rewards.

In this respect, as in many others, in general the most seriously unprepared Americans are our non-white citizens. This is not surprising when you realize the great difference that existed in the conditions under which the members of the two races came in the beginning.

The earliest white settlers came seeking a refuge, seeking an opportunity for freedom. The earliest Negroes came as slaves. Until little more than a century ago, some whites profited in their control of an economic system which exploited the uncompensated labor of their dark skinned slaves. Even when these had become legally free, they still essentially remained outside the free enterprise system so far as ownership and management and profit were concerned. Today's problems underscore the fact that this is still true for far too many of them. It is certainly true for those who are condemned by circumstances to the most meager education, the lowest income from the poorest jobs, and to live in the worst housing. To paraphrase Dickens again, "It was an age of foolishness" in which they were held out so long, and ours will be "an age of wisdom" if we can find a successful way to bring them in.

One of the greatest handicaps to so many of the welfare-supported poor is their lack of understanding of credit—its purposes, its benefits, its uses and its responsibilities. This has been dramatically underscored recently by the announcement of a planned campaign to persuade Negroes to take bankruptcy. Those who advocate this do so with the idea that it will punish and injure the white lenders and merchants, not realizing that they are slamming one of the necessary and essential doors to full participation in our system.

Banks are the heart of our credit-oriented economy, yet apparently only a few of our 20 million American Negroes have bank accounts, and fewer still have qualified for bank loans. In fact, many, if not most of them, are suspicious of banks and never come into them. Studies have shown that many of those in the lower income groups do not feel comfortable in your banks. They find them impersonal and cold compared to the high cost "first name basis" service provided by some of the less reputable sources of financing. I have discovered that a great proportion of our Negroes, both merchants and customers, are actually suspicious of checks, and all too frequently will not accept them. Even Negroes who are obviously responsible are unwilling to accept them in normal transactions because they find it difficult to get them cashed.

Thus, too often, their money and credit experiences are also outside the mainstream of normal white American processes. If they need to borrow money, they may end up in the hands of the hip-pocket lender. Without a normal credit record, they cannot buy on time from reputable merchants, and so are thrown into the hands of the back-street operator, who sells them shoddy merchandise at exorbitant prices and on unconscionable credit terms.

It was this situation and not the credit practices of reputable lenders that produced the horrible examples that were used to whip up emotional pressure for the so-called Truth in Lending Bill. If these poor people had been taught earlier to use credit properly, there would have been little basis for the enactment of such Federal legislation which restricts our whole consumer credit system.

This whole unfortunate pattern presents a clear challenge to the bankers of America. You must provide the initiative and the imagination to replace suspicions with confidence, and help them to use all your services—as depositors, savers, checkwriters and borrowers—with the same freedom as their white neighbors do. I'm sure many of you have begun to move in this direction, but much remains to be done.

There is a great need for simple education about the place of banking in a person's life, with emphasis on the use of checks and credit. It should begin at least in high schools, maybe with programs for activity experience. This is an area in which individual bankers and your association are making a good effort. This activity must be increased particularly in deprived neighborhoods.

A careful review of your public relations and advertising programs to reach adults and get them into the banks might also be worthwhile, even if you have to eliminate some of your present practices and minimums. This was done by a Washington bank recently to encourage those involved in "Pride," a youth clean-up experimental program in Washington, to start a savings account in the bank when they cashed their paychecks.

The whole problem of the slums, with all its aspects, is a dramatic challenge to bankers, to builders, and to Congress. The Federal Housing Administration insurance program has proven to be successful at no cost to taxpayers, because it is essentially a private enterprise operation with only a bare minimum of government involvement. The great urban renewal idea, on the other hand, has displaced many poor people and only produced still-empty cleared land, or developments into which the poor could not move. It has aggravated rather than solved the problems of the poor. It has now been proved through a relatively new so-called Turnkey program that private enterprise can construct public housing at a substantially lower cost than can be obtained through the use of the Public Housing Authority. The difference is not in the quality of construction, but in the greater efficiency of permitting private contractors to erect the building without all of the redtape, expensive and unnecessary procedures the housing authorities would normally have to follow. The cost savings is around 7 per cent and many months in construction time.

We have had some slum rehabilitation programs, but most have produced little more than one-short publicity. Fortunately, forced by the imagination and drive of Senator Charles Percy of Illinois, the present Administration in self defense is being forced into tentative approval of the basic idea that ways should be found to help residents of the slums to acquire an equity in property, under programs which include putting an investment value on their own labor. This could represent another application of the typical American spirit of good neighborliness which produced the "barn raisings" of New England and middle west, and the cooperative building programs of the pioneer days in my own State of Utah.

Banking has always been ahead of most other economic groups in terms of its in-service training and education. Federal Government training programs thus far have not proved to be very effective because they have not been under the direction of those who are in a position to do the hiring. Far more effective than governmental make-work projects would be training and educational programs under the direction and in the places of business or private enterprise. If it is necessary for the community, or the State, or the Federal Government to assist in the financing of these programs, that would still be far better than setting up sterile Federal programs. If labor organizations must make exceptions to their rules and if minimum wage laws must be foregone during training periods, then let's have the vision to recognize and accept this truth.

I noticed in a September 5 issue of a monthly reporting service that private industry shuns government funds for on-the-job training. The refusal is primarily due to the government restrictions on the operation of the program while industry wants a free hand. One company, it is reported, had signed a contract for over $50,000, and on rereading the contract, turned it down in favor of a token $1 contract and will use the program to improve its public relations. Such programs could prove beneficial to bankers, also.

It is to be assumed that these programs are extended to Negro employees who can qualify. Perhaps banking leaders should encourage reaching out for promising Negro college students who, with the support of scholarships at both graduate and undergraduate levels, can be prepared to enter banking and hope for an executive career. I hate the idea of quotas, but the size of the total problem represented by the challenge to bring America's Negroes into the mainstream of our economic system is measured as 10 per cent.

With such executive and clerical trainees, it would be easier for bankers to meet the same challenge in service to the Negro as to other Americans, to take the service physically to him, where he lives and works. This may not carry with it much hope of early profit, but even so it probably can be justified in the long run as a valuable way to reach the overall objective of helping to give all citizens full participation in our American economic system.

One final observation. The terms we are using today: slums, ghettos, riots, would seem to indicate that solutions can be worked out on a mass basis, that we can move whole groups out of poverty as groups. This concept is one that lies at the root of the failure of our present government programs, because it rests on a false premise. President Johnson put that false premise into words when he said, "A great society builds great people." America, with all its wealth of resources and achievement, has justified the title "A Great Society," for most of this century and now is admittedly the world's greatest. Still, after 30 years of Federal management of their lives, many of our people have not had the opportunity or have not responded to the opportunity to become "Great People."

The truth in that statement comes when it is reversed. It takes great people to build a great society. Building great people is a one-person-at-a-time job. Every man is different—a challenge. Poverty is personal. Slums are the result of the decay of many

single buildings. Dropouts are individuals, and so for that matter are hippies, rioters, and advocates of black power. If they are to be helped, they must be found, one by one, known by their names, helped with their own problems.

As bankers, you hold a position of respect in your communities. You have been able to do a great deal in improving communities through your participation in civic activities as well as individually through your banking operations. Many of today's most talented young students are interested in participating in the solutions of our social problems of poverty, air pollution, slum housing, bankruptcy, and unemployment. If bankers expect to attract these individuals as employees into the banking industry, opportunities to contribute to solutions must be sought. I am aware of many bankers who have fought against apathy in their cities, who have supported rehabilitation programs and training programs which are anxious to help to overcome housing and unemployment problems. I am aware of the efforts made by your association and the individual bankers to provide loans to students in order that they may receive the necessary education to contribute rather than detract from our growth and progress. I am aware that in some instances, your efforts have not been based on short run profit motives but on long run benefit to your community and to the country. With the changing attitude throughout the country that the government cannot cope wih these problems, the energy, the power, and the contribution that can be made by private enterprise is receiving greater focus. If the major problems facing this country are to be solved, it will be through the support and activities of individuals who have faith in our free system, not through greater Federal Government paternalism. We must work for Federal and State legislation which will provide incentives to private enterprise, and we must also be willing to undertake new programs and provide our support both personal and financial.

As those who are now non-contributors and a drain on our resources are made to feel part of the system, as they develop pride in themselves and their communities, all of us will reap the benefits through civil peace as well as a greater level of prosperity, not to mention the obvious increases in economic rewards.

You know the human assets of banking in your city better than I do. Can you muster and motivate your people to give leadership in the solution of this problem, so that the negative side of Dickens' description of our times could be stricken, leaving only these good words:

"It was the best of times; it was the age of wisdom; it was the epoch of belief; it was the season of light"; and I underline this last phrase, "it was the spring of hope."

I hope you can!

[From the Washington Evening Star, Oct. 3, 1967]

U.S. JOB TRAINING PLAN HEARTENING

(By David Lawrence)

The federal government 30 years ago tried by means of "make work" projects to diminish unemployment, but the effort failed. Today, in the midst of a period of economic expansion unemployment persists. But this time a new approach is being tried. President Johnson has just directed five cabinet officers, along with the administrators of three federal agencies, to launch a major test program whereby the government would join private industry to help find jobs and provide training for the "hard core" unemployed.

This decision—to cooperate with private industry and give it a major part in dealing with unemployment—is a step that has long been advocated by businessmen. It may not succeed even now unless private enterprise is given the fullest responsibility, without the interjection of governmental bureaucracy.

The situation was emphasized a few days ago in a significant speech in New York City by Senator Wallace F. Bennett, R-Utah, at the convention of the American Bankers Association. He is a former president of the National Association of Manufacturers and has an intimate knowledge of business operations. He said:

"The basic problems of the depressed '30s have survived and even flourished in the shadow world of government welfare. Although the number of individuals and families with incomes below the poverty level has dropped steadily as prosperity has increased throughout the last three decades, the number of public relief welfare rolls has continued to increase at what is to many an alarming rate.

"Three decades ago, there were just over 3 million persons receiving government welfare payments. Today, that number has increased to over 12 million. The dollar outlay for welfare payments has increased over eightfold during the period until today it is over $5 billion annually . . .

"It is hopeful that many in Congress have finally come to realize what has always been obvious to some, that government paternalistic control and handouts, instead of encouraging people to get off relief, actually tend to attract more to welfare as a way of life, and once in this pattern to cling to it . . .

"It is clear to me that we will never solve the problem of the poor of 1967 until we can move them out of the half-world of government support, and make them a part of the real economic world we call the private enterprise system . . .

"While it is easy to agree that this is desirable, it should also be clear that government can never provide the leadership needed to bring it about. In the first place, many men in government have themselves never been a part of the productive side of our free system, and therefore do not understand or trust it."

Senator Bennett stressed, moreover, that the responsibility falls upon the men "whose faith in our free system, and understanding of its processes, have made them leaders in it."

The latest action of President Johnson indicates an awareness of these very aspects of the unemployment problem. As the administration asks businessmen to mobilize their resources to help in job training programs, it is apparent that the government's role cannot be merely one that furnishes subsidies. What is most needed is legislation that will recognize the importance of incentives to private enterprise so that job creation will be encouraged.

Unemployment is related also to geographical factors. For, as the President said in launching the new program, the need is "to create new jobs and new training opportunities for the seriously disadvantaged in plants which will be established in or near areas of concentrated unemployment."

There are, to be sure, parts of the country which can use more employes. But it is difficult to transport the unemployed from their cities of residence because many persons dislike to move to other parts of the United States, away from relatives and friends.

The major experiment envisaged by the administration's new policy, while relatively small in amount, could initiate further experiments on an even larger scale. The fact that business and government are planning at last to work together to try to find a solution to the unemployment problem is a heartening sign.

MAKING THE BEST USE OF THE FEDERAL DOLLAR

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the administration's request for a 10-percent surtax against the background of a $29 billion deficit has dramatically called attention to the Federal Government's enormous volume of spending and the consequent burden that the financing of this spending imposes upon the American taxpayer. Because of this burden, the American people demand and have a right to expect that all Federal programs are operated as efficiently as possible, that they be designed and administered to achieve the declared goals with the fewest dollars possible.

If history is any lesson, we know that 10 years from now the Federal budget will be even larger than it is today. But to assure that this spending is administered with the least possible waste and the most possible efficiency we must determine that the Federal agencies are utilizing modern techniques of administration and that overlapping in functions and services be reduced to the minimum.

An editorial published recently in the Wichita Eagle addresses itself to these and other points. Because of its cogency, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

SURPRISING FACTS ON U.S. SPENDING GIVE HINTS ON HOW TO MAKE CUTS

Congress apparently is not swallowing the President's tale of woe about why a turtax on the income tax is needed.

President Johnson has called for the tax to support what he calls unforeseen expenditures resulting from a stepped up war in Vietnam.

And because the lawmakers are aware of a grassroots objection to new taxes, they apparently will insist on a commensurate reduction in government spending.

To bring this about, a bi-partisan group is working on a proposal to force the President to trim $7.5 to $10 billion from his "Great Society" programs and other nondefense items.

Quite possibly this is an attempt to embarrass the President by forcing him either to cut programs which may be popular in the areas where they function or to furnish a more complete justification for increased defense spending.

Neither alternative would be especially palatable to the President.

For the Congressmen, though, such a bill would serve a two-fold purpose. They would look good at home because they support a reduction in federal spending, and they are in little danger of losing money for vital programs at home because the President faces reelection in 1968, and isn't likely to risk losing any more votes than necessary.

Yet there is good reason to seek nondefense cuts in spending.

One reason is that believe it or not, nondefense spending has grown much faster in the past decade than defense spending.

The American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, a nonprofit, nonpartisan research and educational organization, reports that from fiscal 1955 to fiscal 1965, between periods of accelerated spending caused by military operations in Korea and Vietnam, the increase in national defense payments was from $40.9 billion to $50.8 billion, or 24 per cent.

But the increase for "other federal func-

tions" in the same period was from $29.7 billion to $71.6 billion, or 141 per cent. The "other functions" include social security.

In terms of per capita averages in constant-value dollars at 1965 prices, national defense costs have ranged from $373 in 1953 to $344 as estimated for fiscal 1967. This represents an actual decline in inflation-free per capita dollars for the Korea-Vietnam war years.

For other federal functions on the same basis, the range was from $214 in 1948 to $193 in 1953 to $432 in 1967.

In the 20-year period the federal national debt has risen steadily, but in proportion to the gross national product, has been sharply reduced, according to the study.

Economically, then, the national, state and local governments are spending more, but the nation's capacity to spend has increased. In addition, government has accepted more responsibility for social problems than ever before.

And the sharpened awareness of social problems has revealed complexities in racial relations, urban blight, illiteracy and unemployment previously hidden under the surface.

So chances are spending for nondefense will continue to increase, hopefully a little slower than the nation's capacity to spend.

To assure that the economy can stand the strain, a mechanism should be established to keep a constant watch on spending.

A Hoover-type commission to study overlapping of government services and establishment of priorities should be authorized immediately. This has been proposed this term by Kansas Sen. James Pearson.

Then steps should be taken to assure proper coordination of programs in the future.

GUY M. MINARD CLIMBS TO TOP AT KIMBERLY-CLARK

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Kimberly-Clark Corp., which has its headquarters in Neenah, Wis., and is one of the world's biggest producers of paper and paper products, has just named as its sixth president an able and dynamic man named Guy M. Minard. We in Wisconsin are very proud of Kimberly-Clark. It has been a brilliantly successful company and a highly important employer.

Mr. Minard, the first non-Kimberly to take the reins at Kimberly-Clark, worked his way up from a job as laborer which he held just after joining the company in 1928. He moved rapidly to a post as a chemist, then to laboratory superintendent, and then, in 1930, to technical director. He had an outstanding war record as an engineering officer and later a wing commander with the Royal Canadian Air Force. He returned to Kimberly after the war. He was named a vice president for all Canadian operations of the company in 1951 and executive vice president of Kimberly in 1964.

I am sure Mr. Minard will provide Kimberly with vigorous leadership as it embarks on the biggest capital expansion program in its history.

I ask unanimous consent that an article about Mr. Minard, which was published in the October 1, 1967, edition of the New York Times, be printed in the RECORD.

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

PERSONALITY: FORMER LABORER CLIMBS TO TOP
(William M. Freeman)

Guy M. (for McRae) Minard, who was once a forest laborer in Ontario, has just become the sixth president of the Kimberly-Clark Corporation, one of the biggest producers of paper and paper products in the world.

Mr. Minard, a young-minded, young-looking 60-year-old with fresh ideas, had this to say:

"The growth of this business is going to depend on a whole new concept of what paper means. To some it may mean entirely new kinds of material, perhaps made on paper machines, but strengthened, softened or beautified by new applications of chemistry. To others it will mean new products, satisfying needs we don't even think of today.

"To still others it will be the familiar papers used for printing, packaging and construction, but manufactured by new processes to make them more useful and less expensive."

Mr. Minard, who gives—deceptively—the impression of being shy, dropped in at the American Paper Institute's mind-stretching seminar at the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration in Boston a few weeks ago.

Characteristically, he had little to say, chatting with old friends and a few new ones—he makes friends easily—and he gave the impression of harboring subdued fires.

"This company will grow more in the next 10 years than it has in the last 96," he remarked.

Internal development? Creative markting?

"This doesn't mean we're not considering acquisition or diversification of our product lines, but it does mean Kimberly-Clark is not interested in being a conglomerate.

"The future of some portions of our business are the brightest of almost any industry, and we plan to grow into these promising markets."

Right now the company, a giant in its field, is embarking on the greatest capital expansion program in its history. It is planning to spend in the fiscal year ending next April 30 an amount equaling or exceeding the $75 million it spent last year, when a record was set.

It is building a big new tissue products mill at Beech Island, S.C., and it has announced a major expansion of its business papers mill at Moraine, Ohio. A new paper-making machine will go into operation at the company's newsprint mill at Coosa Pines, Ala., in the fall.

In the last two years Kimberly-Clark has announced or put into operation new production facilities in Australia, France, Japan, South Africa, Mexico and the Philippines and has acquired operating facilities in Colombia.

It is these areas of new markets and new products in which Mr. Minard is interested. For much of his career he has been closely associated with convenience products and disposables.

"This is the most exciting part of the paper business," in his view. "Disposable products have become big sellers in the past few years, and we are right in the middle of this expansion," he said.

Kimberly-Clark has long been a major producer of disposables, and its Kleenex, Kotex and Delsey brands are known throughout the world.

More recently, attention has been drawn to the disposable nonwoven materials produced by several companies in the paper field. These are fabrics formed of layers of tissue and reinforced with synthetic fibers. The resulting fabric is strong, soft and comparatively inexpensive.

Kimberly-Clark's nonwoven materials are being used for items such as paper dresses, hospital sheets and aisle runners on jet airliners, and the company expects demand to grow in many areas.

Mr. Minard brings considerable experience in manufacturing, resource management, sales and executive leadership to his new post.

He was born Dec. 19, 1906, in Ottawa, and attended Queens University in Kingston, Ont., winning an honors degree in chemical engineering.

Mr. Minard, the first non-Kimberly to head the Kimberly-Clark organization, joined the company in 1928 as a laborer at the Spruce Falls Power and Paper Company, a Kimberly-Clark affiliate in Kapuskasing, Ont.

He moved rapidly from the laboring job to a post as a chemist, then to laboratory superintendent, and then, in 1930, to technical director.

He left the company in 1940 to join the Royal Canadian Air Force as an engineering officer. He was attached to the Training Command and was decorated in 1943 with the Order of the British Empire for special services.

With the rank of wing commander, he flew to India and Burma early in 1944 to help form the Canadian air liaison mission to Southeast Asia.

He and his party were ordered to return to Canada by the shortest and quickest route, and he learned later that the urgency was brought about by the United States plan to explode an atomic bomb over Japan.

"We pulled all the seats and other nonessential gear out of our DC-3 to save weight and charted a nonstop flight from the Azores across the Atlantic to Newfoundland," he recalled. "The 1,600 miles was somewhat farther than the normal range of that aircraft, and we knew we'd be pushing a westerly wind all the way. But we took off—and we made it."

After the war he returned to Spruce Falls as assistant managing director and was elected vice president of the company in 1951. He was named vice president for all Kimberly-Clark operations in Canada in 1951, senior vice president in 1961 and president of both Spruce Falls Power and Paper and Canadian Kimberly-Clark operations a year later.

In April, 1964, Mr. Minard was elected executive vice president in charge of operations for Kimberly-Clark and also was named a director. He moved to Neenah, Wis., headquarters of Kimberly-Clark, where he now lives. Two children, a son and a daughter, live in Canada.

Underlying Mr. Minard's management philosophy is the belief that people, properly trained, directed and motivated, will be the deciding factor in corporate growth.

"Most people derive great satisfaction from doing their best," he told a recent conference of company foresters. "And they can achieve their own personal goals by helping the company meet its corporate objectives. Our job is to convince each employe that it really makes a difference to Kimberly-Clark whether he does well or badly."

COASTAL EROSION

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, an article published in this morning's Baltimore Sun emphasizes the urgency of the coastal erosion problem faced by the United States. The article describes the efforts by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to control the washing away of Wallops Island, upon which this country has constructed a major space research facility. The action of ocean waves is gradually eroding the island and threatening the installation.

I have introduced, and 26 Senators have cosponsored, S. 1262, a bill to authorize a 3-year coastal erosion study by the U.S. Corps of Engineers to determine the extent of coastal erosion in the United States and to make a beginning toward controlling that erosion. Two weeks ago the Public Works Committee conducted hearings on this bill in Annapolis, Md., to hear from officials in my

own State about the great progress Maryland has made in surveying and laying the basis for controlling coastal erosion. What we heard in Annapolis only reemphasizes the urgency of prompt Federal action against the coastal erosion threat which is costing our Nation thousands of acres and millions of dollars every year.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "NASA Builds a Home for Fish," published in the Baltimore Sun, October 4, 1967, be printed in the RECORD.

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

NASA BUILDS A HOME FOR FISH—FAKE SEAWEED INTENDED TO LURE NATURE INTO BUILDING SANDBAR

WALLOPS ISLAND, VA., October 3.—The spacemen who launch and track rockets from this Atlantic Ocean island put out to sea in a barge today to build a new home for fish.

The fish's new lodging will be a 300-foot stretch of artificial seaweed that engineers from the National Aeronautics and Space Agency station here began planting on the island's battered northeast beachfront this morning.

The 30,000 6-foot-long orange-colored plastic tendrils are designed to seduce nature into building a wave breaking sandbar 600 to 800 yards beyond the island's eroding shoreline.

"Hopeful it will break the orbital action of the waves and trap sand that can build up into a bar to protect the island; Robert Brashears, head of NASA's range engineering division at Wallops, said today.

The floating strands are also expected to furnish a feeding ground for fish and small crustaceans, Mr. Brashears said.

The artificial seaweed, developed by the space agency, the Army Engineer Corps and a Philadelphia plastics firm, is the latest weapon in NASA's arsenal against the sea pounding this small island.

The space facility has already built 34 jetty-like groins stretching out into the ocean, installed sand-fences to trap blowing sand, and planted beach grass to stop the Atlantic from eating up the beach across the dunes from the concrete pads holding its launch gantries and radar antennae.

"We're having problems with mother nature's encroachments," Mr. Brashears said today, estimating that his division spends two months a year fighting erosion. "She's a pretty insidious character and keeps moving in on us."

A NASA spokesman said today that the agency's engineers and a Norfolk construction company expect to take three days to plant the 68 concrete weighted steel frames anchoring the artificial seaweed in ten feet of water.

The off-shore planting ground was once a part of the island, Mr. Brashears said today.

THE JEWISH NEW YEAR REMINDS US OF A 5,000-YEAR TRADITION OF ENDING THE EVILS OF POVERTY

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, today we extend greetings and best wishes for the New Year to our brothers and sisters of the Jewish faith. This evening at sundown our Jewish friends and associates mark the start of the year 5728. We of the Christian community extend to them our hopes that the New Year will be one of peace, progress, and fulfillment.

The start of the year 5728 is an appropriate occasion, Mr. President, to express our admiration for an ancient tradition in the Jewish community that is frequently overlooked, a tradition that has persevered actively and effectively into this modern day.

It may well have been the Jews who first started the war on poverty 5,000 years ago. Their scriptures, the Torah and the Old Testament, are full of concern for the poor, the needy, the disadvantaged.

A continuing theme, running through all the Jewish holy writing and traditions, is the invocation found in Psalms, "Blessed is he who considereth the poor."

Our Judao-Christian tradition reminds us that few people in history developed a deeper sense of compassion and concern for the poor and the less fortunate members of the commuinty. Very early in history the Jewish community reached the fateful conclusion expressed in the words, "Yes, I am my brother's keeper."

With that conviction as an animating spirit, Jewry down through the centuries has offered to the world an example of brotherhood and humanitarianism. The Christian injunction "and the greatest of these is charity" stems directly from our Jewish heritage.

But I am speaking today, Mr. President, not just to praise the Jewish tradition of fraternal concern for the poor. I want to commend, also, the large and continuing contributions that Jewish organizations have made to our 3-year-old war on poverty in the United States.

These organizations have been among the most prominent and effective in their moral support of the antipoverty programs, but their devotion to the cause of eradicating poverty has extended far beyond that. They have contributed generously of their time, their money, their talent, and their leadership capabilities to insure the success of our war on poverty programs, both nationally and in a thousand large and small communities from coast to coast.

Our brothers and sisters of the Jewish faith have proved invaluable allies, indomitable warriors in the war on poverty.

When that war is won we will be standing proudly shoulder to shoulder, not only to celebrate that victory, but also in determination to march together to create a world of genuine brotherhood and peace.

TIME FOR GREAT DECISIONS: ADDRESS BY ALF M. LANDON

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the international scene is undergoing many changes of far ranging and fateful consequences. Old and familiar conditions are being engulfed by new and powerful forces. How well we understand these new forces, and how well we develop and execute our foreign policy programs will determine America's role in the world of tomorrow. In this period of changing world realities, there is an imperative need for clear, consistent and enlightened leadership.

Mr. Alf M. Landon, in a major speech of September 18, addressed himself to these problems of today and drawing from his long and productive experience offered wise counsel for tomorrow. Because of the importance of these remarks, I invite them to the attention of the Senate, and ask unanimous consent that Mr. Landon's speech be printed in the RECORD.

Among other things, Mr. Landon argues persuasively for the need of greater participation by the United Nations in bringing about an honorable settlement to the situation in Vietnam. He also stresses the value of the role of the Senate in reviewing and advising on American foreign policy. But his concluding remarks are most valuable I think and I want to quote one brief sentence which captures the essence of his message:

What is required is the determination by the President for a long-range American design toward peace—rather than one developed piecemeal to meet the crisis as seen from the eyes of the President alone.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kansas?

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

TIME FOR GREAT DECISIONS

(By Alf M. Landon at the Johnson County Republican Women's Clubs, Overland Park, Kans., September 18, 1967)

I am going to discuss the issues that confront us tonight and their relationship to political and economic life in the future.

I am speaking tonight of the high points of four gaps that exist in the Johnson administration's international relations and foreign policies. They are, first, the credibility gap—on which Senator James Pearson spoke in an excellent Senate speech of May, 1966—then the power gap—the economic gap—and how they all tie into the peace gap.

One of the Democrat leaders in the United States Senate, Joseph S. Clark of Pennsylvania, has described this credibility gap as meaning that "the President has lost his consensus." In other words, the President has lost the confidence of Democrats and Republicans alike in the Congress—and of the American people generally—in his leadership.

President Johnson's "loss of consensus" is more than a national disaster. For that is just what it is when people lose confidence in their leader.

This same question exists in governments all over the world. It exists not because it exists in the United States of America—as the President would have it. It exists because of the confusion created by frequent administration contradictory interpretations of factual press reports on major decisions within high ranking official circles.

The latest case in point: On Thursday, August 30th, the Senate Sub-Committee on National Preparedness—after three weeks of secret hearings—unanimously criticized President Johnson's management of the Vietnamese War, citing the difference of opinion on major strategy and tactics between the civilian Secretary of Defense and the military experts of the General Staff, and urged the President to step up the war—which he is doing. The President immediately had a press interview—saying he never had known more complete agreement!

Ten days later, he approved bombing attacks on port facilities of two North Vietnamese principal harbors, despite press reports of strong objections of Secretary of Defense McNamara. This is the second time in a month that the objections of the Secretary of Defense to bombing targets were overruled in favor of bombing attacks urged by the General Staff.

Then comes the news today of the strange proceedings of a letter prepared in the State Department by two journalists of standing—Harry Ashmore, Pulitzer Prize-winning former editor of the Arkansas Gazette, and William C. Baggs, editor of the Miami News—in collaboration with Assistant Secretary of State William Bundy that was mailed to Ho Chi Minh.

Senator Fulbright was by invitation an observer and confirms that. Mr. Bundy has not denied it as yet.

It is inconceivable that Secretary of State Rusk and the President himself were not privy to this.

Yet, according to Mr. Ashmore, President Johnson three days later wrote Ho Chi Minh a letter which "effectively and brutally" cancelled this private letter.

Let us take a look at the Vietnam War—that has grown in two and one-half years under President Johnson from a comparatively few advisors to a major American war.

From the reports of the news media in Saigon—the Pentagon—the State Department and the White House in Washington—no one would think they covered the same war.

This war is obviously not a partisan question. Both major parties are widely divided on both how effectively it is being conducted and as to its wisdom.

Senator Everett Dirksen—the Republican minority leader of the United States Senate—is closer to President Johnson on both questions than Senator Mike Mansfield—the Democrat majority leader of the United States Senate.

As a matter of fact, future historians will undoubtedly refer to President Johnson's Vietnam policy as the Johnson-Goldwater policy, because these future historians will be able to interpret the division among Democrats on Mr. Johnson's Vietnamese policies today—by and large—as the positions Senator Barry Goldwater advocated in his 1964 presidential campaign. For that reason, future historians will be able to understand the division among some of the Democrat leaders.

Let me refresh your recollection. I remember the hilarious ridiculing of the Republican presidential candidate when he proposed defoliation of the jungle. Today—and for the past year or so—President Johnson is following that military tactic.

Also, the 1964 Republican presidential candidate advocated reducing Haiphong Harbor as the logistic base for modern military equipment and supplies for the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong.

Just ten days ago, the Pentagon announced bombing targets closer to that harbor than heretofore, and, a week ago, the third largest port in North Vietnam was bombed—destroying docks and other harbor facilities for the unloading of ships.

It is timely to note, also, that this split in Democrat ranks is not confined to the "nervous Nellies"—as President Johnson sneeringly called them. Only a few weeks ago, the Young Democrats from seven midwestern states rejected a resolution offered by the Kansas delegation endorsing President Johnson's Vietnamese war policies.

And a few weeks prior to that, the Young Republicans National Convention in Omaha in effect supported the Johnson-Goldwater Vietnamese war policies.

In the meantime, Americans for Democratic Action—with an unbroken record of supporting Democrat presidential nominees—are more than mildly critical of President Johnson's Vietnamese war. They vigorously disagree that he inherited it—as he claims.

They point out accurately—along with others—that he completely changed its characteristics when he turned it from a war by the South Vietnamese in defense of their country, aided and supported with United States supplies and only fourteen or so thousand advisors, into an American war—with a five hundred thousand military force—and when the President reversed completely—in six months after the election—his pledge that no American boy would be sent over there to fight in the place of the Vietnamese boys.

South Vietnam's first elected president last week announced that he was for a continuation of the policy of the American boys doing the fighting and the South Vietnamese boys doing the pacification work behind the lines. Also that he would immediately enact a truce in bombing if North Vietnam would reciprocate.

That brings me to the power gap.

The President himself announced at one time that he personally selected—the first of every morning—the targets that were to be bombed. He did not only that. He selected the number of bombs that were to be carried and the type and load of the bombs. For a while, at least, he decided the strategy of the General in command on the field of action. Senator Mansfield said the Senate Preparedness Sub-Committee report was directed at President Johnson—although only mentioning Secretary of Defense McNamara.

Vietnam—a jungle-ridden, swamp-ridden country four years ago—with no logistic military value—no good road system at all—no good harbors—no modern air fields to speak of—has today, because of American dollars, good roads—major harbors and major air fields. It is therefore a place of logistic military value—perhaps second only to Okinawa.

Last week, Secretary of Defense McNamara ordered the erection of barbed wire and electronic barriers to block infiltration of combatants and supplies to the Communist forces in South Vietnam, with "nary a termine at neither end"—as an early Kansas legislator described a proposed new Kansas railroad. The press has already labeled it the "LBJ Wall"—somewhat unpleasantly reminiscent of the Great Wall of China and the Maginot Line of France.

The Secretary of Defense—over a difference of opinion with the military—decided to spend untold millions of dollars and untold casualties in constructing a new barrier of barbed wire and most effective electronic equipment available in an attempt to stop the proliferation of men and supplies for the Communist forces in South Vietnam.

Yet the Secretary of Defenes is reluctant to start on an anti-ballistic missile system—favored by military experts.

America has three distant early warning huge radar outposts—one in the northern Canada, one in Alaska and one in Greenland—warning of any launching of missiles with nuclear warheads.

I do not believe there should be any longer delay by the President in deciding—or if the President continues to make no decision on this most vital factor in America's defense against a surprise missile attack, the Congress should itself made the decision—to start an adequate anti-ballistic missile system, located in Alaska. There can be no question that location would be a most needful contribution to our present warning system.

A location in Alaska—only seconds away from our present radar outpost there—could intercept nuclear warhead missiles coming over the top—as it were—the Arctic Circle. That is the shortest route for any enemy missile attack on the United States.

We are spending billions in South Vietnam—unable to stop the build-up of men, supplies and more effective military equipment to the Communist forces in South Vietnam—unable to bring the North Vietnamese any nearer a negotiating meeting.

Russia is building an anti-ballistic missile system to guard Moscow. China's border is so close, that is the best location the Soviet has.

America's geography is so different that Alaska is the natural and best location for its anti-ballistic missile system for a missile attack from any direction.

The Secretary of Defense is right in basing his objections on the fact that it involves extremely complicated technological factors with constant changes all the time—not only in the anti-ballistic missile system but also in the missiles—that would change the design of the anti-ballistic missile system.

Nevertheless, I think America can meet the cost of such a system with all its attendant changes. The President or the Congress should forthwith authorize and see to the construction of an adequate anti-ballistic missile system immediately located in Alaska. In today's news, Secretary of Defense McNamara reversed his previous opposition to the construction of an Anti-Ballistic Missile system with the announcement of a "thin" ABM system. Just what the Secretary has in mind is not clear. It no doubt will be explained further for consideration by the Congress and the country.

By way of the Manila Times come reports of increased bombing of North Vietnamese river dykes. Military men have believed the destruction of these dykes and flooding of North Vietnamese crop lands and blocking transportation would soon end the war.

Gunfire is rampant in China. There is gunfire along the Russian-Mongolian border—along the North-South Korean boundary line; gunfire between the Egyptians and the Israelis. Gunfire broke out last week along the China-India border.

Many governments in the world are facing internal rifts and crises of varying proportions on military-economic and political issues. The Israeli victory has completely altered the entire Middle East's position and problems.

All of which brings me to the immensely valuable review of our entire international relations policy initiated by Senator Fulbright for the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

Just what are the commitments President Johnson made at the Manila Conference of October, a year ago, for the military defense of all Asia? That is still kept a secret from the American people by the President.

Just what are America's commitments to the Congo that prompted President Johnson's hasty dispatch of three or four big cargo planes to the Congo a few months ago in response to that country's president's appeal for help?

Just what are the commitments that the Israeli government thought it had from the United States of America—that President Johnson said not so?

And what are our relations with the new government of South Vietnam? The election—the first in all its history—may have been fair—but the sky is cloudy.

These are only a few of the international policies of this administration that call for a review by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

This is not an attempt by the Senate to conduct the foreign policies of the United States of America. It is simply an attempt to apply Woodrow Wilson's famous doctrine of "open covenants openly arrived at."

Senator Fulbright is simply applying that to the people's right to know of commitments secretly arrived at—and not so secret at that. For these other governments know what President Johnson's commitments are—or what they think they are.

For sure—the American people do not want to get into another major war in Asia or Africa—without knowing what it is all about—and without a declaration of war by the Congress.

President Johnson has at one time said the Vietnam War is carrying out the Containment Policy of President Truman. At another time, it was for the freedom of the South Vietnamese. He has compared them

to the American colonies in the War of Independence.

As for me, the Containment Policy is one thing. I am not willing to spend one drop of an American boy's blood fighting for the freedom of a people unwilling to fight for their own freedom.

All foreign treaties can be made constitutionally only by and with the advice of the Senate. It is high time the Senate asserts its constitutional responsibility and that the American voters hold the Senators—who ignore their obligations of their office in that respect—responsible for involving us in any future major wars.

Therefore, I believe Senator Fulbright and other members of his Committee—in reviewing America's position in its foreign policies and international relations—should have the stout support of all Americans opposed to getting involved in another major undeclared war.

That brings me to the economic gap.

Russia today is suffering quite an economic loss in the Middle East—not to mention the political phase. The Soviet is building back at additional cost the Arab military equipment destroyed or captured by the Israelis.

The big military base in Cuba is an economic drain on Russia. The Vietnamese war is a steadily increasing economic drain. So is China.

I think the question can be raised with validity that the costly anti-ballistic missile system the Soviet is building to guard Moscow is for protection against a nuclear attack from China rather than from the United States of America.

Moscow is only maybe a thousand miles from the present atomic base of China, as compared with many more thousands of miles from America. On top of all that is the increasing pressure on the inefficient and unworkable Marx-Lenin economic theories of keeping up with the United States of America in the arms race—especially space developments.

Furthermore, I repeat my previous question: After Mao—what? That is of infinitely more concern to Russia than any other factor in the international situation today—and to the United States of America as well.

As evidence of this economic drain on Russia, I call attention to the fact that Communists inherited all the accumulated wealth of the Czars of centuries and the private property and money in the banks they seized and expropriated.

The Soviets inherited no debts to offset these enormous assets because the Communists repudiated all public and private debts. That enormous treasury has enabled the Soviets to weather forty and more years of the economic failure of Marx-Lenin theories.

Not long ago, I read that the Soviets have offered for sale for the first time some of the valuables they acquired in the Czar's collection. It is always a sign of economic stress and strain when a country starts selling very rare collections of that nature. It also indicates its dependence on international trade.

The same economic and political strain is telling on America.

The Johnson fiscal policy is really an adaptation of Lord Keynes' economic theories that have not been adopted in any country in the world except the United States of America. Even in England—his home country—the different governments, whether Conservative or Labor, have been reluctant to make Lord Keynes' new economic theories the basis of their fiscal policy.

The Keynes theories have been widely accepted by modern economists in this country. They provided for deficit spending in time of depression—to be paid for in good times.

The Johnson administration fiscal policy has completely disregarded that last provision.

As I've said heretofore, it is not only the theories of Keynes that trial and error would prove; it would be the management. And sound management would always be handicapped by the politics of preparing for the next election.

In late 1965, the President's Economic Advisory Council recommended an increase in taxes for the fiscal budget planning of 1966. There was a division in the Council, but the majority—including Chairman Ackly—favored the tax increase.

Instead of following the recommendation of the trained economic experts, the President disregarded it as a way of meeting the mounting pressure of inflationary prices created by the so-called good times boom.

He left it to the Federal Reserve Bank to increase the interest rate as a brake on that anticipated pressure. When the Federal Reserve action was attacked, he sympathized with that in a public statement. When he had the opportunity to change the set-up of the Federal Reserve Bank to correct the action he criticized, he did not do so.

It is obvious that the President was trying to avoid a tax rise in an election year.

In his fiscal budget recommended to the Congress in 1967, he asked for a six percent sur charge tax. But that was not followed with any legislative information to the Ways and Means Committee of the National House of Representatives—where all such fiscal legislation has to start. As a result, the House Committee simply waited for that proposed legislation.

A month ago he increased his recommendation to ten percent.

Today we are confronted with an estimated astronomical $29 billion deficit if the Congress does not enact the President's request for increased taxes. Even if it does, America is confronted with its largest deficit at any time in its history—except for World War Two—of approximately $19 billion.

Therefore, America is confronted—on the one hand—with an increased tax rate—on which the President's Economic Advisory Council is divided because of the timing of the brake—or—on the other hand—even if it is passed—with an equally threatening fiscal policy of still an astronomical deficit of $19 billion.

Therefore, the entire world situation is completely changed from a year ago—and there is significant change in South Vietnam itself.

That brings me to the peace gap.

There is general agreement among those familiar with the facts that President Johnson has missed worthwhile opportunities for peace.

There are, for instance, the leads that our late Ambassador to the United Nations, Adlai Stevenson, believed were worthwhile following up in further conversations with the North Vietnamese that President Johnson brushed aside as being of no consequence.

This points up the lamentable failure of President Johnson's administration to accept the formal proposal of Premier Chou En Lai and Chairman Mao—two days after the explosion of their first bomb in October, 1964—for a meeting of the five nuclear powers—America, Russia, France, England, and China—preliminary to a meeting of all governments to eliminate nuclear weapons. The Pentagon dismissed the Chinese bomb as obsolete. The State Department dismissed their proposal as propaganda.

Five days later, I urged its acceptance for the purpose of discussion, at least. If it was mere propaganda, that was the way to find out. France and Russia, two months later, agreed to the Chinese proposal. Our refusal to do so can be the most fateful decision for the entire world—for a nuclear war will not be limited to one country or a number of countries, as what is now called the "conventional wars" or "conventional weapons" of the past.

What I have briefly outlined of the changing world situation may offer new opportunities for exploring an over-all stabilization and stopping of these incipient wars scattered all over the world. I've always said that Vietnam was a part and parcel of the entire international relations.

It is evident that President Johnson can no longer continue in place his present policy. He has to move in one direction or another. The American people are growing impatient and frustrated over the failures of his military decisions in South Vietnam. He has to move either to step up the war, as the Sub-Committee on National Preparedness called for—or step up negotiations for peace, as the increasing pressure of the United States Senate calls for.

The time is right for factual, realistic talks instead of such fanciful claims for the Nuclear Arms Embargo Agreement that is meaningless—with the key third clause left blank because no agreement could be reached on the provisions for inspection and enforcement, and with the failure of France and China—with nuclear powers in their own right—to sign this facade of a nuclear weapons limitation agreement.

I call your attention to a speech on the floor of the Senate by Senator Mike Mansfield on September 1st—the day after the report of the Senate Sub-Committee on Preparedness I have referred to.

Then the Senator said that, with the approval of the President, he was urging referring the peaceful solution of the Vietnam War to the United Nations.

Using the good offices of the United Nations is not a new position for Senator Mansfield—or Senator Fulbright—or Senator Morse—or Senator Carlson—or Senator Aiken—or other Democrat and Republican members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

The importance of Senator Mansfield's statement is the use of the word "approval" in the timing and the new approach.

ON THE POSSIBILITY OF BEING WRONG

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I commend to Members of Congress a commencement address by Mr. Hedley Donovan, editor in chief of Time, Inc., delivered at New York University on June 13, 1967. The address, entitled "On the Possibility of Being Wrong," is a thoughtful perceptive discussion of the importance of magnanimity of thought on the part of Americans viewing the Vietnam war.

Said Mr. Donovan:

> I foresee in this country a kind of crisis of integrity, in which powerful and influential people will have to consider the possibility of saying out loud that they were wrong. Many of them have never tried it before, and it would not come easy to them. But if they cannot bring themselves to it, I think the American intellectual climate and the whole tone of our politics could be embittered for years.

Mr. President, I was impressed by the breadth of mind and the refreshing frankness of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] when, last week, he simply said:

> I was wrong about Vietnam.

Senator MORTON is one of the most respected leaders of the Republican Party, serving formerly as national GOP chairman. He had previously backed the Vietnam escalation policy, including the bombing of North Vietnam. Now he has changed his mind and is honest enough to say so. I believe this is the kind of spirit Mr. Donovan is recommending.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Donovan's address be printed in the RECORD.

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

ON THE POSSIBILITY OF BEING WRONG

(Commencement address given at the 135th exercises of New York University, June 13, 1967, by Hedley Donovan, editor in chief of Time Inc., trustee of the university)

Chairman Murphy, President Hester, Faculty, Trustees, alumni, friends of New York University; and Graduates of 1967:

Along with all your academic achievements that we are saluting today, I think you should also be congratulated for choosing such an exceptionally interesting moment of history for your Commencement Day.

History has been moving with dazzling speed in the Middle East these past few days. In Southeast Asia it moves with agonizing slowness, but equally momentously. And history has not exactly been idle in other regions. Britain once more is trying to join Europe; Nigeria, the most populous state of Africa, is tearing itself apart; China's "Cultural Revolution" continues to shake the most populous nation on earth.

I don't know how often it happens that a Trustee of New York University is caught quoting Leon Trotsky with approval, but I will risk it this morning Trotsky said nobody who longs for a quiet life should be born into the Twentieth Century.

Clearly enough, all of you New York University graduates of 1967 come equipped with good steady nerves.

But I want to talk this morning about quite a different quality which I hope you also possess. If you have this quality, I think you must have learned it from wise parents, or developed it out of your own innate good sense, because I am not sure it is being taught today at any major American university. I am speaking of the ability to be wrong.

You may consider this a peculiarly appropriate subject for a speech by a journalist, and so do I. In our line of work we journalists are given a good many opportunities to be wrong. We have one or two other weakness I should mention. We are often too heavily preoccupied with the news of the last ten minutes. We are always flattered, therefore, and sometimes a little intoxicated, by an invitation to speak in some setting where it is permissible, or even customary, to talk in terms of generations, and lifetimes, and the long sweep of history. I shall try not to be carried away by the spaciousness of this occasion.

But I do want to try to look a year or two beyond today's front pages, to what seems to me to loom up as a difficult and perhaps dangerous moment in the intellectual and political life of the United States. I foresee in this country a kind of crisis of integrity, in which powerful and influential people will have to consider the possibility of saying out loud that they were wrong. Many of them have never tried it before, and it would not come easy to them. But if they cannot bring themselves to it, I think the American intellectual climate and the whole tone of our politics could be embittered for years.

So I am going to ask you this morning to consider the American aftermath of Viet Nam. But I want to go there by way of the Middle East. The Middle East has given us a short vacation from Viet Nam; I think it may also give us fresh perspective on Viet Nam. There are certainly some instructive contrasts between the two wars, and there are also significant connections.

I think if we are honest, we must all admit we found last week very exciting. It has been a long time, if ever, since Viet Nam seemed exciting. I think we must admit that we were caught up last week in some very old-fashioned emotions, ignited by a popular war, even a romantic war. It has been a long time, if ever, since there seemed to be anything romantic about Viet Nam. And wasn't it gratifying to be able to follow it all so clearly on sensible old-fashioned war maps—two columns advancing here, three towns captured over there, and so on, a satisfaction we never have (and never will have) in that maddening new-style war in Viet Nam. I suppose if we are honest we also must admit that as we saw those advancing arrows on the maps, our first thoughts did *not* turn instinctively to the casualties that must have been suffered, civilian and military, Israeli and Arab. No, I think we were busy cheering.

So the brilliant Israeli army has among other things given us an interesting glimpse into ourselves, and what we see in there is that we Americans are certainly not a pacificist people, we do not believe the use of military force is immoral *per se*, we are quite prepared to see it used in behalf of a just cause, and in the last analysis it is we ourselves, and other nations whom we think well of, who will be the judges of what is just.

Speaking to this generation of university students, I think that you, if I may say so, are especially indebted to the Israeli army, because you had not had any previous exposure to a popular war. The only war you had known, I mean not from the history books but in your daily life, as readers of the press, viewers of television, voters or voters soon to be, debaters, demonstrators, soldiers and potential soldiers, your only war has been the extremely controversial, complicated, frustrating war in Viet Nam. But now you have had at least a brief experience of another face of war.

I am not suggesting that everyone who admired the operations of the Israeli army last week must now necessarily support the operations of the American forces in Viet Nam. We might well wish that we could see in Viet Nam such surgically exact use of force as the Israelis so masterfully demonstrated. We might also wish that South Viet Nam had the cohesiveness and discipline and national spirit of Israel. We are there, of course, precisely because South Viet Nam does *not* have those things, but might in time develop them, and meanwhile occupies a piece of ground that has become enormously important, strategically, politically, and psychologically.

By the way, General Moshe Dayan, the Israeli Defense Minister, made a tour of the Viet Nam war last year. When he returned to Israel he published some articles supporting the general objectives of the U.S. stand in Viet Nam, criticizing some aspects of the U.S. performance there, praising others. Just this past Sunday, on a C.B.S. program, somebody said to General Dayan wouldn't it be nice if South Viet Nam would fight like Israel, and the General was tactful enough to say that it would also help if the Viet Cong were Arabs. My own amateur guess is that within the next year—or two years at the most—we will see the shape of the final outcome in Viet Nam, not the last shot but an unmistakable trend. It will begin to come clear that the Viet Nam policy of the Johnson Administration is a failure, or that it is a success. This war is just not going to grind along forever.

I would define any of the following situations as constituting clear failure of the Johnson Administration's Viet Nam policy: Any significant reduction in the percentage of the South Viet Nam population now under control of the Saigon government; or a disruptive new round of coups among the South Vietnamese Generals; or a condition in which the rural pacification and development programs were completely stalled, and very large increases in the American troop commitment—such as a quarter million more men—were being requested. A more advanced stage of failure would be a negotiated American evacuation, in a situation which gave the Viet Cong control of South Viet Nam or put them in a good position to take it over soon. The latter of course is a settlement we could have had at any time with no effort whatever, so if that should be the final result of all our sacrifice, the whole policy would have been a sorry mistake indeed.

Confronted with a failure of the policy in any of these forms, there are several lines of rationalization by which an individual supporter of the policy could avoid saying he himself had actually been wrong. One obvious line would be that the policy was right but it hadn't been prosecuted vigorously enough, that we should have gone all-out to win. Another argument might be that our Viet Nam stand had already brought about certain strategic benefits—that it had helped, for instance, make possible the anti-communist revolution in Indonesia—but now this effort was no longer needed. Other ways of evading an acknowledgment of failure are fairly easy to think up. What is perhaps more difficult to visualize is any important number of politicians, editors, generals, or ordinary citizens stepping up and saying, "I was wrong. I thought the policy would work, but it didn't."

But now consider another possible outcome, that the policy succeeds. I would define success as a situation in which the percentage of Viet Nam population under government control is increasing; political stability in the countryside is improving; enemy troop strength is declining; U.S. and Allied casualties are declining though guerrilla operations might still continue for quite a time; U.S. troop strength has leveled out; and a schedule can be set up for the first gradual withdrawals of U.S. troops. If that should be the situation sometime within the next year or two, I would say the Administration's Viet Nam policy had been vindicated.

Again, however, there could be many possible ways for opponents of the policy to evade such an admission. One would be to say that such stability as existed had been achieved in spite of the Johnson Administration's policy, that the big U.S. military effort had served to magnify rather than reduce the underlying political and economic problems of Viet Nam. Another argument would be: Yes, we did finally succeed but it just wasn't worth the cost. And still another argument could be that our policy was morally indefensible from the beginning, and therefore any apparent successes for the policy are morally unacceptable.

But I wonder if any Senator, columnist, professor, clergyman, pediatrician might come forward and simply say, "Well, what do you know, I have to admit Lyndon Johnson was right about Viet Nam." It is kind of fun to try to imagine some of these scenes, and I admit there are one or two particular individuals it would be especially interesting to watch in these roles.

But there is a much more serious point involved. Viet Nam has been a bitterly divisive issue in American life for some two and a half years, ever since we began the air attacks on the North and made the first commitment of U.S. ground combat units. Viet Nam will continue to be a highly divisive issue until the Johnson policy has unmistakably failed or succeeded. I think that realization will come not in a single thunderclap some Monday morning, but in an accumulation of evidence over several months.

And when that happens—and I believe it will happen in 1968 or 1969—then surely there is plenty of other business America should be turning to. But if at that time everyone must still insist he was right about Viet Nam, and no one is willing to admit he was wrong, then I am afraid we are doomed to go on arguing about Viet Nam. This could perpetuate in America a very sour political and intellectual atmosphere. It would not be

an atmosphere favorable to trust and confidence and purpose in our national life.

Politicians, of course, are notoriously reluctant to admit error. Few of them have ever gone so far as Mayor Fiorello La Guardia, N.Y.U. Law School, 1910. You remember his famous line—"When I make a mistake, it's a beaut."

The President of the United States at the time of my graduation from college, indeed for more than a decade afterward, was Franklin Roosevelt. There is no instance of President Roosevelt ever publicly acknowledging a mistake.

Harry Truman once went to a seminar at another university of this city—I hope it's all right to mention the name—it was Columbia—and said "On the big things, I was right. And on the little things . . . well, if there's anyone listening here who hasn't ever made a mistake, let him put on his wings and fly the hell out of here." You notice, of course, that President Truman was conceding mistakes only on the occasional little thing, and even this confession did not come until 1959, six years after he had left the White House.

President Kennedy has been credited by some biographers with a particularly generous confession of error after the Bay of Pigs, when he said he would not try "to conceal responsibility . . . because I am the responsible officer of the government." This was a manly but I think entirely obvious statement of a simple constitutional fact. In a great many private and semi-private remarks which got leaked to the press quite rapidly, President Kennedy made it very clear that he felt he had been given very bad advice by the CIA and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and that his error was in underwriting their error. They in turn have let it be known that they, of course, were right, and that the crucial error was President Kennedy's, because he watered down their plans.

Lyndon Johnson is another President who is not on the record with many acknowledgments of fallibility. He did say at a press conference in February, "From time to time we will make mistakes," and then just last month he said, "We try not to think ourselves in possession of all truths . . ." At first glance these are appealingly humble statements, but then you begin to wonder a little about that "we." It's somewhat ambiguous, perhaps a trifle imperial. Or maybe it's merely the "editorial we."

Coming to the editorial, I would have to say that journalists have never been notoriously eager to acknowledge their mistakes. Many, indeed, have perfected a smooth, effortless way of taking a new position without ever noting that they once held quite the opposite view.

I do know one editor, however, who developed a remarkable facility in confessing error, and he used this to play upon the sympathies of his staff; they felt so sorry for a man who could make so many mistakes that they would do almost anything for him. Indeed one of his colleagues once accused him of practicing "wrongmanship." This is really very rare.

A few weeks ago in New York I attended a ceremony where some of the most prestigious prizes in journalism were being distributed. One of the recipients made a graceful little speech saying, among other things, that reporters in specialized technical fields do from time to time make mistakes. But I thought the particular language chosen by the reporter for this confession was revealing, and so I wrote it down. "No reporter in these fields has totally escaped from being had in some particularly difficult and humiliating way." *Being had*—here you will note that the main burden of error rests not so much on the reporter as on the people he was unlucky enough to listen to. Perhaps a little like the President and the Bay of Pigs.

Maybe journalists and politicians are hopeless cases, though I prefer to think not. But surely everyone would agree that the people who should be first and frankest in admitting error would be the academic intellectuals with their totally disinterested dedication to free inquiry and the pursuit of the truth. If the academy is indeed faithful to the rigorous standards it professes, one might expect to see it lead the way when there are errors to be acknowledged. But the recent record is not reassuring.

It may seem hard to remember now, but only two years ago much of the intellectual community of the United States was in a furor of indignation against Lyndon Johnson's intervention in the Dominican Republic. There were protest meetings, angry letters to the editor, paid ads in the papers with hundreds of professors' names in fine print, and so on. A much louder protest, as a matter of fact, than the President's Viet Nam policy had then begun to draw.

Well, you don't hear much about the Dominican Republic any more. It has not turned into a land of milk and honey, or a nice clean Anglo-Saxon model democracy, and like almost any one of the 131 countries in the world with the exception of the dozen or so richest and most stable, the Dominican Republic could have a revolution tomorrow. But in the meantime, by any reasonable standards for its part of the world, it is getting along pretty well. There is no evidence that President Johnson's intervention did any lasting harm to U.S. relations with Latin America, and in the Dominican Republic itself there is considerable evidence that his intervention did quite a lot of good. But we certainly don't see very many of those intellectuals who protested the President's Dominican policy now coming forward by letter, picket line, lecture, editorial, paid ad, or any other of our many available means of free speech to say, "Well, Johnson was right, and I was wrong."

I wonder if it will be this generation of university graduates—your generation—that could perhaps teach Americans how to be wrong. All it takes is courage, honesty, self-respect, grace—and sometimes a sense of humor can help. You might give quite a lesson to some of your elders—journalists, politicians, even some professors and preachers.

I know many students of New York University have felt deeply, and spoken up strongly, on Viet Nam, the issue that has dominated the public life of the United States for half or more of your college years. I as a Trustee of this University am proud that so many of you have taken a stand in this passionate debate.

Some of you will turn out to have been wrong. It is in the way you react to that moment, I suggest, that you will get a chance to take another stand—in behalf of a mature and civilized style of public life in America.

How to be *right* is something of an art, too, and some of you will get a chance to show your skill at that, when the Viet Nam returns are finally in. How to be right in ways that make it a little easier for the people who were wrong to decide that they were wrong, and that make it easier for all of us to turn together to a fresh agenda.

You know, after a war we Americans do a beautiful job of binding up the wounds of the enemy. Look at Japan and Germany today. After Viet Nam, I think many of the most serious wounds will be internal, right here at home, and some of the most grievous will be in this very deeply divided city of New York.

Looking ahead to that time, we might perhaps begin even now, without in any way restricting the Viet Nam debate, to let a certain measure of modesty and generosity into the dialogue. As to what will or won't work in Viet Nam, we might begin by admitting that we are all to some extent guessing. Nothing is guaranteed. So far as the morality of the policy is concerned, we might do well to credit all parties to the debate with decent motives and a normal sense of human compassion. We might also try, even as we go on arguing, to reawaken some sense among us of community. As Americans we have come a long way together; our history, when you get right down to it, really reads pretty well.

I was in Viet Nam last month, and one day in Saigon I met a New York University alumnus named Hoang Nang Oanh. He took a Master's degree here in Comparative Jurisprudence, Class of 1964. He is now a Third Lieutenant—they have such a thing—in the South Vietnamese army. In the course of our conversation, he said to me, "You know it is only two days from Saigon to Washington, but it is also 200 years."

The incredibly audacious thing that Third Lieutenant Oanh—and a few million other people in South Viet Nam—and we Americans—are trying to do, is to defend not so much a nation as the possibility that South Viet Nam can become a nation. It's a very tough proposition. We may fail. If so I hope that I, as one who has supported the policy, will be prompt to admit that we had attempted something beyond our powers.

But you know, we may just succeed. And if that happens, I hope that the many thoughtful and dedicated Americans who have opposed the policy will be glad to acknowledge that their country is sometimes capable of even more than we should dare to dream.

HOW TO CUT SPENDING SHARPLY AND RESPONSIBLY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, succeedingly over the past few weeks, more and more critical appraisal of administration economic policy has been raised. And heard throughout this criticism is the reasoning that it is up to the Government sector to meet the threat of inflation and recession; that, indeed, wasteful public spending and inflationary pressures go hand in hand.

The September 23 issue of Business Week contains an editorial aptly stating the current dilemma. The editorial says in part:

> The President would be well-advised to respond to this resistance and make a really tough program-by-program review of his budget. Every billion dollars in outlays he can cut is a billion dollars that could be scaled off the needed tax bill. All programs—military, space, agriculture, public works, and welfare—need to be subjected to fiscal scrutiny, with an eye to eliminating fat and pork.

Mr. President, there is no room today for policies which misallocate valuable resources. Government spending programs should be funded only if they can return significant benefits. But this has not been the case in the past.

A major gap now exists between the exjected rate of return on investment in the public sector and the rate found in the private sector. The rate used in Government projects corresponds to the historical coupon rate on outstanding long-term Government bonds. This rate is slightly over 3 percent, even though the Government is currently paying more than 5 percent. When the low rate is applied to Government planned projects, it means that funds transferred to the public sector will be used in spending programs which do not necessarily yield large-scale benefits on any realistic basis.

In the study of economics, the term

"cost" includes an evaluation of the alternative uses in which a resource could have been used. A low estimate of opportunity cost understates the real cost of a project; it creates inflationary pressures, an increasing national debt, and lower overall economic growth.

Members of the economics professions are adamant that the administration is applying the wrong discount rate. In recent hearings of the Joint Economic Committee's Subcommittee on Economy in Government, a group of leading economists agreed that the private sector discount rate should be the relevant rate for public projects. These economists testified that by using the private sector rate—which they noted was at least 10 percent, and perhaps as high as 15 percent—billions of dollars in long-term public works type programs could be pared from the budget.

This criticism does not mean that we should begin slicing away at every Government program. That is not either the idea or the intent of these remarks. The point to be raised is that many possibilities do exist for cutting back administration spending requests. It is within the role of Congress to insist that realistic discount rates be applied to both existing and future budget plans. Already I have asked that the Department of the Interior redo its cost-benefit calculations on projects undertaken during the past 3 years, showing comparisons with the present rate and the discount rate used in the private sector.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Business Week editorial, entitled "The Two Sides of Fiscal Policy," be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE TWO SIDES OF FISCAL POLICY

The evidence is mounting that the Administration is right in calling for fiscal measures to damp down inflationary pressure and to maintain balance in the U.S. economy. Personal income took a $4.5-billion upward jump in August. Industrial production climbed more than a full point in the same month. At the rate these indicators are moving, it is likely that gross national product will climb by almost $15-billion in the current quarter—of which about two-thirds will be real gains, and one-third will represent price inflation.

With military spending on Vietnam slated to rise and the deficit in the federal budget widening, there is genuine danger that we will have a worsening of inflation if the Adminstration fails to take restrictive action. This would surely bring back tight money, hurt capital spending and housing—and in effect, replay the policy blunders of 1966.

A very substantial majority of informed economists, businesmen, and bankers have now agreed that taxes must be raised—and have so advised the House Ways & Means Committee. Nevertheless, the committee's powerful chairman, Representative Wilbur Mills, has made it perfectly clear that he and a substantial majority of his committee are not going to go along with the Administration's tax request unless the President shows that he is willing to cut the expenditure side of the budget.

It will do no good for the Administration to contend that this is impossible with the war in Vietnam still escalating, the war on poverty and urban squalor still building, and new programs like the "thin" anti-missile defense system getting under way. The hard political fact the Administration must face is that the proposed tax increase is bitterly unpopular, not merely with congressmen but with the voters to whom they respond. It is too easy to assume that this resistance is simply based on short-sighted self-interest. There is some of this, of course, but resistance also stems from concerns over inequities among different taxpayers and industries that would result from the proposed flat 10% surtax. It also reflects widespread popular discontent with the Administration's management of public policy, and a feeling not very clearly defined, that the Administration is trying to do too much in too many different directions.

The President would be well-advised to respond to the resistance and make a really tough program-by-program review of his budget. Every billion dollars in outlays he can cut is a billion dollars that could be scaled off the needed tax bill. All programs—military, space, agriculture, public works, and welfare—need to be subjected to fiscal scrutiny, with an eye to eliminating fat and pork.

After the President has demonstrated that he is determined to meet the sort of stiff criticism he is getting from Wilbur Mills, he will win the size and kind of tax increase the country needs. But this struggle over fiscal policy is going to take more time—probably until the last hours of the Congressional session late this fall.

SUBSIDIES FOR MARYLAND TOBACCO EXPORTS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, yesterday I had the opportunity to testify before the Subcommittee on Foreign Agricultural Operations of the House Committee on Agriculture on a bill (H.R. 7986) which would allow Maryland tobacco farmers to receive subsidies for tobacco exports. I have cosponsored in the Senate, S. 1444, identical to H.R. 7986, and currently pending before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

For more than a year, now, the Department of Agriculture has continued to discriminate against Maryland tobacco exports by denying the Maryland farmers a subsidy of 5 cents a pound of tobacco. The proposed legislation, if enacted, would put an end to this discrimination visited upon Maryland tobacco farmers by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my testimony before the House Agriculture Subcommittee be printed in the RECORD.

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

TESTIMONY OF SENATOR JOSEPH D. TYDINGS BEFORE THE FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE REGARDING EXPORT SUBSIDIES FOR MARYLAND TOBACCO, OCTOBER 3, 1967

Mr. Chairman, I appear this morning to urge this subcommittee to act favorably on H.R. 7986, a bill to encourage the exportation of agricultural commodities. This bill would allow Maryland tobacco farmers to receive subsidies for tobacco exports regardless of their disapproval of marketing quotas.

Maryland tobacco has been an important export crop since colonial times. Today, five counties in Maryland grow tobacco, and three of them are heavily dependent upon this crop to sustain their economy. In fact, both the federal and state governments have spent considerable effort and money in recent years to develop the economies of these counties. The Department of Commerce has classified one of these counties as economically "depressed," but, regardless, the Department of Agriculture has continued to deny a subsidy that would protect its tobacco and thus its economy. The economic effect of the denial of this export subsidy to Maryland tobacco by the Department of Agriculture is not only felt directly by the tobacco farmers and dealers, but by countless citizens of the five Southern Maryland counties where tobacco is the prime cash crop and whose livelihood depends upon the tobacco industry. Only by the enactment of this legislation, Mr. Chairman, can the Congress end the unjustifiable treatment which Maryland tobacco exports have been subjected to by the Department of Agriculture.

I would like to indicate briefly how this problem developed.

On February 25, 1966, faced with a second consecutive 15% cut in acreage allotments, the Maryland tobacco growers voted against marketing quotas. Having elected to take their chances on the workings of a free market, the Maryland producers assumed that their crops would have the same competitive advantages as other tobacco. Subsequent action by the Department of Agriculture prove these assumptions wrong. On June 10, 1966, the Department announced that Maryland growers, who had rejected acreage quotas, would not be eligible to receive the newly-created export subsidies of 5 cents per pound of tobacco. This action was taken even though the export subsidy was instituted, according to the Department of Agriculture, to help American tobacco "regain and expand foreign markets." In light of this rationale for the subsidy, it is difficult to understand the Department's conflicting position of denying the subsidy for Maryland tobacco. This discriminatory decision by the Department can *only* be seen as an attempt to punish Maryland tobacco farmers for voting to remove acreage allotment controls for the 1966 crops.

It must be noted that it would have been impossible for Maryland tobacco farmers to know at the time of their vote that they would be denied export payments as a result of their decision to reject acreage restrictions. There was no precedent for the Department's inconsistent action. Furthermore, the farmer did not know at the time he voted that the Department of Agriculture was actively considering the implementation of this export subsidy program, and, to compound the hardship on the Maryland tobacco farmer, the Department even refused to extend the export payments to previous crops that were grown under acreage controls.

The Maryland Congressional delegation has constantly tried to persuade the Department of Agriculture to rescind its decision. I would like to insert in the committee's records copies of correspondence the Maryland delegation has had with Secretary Freeman. I think these letters clearly indicate the detail to which we have gone in stating the case for the Maryland tobacco farmer.

Members of the delegation and their staff personnel have spent many hours in conference and consultation with officials, representatives of the Maryland Port Authority and the steamship trade association, members of the banking fraternity, the American Farm Bureau, the American Tobacco Exporters Committee, agricultural officials at the University of Maryland, and growers and dealers. Virtually all of these organizations and individuals have gone on record in support of the position of the Maryland tobacco farmer and the belief that Maryland is being unjustly punished by the Department of Agriculture's decision. Secretary Freeman says he interprets the law to forbid the payment of an export subsidy for uncontrolled crops. The Agricultural Act of 1949 does provide that no price support shall be made

available for any crop of tobacco for which marketing quotas have been disapproved by producers, *but*, the language of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, which provides authority for the Department of Agriculture to initiate export subsidy programs, is broad enough to allow export payments to be made on non-price supported crops. It states that:

"In the fulfillment of its purposes and in carrying out its annual budget programs submitted to and approved by the Congress pursuant to the Government Corporation Act, the Corporation is authorized to use its general powers to—

"(f) Export or cause to be exported, or aid in the development of foreign markets for, agricultural commodities." Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, 15 U.S.C.A. Sec. 714 (c).

At a meeting on September 16th, 1966 between the Maryland delegation and Mr. Horace Godfrey, Executive Vice President of the Commodity Credit Corporation of the Department of Agriculture, it was admitted by Department officials that they possessed the authority to grant Maryland an export subsidy. In other words, Mr. Chairman, the Department of Agriculture had the legal authority to interpret subsection (f) of Section 714 (c) of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act so as to allow Maryland tobacco farmers to be included in the export subsidy program. But the Department of Agriculture has continued to say NO to the Maryland tobacco farmers—continued to deny them export subsidy payments—continued to punish them for their referendum vote—and continued to threaten the economic future of the 7,000 Maryland tobacco farmers.

It is in the face of this continued refusal of the Department of Agriculture to extend export subsidies to Maryland tobacco farmers that I wholeheartedly endorse H.R. 7986. I am co-sponsor of similar legislation in the Senate. The effect of this bill would be to change the present interpretation of the laws by the Department of Agriculture, by spelling out that acreage controls are not to be linked to payments of agricultural export commodity subsidies. The Commodity Credit Corporation Act does not limit export subsidies to price supported crops. It was never intended that acreage allotment controls should be linked to the Commodity Credit Corporation as a criteria for receiving export subsidies. The Department of Agriculture has not cited any precedents or clear statutory language to support their administrative decision.

The continued imposition of such a penalty could lead to the eventual destruction of the Maryland tobacco industry. Maryland tobacco has been historically dependent on foreign markets. In dollar value between ⅓ and ½ of every Maryland crop is exported. It is absolutely essential to the Maryland growers that they maintain and increase their share of foreign consumption. If Maryand tobacco is continually discriminated against on the export market, European customers will find substitute tobacco for their blends.

I would like to submit to the Committee a copy of a unsolicited letter from the Portuguese tobacco industry to an American exporter of Maryland tobacco. It clearly demonstrates that the absence of subsidy will place Maryland tobacco at a relative disadvantage on the foreign market, threaten the future of consumption abroad and encourage the use of foreign grown Maryland-type tobacco as a substitute. Maryland tobacco can *not* be allowed to remain non-competitive on the world market. There is *neither* a legal nor a logical justification for withholding export subsidies from Maryland tobacco. Unless the Department of Agriculture's position is changed, as H.R. 7986 would do, Maryland's annual exports will be lost to other countries. This, plus the grave injury imposed upon the growers in the five Maryand counties, is too high a price to pay for this unprecedented and dubious decision by the Department of Agriculture.

I urge the enactment of H.R. 7986.

HIGHWAY SAFETY STANDARDS

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, for too many years, highway safety in our country has been the victim of what Will Rogers used to say about the weather—everybody talks about it but nobody does anything about it. Or, at least, nobody did enough to reverse the shocking level of highway accidents, injuries, fatalities, and property damage.

In 1966, Congress passed two laws which, in sum, are meant to come to terms with the most important aspects of the American highway safety problem. The National Traffic Safety Act of 1966 deals with the vehicle or, to put it another way, the safety of the highway traveler's immediate environment. The National Highway Safety Act of 1966 aims at improving State and community highway safety programs with the funding and advisory support of the Federal Government.

Both of these acts are now being administered by the Department of Transportation. The first, involving auto safety features, has received by far the heaviest public attention up to now. But the second, dealing with State and local highway safety efforts, actually will have a much greater impact upon the driving habits and practices of millions of individual Americans.

The Secretary of Transportation has transmitted to Congress the Federal standards which he approved for application to State and local highway safety efforts. These 13 standards represent the first concrete demonstration of Federal activity under the National Highway Safety Act. As such, they deserve the interest and support of every citizen who has a stake in making our highways safer.

The standards cover a variety of performance areas including driver education, licensing and relicensing examinations, motorcycle driver protection, vehicle inspection, and others. To the best of my knowledge, no one in the administration or anywhere else claims that these standards represent all that ultimately needs to be done by States and cities to bring highway accident figures to an absolute minimum. Instead, they represent realistic goals at which States and communities can begin aiming today, with the firm hope of achievement in the near future. But if that achievement is to mean anything, we cannot back away from the Federal commitment. We must restore the highway safety funds cut by the House.

It is worth stressing that these standards are the first of many steps which the Federal Government is committed to take under the act. The Department of Transportation will be continually working to develop additional or improved standards which may be found necessary to advance its program.

These standards will be aired and processed with the advice of the States and cities themselves, the National Highway Safety Advisory Committee appointed by the President, and all other interested governmental and private groups.

Thus, we can be assured that the full exchange of views which contributed to development of the first standards, also will be provided in connection with future standards.

President Johnson has said that no responsibility of the Federal Government is more important than the saving of American lives and property. And the President has labored diligently to that end.

The new highway safety program is an excellent example.

THE DOVE WHO FLIES WITH HIS OWN WINGS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, with every day of continued escalation of the war in Vietnam, more and more Americans are questioning the extent and purpose of our involvement in Asia. My personal opposition to this tragic bloodbath is a matter of record. Among those Americans whose views and attitudes are turning, are many of my distinguished colleagues in this Chamber. This is heartening, for there has been a long period in which only a handful of us raised our voices in the most unpopular of all political actions—open dissent with the administration. We have all paid a price for our convictions. One of the most courageous and eloquent of this small group has been the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH]. His courage perhaps cost him most dearly, for it subjected him to a vicious public attack in his own State—an attack financed from out of State by a wealthy, unscrupulous individual, using both his money and unwitting people as tools for personal power. An effort was made to recall the distinguished Senator from Idaho because of his honest concern over our involvement in Asia.

What has been the reaction to this unwarranted attack? One of the most definitive accounts of public reaction was published on September 3, 1967, in the magazine section of the Sunday Oregonian. Reporter Blaine Schulz traveled with Senator FRANK CHURCH in Idaho. I commend this article to all Senators, for it is gratifying to know that integrity in public office is still a most-valued characteristic of an elected official and that the American people want no part of a rubberstamp politician. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE DOVE WHO FLIES WITH HIS OWN WINGS

(By Blaine Schulz)

The sun was high in the sky and the 95-degree heat was like an oven.

Sen. Frank Church, the 43-year-old Stanford-educated politician from Idaho, sat with me in the back seat of a car that wound its way through the parched, high valley south of McCall, Idaho, on the way to Boise.

I wanted him to tell me why he is a "dove"—why he had taken on the unpopular role of a dissenter on American foreign policy.

It was well known he doesn't believe the

United States is facing the Communists in Vietnam in some sort of Armageddon.

His previous pronouncements had indicated he sees the war as a civil conflict that the United States was unwise to get involved in.

Now, coatless, shirt sleeves rolled up, he hazarded no miracle cures about Southeast Asia but said the hour is late and America must find new priorities on how it is spending money at home and abroad.

He said he rated the war in Vietnam "as a blunder that we are stuck with" and would explain why.

Sen. Church, the night before, had addressed the Young Democrats of Idaho at a convention in the Payette Lake resort town of McCall. He had struck hard at what he called the "apostles of fear in America," who, he said, "would have us believe that the world is a great Red sea into which we are rapidly sinking."

In the oratory at the convention, the Democratic senator had cited numerous examples of hysteria. Fearful men, he said, "see every step toward peace as a sell-out, every attempt to deal with dangerous tensions as appeasement, every rational act of confidence as a signal of impending doom."

He had told the Young Democrats that "Communism is not taking over" because "it is too poor a system for that, and it isn't even holding its own."

Now, as the engine droned monotonously along the road through the hot, high grazing land, Church glanced at the livestock munching a noon meal.

Turning to me, he brushed aside a heavy crop of black hair and elaborated on the topic of hysteria, fear and self-delusion.

"This notion," he said, "that we are somehow going to settle everything by teaching the Communists a lesson in Vietnam is a grandiose self-delusion."

He said he believes the Communists and the followers of Ho Chi Minh are going to continue to seek their own way. "We are living in an age of ferment and revolution that we will not see an end of in our time. We've got to learn to live in this kind of an untidy and uncomfortable world. There are not weapons enough in our arsenal or money enough in our treasury to damp down the smouldering fires of revolution everywhere in the world, and that ought not to be our purpose."

What we have to get over, he said, "is our paranoiac fear of communism and be less concerned about other people's ideologies."

Americans, he said, should learn from Vietnam not to involve themselves in the future in a foreign war "where our own vital national interests are not really at stake." This means, he said, "we must learn to keep our commitments commensurate with our real interests."

Loosening his shirt to let in a fresh breeze around his neck, the boyish-looking senator let the words flow through a gesture made by an outstretched palm: "Vietnam is the end product of frozen patterns of thought that have resulted from the prolongation of the Cold War."

America's "obsession with Communism," which permits it to follow a 1947 foreign policy in 1967, "has caused us to pursue a policy that contradicted the principle we stood for everywhere else in Asia and Africa—the right of self-determination and an end to colonialism," he said.

Drawing from a metaphor used by Harvard's John K. Fairbank, a noted American authority on Far Eastern affairs, the Idaho senator said, "We sleep in the same bed the French slept in though we dream very different dreams."

To the Vietnamese, he said, "we are now the foreigners in their house."

Wracked by the Birch-oriented drive to have him recalled from the U.S. Senate because he has served himself up as spokesman for an unpopular cause on affairs dealing with Southeast Asia and American policy abroad, the "Boy Orator of Idaho," is, nevertheless, reaching a new peak in his career.

This is because the recall movement is turning in his favor. Even the Republicans in Idaho admit the charges against Church are unsupportable.

Said Valley County Republican district attorney Larry Schoenhut, "Before the recall, Church was dead. The people feel this way, 'We like the independency here. Somebody is picking on Frank Church.' "

By taking the recall movement to the District Court in Idaho, the conservatives "are helping out Frank Church," Schoenhut said.

Responsible Republicans in the state, he said, believe that "if you don't like a man, vote against him." Attempting to remove a senator because you don't agree with him is not the right way to tackle the problem, he said.

The man-in-the-street's reaction to the recall attempt, which was fostered by Californians, is this: "Sounds like a bunch of kooks to me." Such is the appraisal of Democrat Cecil D. Andrus, Orofino businessman who tried for the governor's seat in the last election and lost.

Thus, basic Idaho provincialism—the mistrust of "carpetbaggers and outsiders" is working in Church's favor.

Many Democrats, Republicans, and political observers in Idaho believe Church could not have stumbled onto a better attention-getter for his election campaign coming up next year if he had dreamed it up with all his Party's congressional aides in Washington.

The recall is a rallying force, causing the man-in-the-street to have a second look at the credibility of Church's record. Moreover, it gives Church and the Democrats a good chance to point out what his record really is. As a Grand View, Idaho, farmer and former state senator, Harold Collett, put it, "I personally am a Hawk." Of the war in Vietnam, he said, "I believe we can get away with it, but I feel the senator's position is basically responsible. We all agree with (Church's) policy statement against unilateral withdrawal."

A man outside a restaurant in Cascade, Ida., responding to the question of the recall movement, said, "It will elect him; it makes a martyr out of him."

In recent years, Idaho has been moving to the right. The recall petition was presented by a citizen of Idaho, Gene M. Mileck, dogcatcher from St. Maries, but it was printed in California.

The chief advisor for the recall movement, Ronald Rankin, was once a leader of the right-wing political movement in Orange and Los Angeles Counties in California before moving to Idaho two years ago. He has gone to the District Court in Idaho to force Secretary of State Pete Penarrusa to accept the initial recall petition, which Penarrusa turned down because of a ruling from Idaho Atty. Gen. Allan Shepard that a petition in Idaho to recall a U.S. senator is against the Constitution.

The petition against Church specifies that he should be recalled because of his opposition to military measures which would help win the war in Vietnam and Church's support of the Soviet consular treaty, "thereby giving aid and comfort to the Soviet Union."

Rankin, it is reported, doesn't believe he can now get the required 24,538 signatures necessary for a successful recall petition, but he believes the issue should be tested. Church, himself, said he is not opposed to the "test" in the courts so long as it is carried out with fair play.

For Church, the danger is not so much in the recall petition as it is that the insinuations and charges may return to haunt him in the coming election. Voters may feel they were right in going against the recall, but they could choose to throw him out of office when they get in the voting booth.

So the senator has been working hard to mend his fences at home.

Six months ago, the people who make bets on the futures of politicians, were saying that Frank Church could not get re-elected. This feeling was reflected in the comment from a housewife in the resort town of McCall. "I feel Frank lost a little touch with the Idaho people for awhile. During the time of President Kennedy he got a little federally involved." She added, "I don't believe they have any legitimate reason for the recall."

Now, having held 13 courthouse conferences with the home folks since March and traveling home every chance he gets, the youthful senator is finding again what it means to have his hand squeezed, to serve as mother confessor and counselor.

A big, boyish grin and easy laughter erupts from his face as he meets the townspeople, one by one, in a small room in the courthouse, as he did recently in a conference in Cascade, the home of 1,000 and the seat of Valley County.

An elderly woman walked into the small office, and he greeted her. "I'm surely glad to see you. How's your son?" At the conclusion of the conference, when the woman stood up to leave, he said, "I'll give your regards to Mrs. Clark." (Mrs. Clark is Church's mother-in-law. Church married the daughter of the late federal judge and Gov. Chase Clark of Idaho.)

At no point during the conferences did anyone bring up the matter of the recall or of Church's position on Vietnam, except for one man, who said, "I want to shake your hand. Anyone who has caused the stir you have deserves support."

Church said later, however, that some of his Town House conferences had elicited comments from persons who wanted to talk about foreign affairs and his positions on the war. But in the rural areas, such as Cascade, the questions deal with personal problems faced by the constituents. Water rights, life estates, irrigation taxes are on the minds of the people who come in to see the senator. One woman complained she could not get a federal loan to get her son into college.

If these questions seemed small compared to the big issues involving foreign affairs, Church gave no hint of it and promised to write to the people who could do something about the problems with which the townspeople were concerned.

A little past noon, we walked with the tall, boyish figure down the street to a luncheon at a cafe in Cascade. His youthfulness and relaxed manner betrayed the restlessness he feels now.

"After I turned 40, I discovered I don't sleep as well at night as I used to," he said.

Later, getting Church by himself in the car was one way to learn why he chose to "fly like a dove" rather than "screech like a Hawk." The decision comes out of deep-seated philosophies that he believes are rooted in the pages of history and the realities of modern national movements on all the major continents.

"It is nationalism, not communism, which is the dominant force in the former colonial regions of the world," said the Idaho senator.

He went on to say that if we had a better sense of history, we would scoff at the notion that Vietnam is some sort of test case, where Communists must be taught to abandon their resort to force.

"I totally disagree with the Department of State: to view 'Ho Chi Minh's War' as no more than an extension of Stalin's post-war aggressions in Europe—to regard communism still as a seamless web—is not 'the beginning of wisdom.' It is the denial of wisdom. It is a view of the world as rigid and doctrinaire as that of the most credulous

Marxist. It is a myopia reminiscent of the Bourbon Kings of whom it was said, "They have learned nothing, and forgotten nothing.' "

Regardless of the final outcome in Vietnam, according to Church, guerrilla wars will continue to break out in the future whenever internal conditions in any country seed revolt. "We can draw no battleline—in Vietnam, the Dominican Republic, or any other foreign country—which will either put an end to future revolutions, or cause the Communists to quit trying to take charge of them."

Rather than rushing in with our troops whenever a guerrilla war in some distant country takes a bad turn, "we should begin to exercise prudent restraint," he said, adding:

"The Communists are doing badly in the underdeveloped world. Only where they have managed to seize hold of nationalist aspirations have they gained the upper hand. The lesson for us, in dealing with communist *rebellions* in Asia, should be to hold our distance, extend our aid at arm's length and avoid implicating ourselves so openly as to convert these struggles into American wars."

As our driver steered the car down out of the high plateau country toward Boise, the heat gathered in intensity and the youthful senator put the important touches on what he saw as the basic flaw in America's Asian policy.

Turning toward the interviewer as though no one else existed at this moment, he said, "Each people must find its own natural path to freedom."

He went on, "Democracy can't be exported or imported. It has to grow. I doubt that any government, no matter what outward form it may take, will have genuine support in Vietnam if it depends for its protection and its sustenance on the United States or any foreign power."

He said the greatest weapon against Communism in Asia is indigenous nationalism. With Ho Chi Minh as their leader, the Vietnamese struggle on fiercely in what they regard as a continuing struggle for national independence.

The tragedy of the war, he said, is that "the longer it lasts and the greater it grows, the more Ho Chi Minh is forced to depend on China."

Hammering home the point, he declared, "We may end up driving him into the Chinese hands if the escalation continues, and thus we will have accomplished the very thing that we say we are fighting to avoid."

Asked if there are any alternatives to what we are doing now in Vietnam, Church, the first Democratic senator in the history of Idaho to be elected to two successive terms, said the war is a "quagmire" and "there are no satisfactory answers now. If we can't achieve a settlement of the war to permit us to extricate ourselves with honor from South Vietnam without repudiating our commitments there, the other alternative may well become the establishment of an American protectorate with a large occupational army stationed in South Vietnam for many years to come."

The elections in Vietnam, he said, demonstrate America's "limitless capacity for self-delusion." Why? "There are no traditions of democratic government in Vietnam. The system is wholly alien to them. They can't learn it as a foreign import. They can put up a facade, as many South American governments put up the facade of democracy with institutions patterned after those in the United States."

We watched as the driver passed a car on the long stretch of roadway, and the specter of Robert Duncan, who failed to convince Oregonians they should pick him for the Senate instead of Mark Hatfield, hung in the air as Church spoke of America's fear of Communism.

"It's only hysteria that leads people to believe that if we don't fight the Communists at the 12th parallel we'll have to fight them later at the beaches of Hawaii or the gates of Seattle."

He punctuated the comment by saying, "A moment's reflection should be enough to explode that myth; the elephant can't drive the whale from the sea or the eagle from the sky."

But conceding that Americans often see things in terms of an undifferentiated whole, he continued, "If you ever believed in the monolithic character of the Communists, the place to drive the defense line is along the Western Pacific, not on the mainland of Asia—least of all in a country of no size or strategic consequence—the Balkans of Asia."

Is the United States winning the war? "We have the resources and the power—so overwhelming against a country of this size that in time we can suppress the war and maintain control as long as we are willing to occupy the country. But the Vietnamese say, 'We are going to live here always; that means we are going to have greater staying power than the Americans.' It's hard to argue with that."

In our determination to maintain military superiority there no matter how long it takes to stop the fighting, "our motives are all the best," the senator acknowledged. "We really are not interested in making Vietnam an American colony. Our purpose there is totally different from that of the French. The tragedy is it is really impossible to convince the Vietnamese themselves that this is so.

"Out there, Communism isn't the ugly word; it's Capitalism. Asian people tend to relate Capitalism with the foreign-owned system of the colonial period."

How do congressmen feel about the war? Are they talking about it in the cloakrooms? "Surely," answered the Boise solon who has been close to them. He holds a seat on the foreign relations committee and was U.S. delegate to the 21st General Assembly of the United Nations last fall.

"There are many more dissenters in the Congress than those few who have spoken up," he said. "But the political instinct for self-survival leads many to remain silent."

There are some signs, he added, that the Republicans now are beginning to express disfavor with the conduct of the war. George Romney is now beginning to move in that direction, but his stand on Vietnam seems to change with each new pronouncement.

Asked if the Republicans have a chance of winning against President Johnson in 1968, he said, "If the Republicans present an alternative policy which gives us a hope for peace, and conditions remain as they are today, their prospects for victory in the next election will be great, but it depends on the man they nominate and the path they follow. A candidate who would propose to outdo Johnson on the war would lose."

In either party, he said, "I don't see anyone on the stage or in the wings who would advocate a reversal of the war policy."

He said it is very difficult for any country to change course; it happens rarely. "De Gaulle is a phenomenon in political life because he had the strength and stature to reverse French policy in Algeria. He said France had been wrong and Algeria should have independence. He did this when the French were on the verge of civil war, but the French came out feeling greater pride in being French than they had ever felt before."

Church said it takes someone like an Eisenhower or De Gaulle, "who are the personification of patriotism and in whom people will have implicit trust." Eisenhower, he said, "had the opportunity to make significant changes in American policy abroad but he failed to do it. He lacked the personal conviction and the determination of a great political leader."

What has happened, Church said, is that the American position in Vietnam "has thrown the nationalist banners into Ho Chi Minh's hands and has branded the Saigon government with the most contemptible of epithets—puppetry."

Church referred to Ho as a despot who has used regressive practices, "but since he is an architect of Vietnamese independence, he has retained strong popular backing."

To put across his point, Church talked about Burma, which has 1,500 miles of common frontier with China. Said Church, "U Thant (U.N. secretary) told me that had the Burmese government turned to a white Western nation to rescue it. Burma today would be either all Communist or split with a non-Communist half and an occupied Western protectorate. It's now all non-Communist. The Communists are all in jail and have been for the last 15 years."

It was on the subject of the Birchers, extremism, and American priorities that we closed the interview as the car approached the Boise city limits.

"There is a strong Birch movement in Idaho," Church said, "and they've claimed credit for the outcome of the governor's election and the election of two Idaho congressmen.

"Nationally, they are concentrating their efforts in states like Idaho—small states, where their money can be concentrated in the most telling effect."

The Birchers, he said, are not to be ignored as a threat because "the next elections are likely to be a testing case determining whether or not extremism is going to take charge and whether Idaho is going to become one of the first states to be captured by extremism.

"They'll concentrate their fire and fanaticism against me."

Civil rights, the riots in the ghettos, the cost of fighting a costly war in Southeast Asia—Church studies the topics in a tight perspective in an attempt to find new answers to old problems.

He said that because the recent riots call for a clearing up of the ghettos and new job opportunities for Negroes, "the great need in this country is to re-order our priorities."

He said 80 per cent of the people in this country enjoy a great affluence, but 20 per cent have been left out.

"Congress is calloused and unwilling to pay for rat eradication, which could be paid for by just four hours of the war in Vietnam.

"We want to take the Great Society to Southeast Asia; we don't even have the Great Society here. We've been carried away by our own romanticism. We need to bring things back into perspective and re-order our priorities.

"Only circumstances will change the emphasis, and a new conventional wisdom will grow up around it for rationalizing the new policy.

"I see the first evidence of it—within the past year—within recent months.

"The public is coming to recognize the elements of folly and futility involved in the war in Vietnam and is being shocked by the riots to the problems at home. We are recognizing that much has to be done to put our own house in order."

The car pulled up in front of the old Chase mansion where the Churches live when in Boise. He stepped out and gripped the luggage and walked toward the white frame house. It would be quiet for a few hours before he had to catch the plane to Washington.

WALKER STONE'S REPORT FROM BANGKOK

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, Walker Stone, of the Scripps-Howard newspapers, who has been traveling in Asia and filing a remarkable series of interviews

with Asian leaders, has recently presented us with an excellent view of troubled Southeast Asia from the viewpoint of Thailand.

Thailand is, of course, the next nation of Southeast Asia on the list of China. It is the next target for subversion and overthrow. The effort in Thailand is, in fact, underway, though the Thai Government has proven capable, so far, of containing the threat. The leaders of Thailand are not hedging their bet that Communist aggression will be stopped in Vietnam by American muscle, as Mr. Stone reports. That does not mean the Thais are unconcerned with developments which feed the Communist hopes we will tire and withdraw.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Walker Stone's report from Bangkok, published in Monday's Washington Daily News, be printed in the RECORD.

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

WHY THAIS BACK U.S. POLICY

(By Walker Stone)

BANGKOK, October 2.—The rulers of Thailand, long known as the world's greatest anticipators of history, are not hedging their bet that communist aggression will be stopped in Vietnam with America providing most of the muscle.

Accommodation has been a trademark of Thai diplomacy that has maintained this small kingdom's independence for centuries against political and military surges across Southeast Asia. It worked out neatly in World War II, permitting a Japanese occupation which was de facto but not de jure, and Thailand emerged from the war unscathed and still free.

The hedging technique was evident in our early arrangements to establish U.S. Air Force bases on Thai soil for use in the Vietnam conflict. The agreement was that our planes could fly out of here on their missions but it should not be a matter of public record. That diplomatic fiction was dropped as air strikes entered large-scale operations and the Thais assumed that Americans were in the area to finish the job they had started.

STANDING PAT

A reason for Thailand standing pat on our side is expressed simply by elder statesman Prince Wan Waith Ayakon, deputy prime minister: "If Vietnam falls our turn will come. China has declared it."

Similarly, Foreign Minister Thanat Khoman, when asked about statements of other area political leaders that, if the Vietnam war ended in a way which did not give stability, smaller Southeast Asia nations would have to make accommodations with Red China, said:

"The communists never made accommodation with anyone for any length of time. They may make a truce, until the time they can grab the whole thing. Everyone should know that. God should condemn us to make accommodation with the communists. It would mean that it would be a very short-lived truce, a temporary moratorium, because in no time the communists would take over.

METHOD DESCRIBED

"We knew the method of operation, the 'M.O.' of the communists. They make no accommodation unless it be for a few months, a few weeks, but not permanently. The Indians thought they could share power with Communist China, that they could set up some kind of condominium of Asia with Communist China. You see how it worked. That was the policy of India which had been thought out by Mr. Nehru when he was in jail. He thought that it would be possible to set up two poles of power in Asia, one pole in Peking and the other in New Delhi, and that the smaller nations in Asia would gravitate around one or the other pole.

"To his great regret, he died seeing his theory of condominum with Communist China fall into dust."

The fact that the Thai leaders are not yet hedging does not mean they are unconcerned with the hawk-dove debates in the U.S. and elsewhere.

On the military side of the Vietnam situation, said Foreign Minister Thanat, we are making progress, but on the propaganda side we are taking a beating.

COMMUNISTS AIDED

"The communist side," he continued, "has a great deal of help, not only from sister communist nations, but also from our own (allied) people, from some of the senators, some of the professors, some of our press people, from several other people in Western Europe from non-communist countries, in Asia also.

"That gives them the feeling if they can hold out somewhat longer, they will get the results they want—mainly that Americans, Australians, Thais, Koreans will get tired of the war in Vietnam and pull out and therefore let them grab the whole of South Vietnam."

Asked about proposals to stop the bombing of North Vietnam was a move toward a negotiated peace, Mr. Thanat's response was not muted:

"This is one of the strange approaches. When the Viet Cong or the North Vietnamese use mortars against South Vietnam's people, no one ever thinks of asking the North Vietnamese or the Viet Cong to stop the shelling or the massacres."

HUD UNDER SECRETARY ROBERT WOOD'S "REDISCOVERY OF THE AMERICAN CITY"

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, Under Secretary Robert Wood, of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, recently delivered one of the most balanced and most cogent statements on the American city that I have ever read. Entitled "The Rediscovery of the American City," this fine speech is one of constructive criticism and cautious optimism. At a time when urban critics abound, it is particularly refreshing to find these qualities in an advocate of the cities. Mr. Wood's thesis is that, contrary to general impressions and current controversies about our urban ills, the potential for building great new cities in the United States has never been brighter.

Mr. President, I commend Mr. Wood for his excellent statement, and I recommend it to the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE REDISCOVERY OF THE AMERICAN CITY

(Address by Robert C. Wood, Under Secretary, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, MIT Alumni Seminar, 1967, Cambridge, Mass., September 8, 1967)

Good evening. It has been twenty months since my sabbatical year was suddenly transformed from one of political speculation to political experimentation—and extended somewhat in duration. But three times since then one group or another on this lively, diverse and changing campus has welcomed me home again. I appreciate every opportunity.

Early in my Washington days, I explored with undergraduates the new career challenges urban affairs offers young scientists and engineers.

Later on, I talked with faculty friends as they took up Jim Killian's and Howard Johnson's charge to bring the resources of this great university to bear on urban problems in a major new commitment. And I salute the program's first great accomplishment, persuading one of the country's great urban leaders, John Collins, to join MIT's ranks.

Tonight, I meet with this distinguished group of alumni and alumnae—hoping to help make clear how your fortunes and interests are intertwined with the American urban community and to encourage the use of your talents and energies in its behalf.

From each visit to MIT I take more than I give. There are older universities in this nation and some that profess a more cosmopolitan style. But none can claim to be in closer touch with those distinctive features of the American character and culture that have generated this nation's uniquely successful development:

A reliance on reason in place of emotion or illusion as a means to solve problems both human and material;

An emphasis on productivity, on action, on work, on results—not talk—as the measure of competence;

An insistence on quality in the application of reason and the execution of tasks, so that the mark of the professional stamps the men and women of MIT from their freshman year onward.

It is worth recalling these characteristics. They underlie the Institute's reputation. They are also qualities sorely needed in our present struggle to build cities that reflect the best of America's aspirations.

For, since the time I accepted Bob Bishop's invitation to join this Seminar today, we have passed through a series of calamitous events in our cities. In President Johnson's words, "We have been through a time no nation should endure." Since last May, storms of urban discontent have broken over Cincinnati and Tampa, over Newark and Detroit, here over Boston—indeed over more than a score of American cities.

This is the fourth consecutive year of urban violence and the intensity is increasing.

These outbreaks were not unexpected. Nor were they, to the professional observer, inexplicable. But they have produced the torrent of commentary and explanation that now swirls around us and the sense of urgency and concern with our urban civilization that was lacking in earlier years.

All of us in the urban business welcome every indication of the public's sense of heightened urgency and broader concern. However, the solemn predictions of disaster, and the panicky search for panaceas is another—and disturbing—matter.

Urban problems we have aplenty—and inventory of ills assembled over years of indifference and inattention. Yet the potential for city-building in the United States grand in scale and fine in quality has never been greater.

Indeed, my central theme is that we are in fact further along in understanding the urban system, developing the capabilities to direct it, and deciding in what direction it should go than most Americans appreciate—or, given the decades of neglect, than we probably deserve.

This thesis runs contrary, of course, to the cloudburst of criticism that now falls on our city policies. The urban wailing wall is lined today with eloquent comunicators urging us in this direction or that. Some of these are old colleagues who only a few short years ago wrote learned treatises entitled "There is no Urban Problem" or

"Cities are Better Than Ever." Others are the experts who called for the abolition of the automobile as a practical solution to the unspecified ills of suburbia.

Now while these observers come forward with a different set of opinions and assertions, prescriptions and philosophies, let me present some evidence for long-run confidence in Americans as urbanites. The foundation for this optimism is principally that the characteristics of reason and problem solving which give validity to this Institute's approach, are now being applied to urban affairs.

Specifically, *we come increasingly to understand the city as a system of many variables in precise and accurate terms, as a complex set of relations of people and space involving many dimensions.* This may sound theoretical, but an accurate description of the phenomenon is a prerequisite for guiding it. Until very recently in urban scholarship there was a clear and present danger of committing the single-factor fallacy in diagnosing our cities ills. The special error was a tendency to analyze them solely in terms of race.

Second, we are beginning to develop a balanced capacity to design and build better city systems. We are learning that, as in all great national endeavors, manpower, know-how, talent, and commitment are as important as dollars. We ignore any one component at the peril of the total enterprise. And when we emphasize only one, we invite waste and error.

Third, our national policy states clearly that the task is still city-building in the broadest sense of the word everywhere across this continent. It is not only the ghetto and the ghetto resident that concerns us, but all urban dwellers and all parts of the urban complex. This means we must develop a broader system and direct it toward goals we identify and come to agree upon more clearly.

Let me expand on each of these points.

The first reason for some confidence in our urban future is that, despite the spate of Sunday supplement commentary, we are beginning to define and study urban behavior systematically. It has been ten years since Raymond Vernon began directing the New York Metropolitan Study. This was a truly extraordinary nine volume inquiry into the economic functioning of our largest metropolitan area.

This thirty-man professional group effort established a new direction in urban scholarship. It shifted the study of the city away from the emotionally oriented, intuitive, historical and architectural approaches of the lonely-scholar tradition. It moved urban scholarship toward a carefully designed, multi-disciplinary exploration of the varied relationships between the location of jobs and households in urban space.

The economic focus of the New York Study had its limitations. Vernon's policy conclusions were largely comforting and reassuring. They gave heavy emphasis to the fact that *relatively speaking* city dwellers are better off in material terms than ever before.

With ten years' hindsight, it is possible to identify some critical missing elements of analysis. They include the failure to recognize that there is a psychological identity crisis among the new migrants from rural American circumstances; that we wrote off too quickly the potential role of government in the process of urban development; that we did not take into account the full meaning of changing technology.

But the foundations of urban systems analysis were clearly set by the Study. They still stand in stark contrast to some contemporary diagnoses by latecomers in the field who even now persist in treating a multi-variable situation in single cause and effect terms. The Study carefully avoided any simple classification of a special category of urban people, a single source of discontent, or a particular kind of family problem.

As we build on the work of the 1950's we have come to know that urban conditions of stability or instability, squalor or decency, efficiency or inefficiency, beauty or ugliness, are not the function of single factors.

They are not the result of just obsolescence of our housing supply; just the changing requirements of industrial location; just a radical change in the character of the jobs technology makes available; just the vast migration of rural citizens to strange and complex urban circumstances; just discrimination; just the desire of new urban residents to be heard; just hostility between generations; just the increase in sheer numbers.

The urban condition is all of these. The issue is not the intuitive search for the single thesis, be it anomie, or the unemployment rate among central city residents, or the family structure of poor people. The issue is how to balance and take into account, on some weighted basis, the play and pull of all these varied forces.

The Woods Hole Conference which the President's Science Advisor, Donald Hornig, and Secretary Weaver sponsored in the summer of 1966 marked the first official effort to move in this direction. Walter Rosenblith, Chairman of the Faculty at MIT, led some fifty largely "hardware" researchers in the search for simultaneous equations to locate and remove the sources of urban discontent. That Summer Study began the process that continues today within the Department. Its work was the basis that led the Congress to approve our first meaningful research and development budget.

Where one appreciates that a problem is complex and subtle, not responsive to massive undirected applications of energy or simple professions of good will and heartfelt concern, one is likely to search for a reasonably comprehensive and carefully-developed response. This is the second reason for some optimism for urban America. Our public policy today, proposed by the President, enacted by the Congress, is of that character.

In the tumult of this summer, it is easy to forget—but vital to remember—that urban aid legislation enacted in 1965 and 1966 was designed to remove the causes of the tumult. We have many new efforts underway to provide more housing for those who desperately need it. For the first time we are seeing the leaders of private enterprise focusing their talents and energies on the nation's most pressing urban problem. Here I mean the involvement of private industry in the Rent Supplements Program which makes privately developed housing available to low-income families by helping them to pay the rent. I also mean the new program of leasing private housing which increases our supply of low-cost public housing. I mean the Turnkey process by which private enterprise uses its ingenuity and efficiency to build low-cost housing for sale to local authorities. And I mean the new refinement of Turnkey—we call it Turnkey II—in which private management firms will operate public housing.

The Model Cities Program of the 1966 Act is designed explicitly to bring comprehensiveness to the rebuilding of older portions of older cities. It will provide more housing. But, more than that, the Model Cities Program seeks to restore all aspects of the neighborhood environment—by merging social, physical, public and private programs from many sources into a total attack. For the first time, it introduces quality control into urban rebuilding. For the first time, it offers bonuses to stimulate local innovation, local ingenuity, local solutions of local problems.

Then there is the Metropolitan Development Program of 1966. It would reward, and therefore, encourage collaboration between local governments. Finally, there is the new program to stimulate the development of entirely new communities. This offers the hope of providing fresh alternatives to urban living.

Taken together, these new efforts represent a reasoned strategy. They will expand the freedom of choice for urbanites. For all of us, they will increase our options for where we seek to live, to work, and to invest our leisure time.

These, among others, are programs now on the statute books. Now they are all in the process of first funding.

They already authorize many of the programs proposed in the 30-odd new bills introduced in the Congress in the aftermath of Newark and Detroit.

Their principal limitation at the moment is the size of the investment they call for.

But here, amid calls for billion dollar emergency funds, and a thirty billion dollar housing investment, three comments are in order.

The urban professional recognizes that all three levels of government and the private sector as well must be involved in the process of rebuilding our cities. The Federal investment is not the total investment, as it is in space or national security programs. Those who make facile comparisons of just the gross Federal budget figures are either amateurs in urban affairs, or worse, they are actors engaging in political chicanery.

The urban professional also recognizes that the investment of economic resources alone does not assure effective capacity. Talent and knowledge are equally essential components and our shortages in each are awesome. This year is the first year of urban planning fellowships supported by the Federal government. Our $500,000 authorization this year will support 95 fellowships against an estimated shortage in urban planners of 1,500 to 1,700. This is also the first year of operation for our new Office of Urban Technology and Research in HUD. At a time when Federal Research and Development expenditures were 16 billion, we in HUD have spent only $70 million. Though we have begun the development of a genuine research program, we remain woefully behind other areas of national concern.

Meantime, the popular battle cry of many local officials remains: "Give us the money and we will do the job." This does not ring so true when they cannot show that they have people to spend the money on programs and enterprises that are well designed, carefully tested, and certain to achieve the purposes for which they were intended.

Finally the urban professional recognizes that the true test for an effective urban response is how it helps people. An effective program, at a minimum, involves an appreciation of the needs of the human personality and the human spirit. There is an oft-quoted line of Martin Lomasney, the old political boss of Boston, to the effect that "there's got to be in every ward somebody that any bloke can come to and get help. Help, you understand, none of your law and justice, but help."

But, it is no less true today than it was at the opening of this century that "the greatest of evils and the worst of crimes is poverty." Help these days is more than more urban renewal funds, more jobs, more housing. Help is all of these and law and justice, too. But, help is first communicating with those who now feel debarred from our society and consequently debased. Second, it is assurance of genuine participation in the process of city rebuilding and neighborhood restoration. Access to those in authority, a share in decision-making—these are the vital components today.

It was this desire to show tangible, visible concern for the current conditions of the poor—and to take at least one specific step to eliminate at least one shameful condi-

tion—that led the Administration to propose the so-called Rat control bill to the Congress. Those members of the House of Representatives who thoughtlessly laughed it out of the chamber, and those outside observers who wrote it off as budgetary trivia, and therefore, of no consequence, underestimate grievously one whole dimension of the urban challenge.

The same drive for action underlies our new program of making Federal surplus property available for new community development. Our first project is building a new town in town for 25,000 people on the site of the National Training School in Washington.

Admittedly, human concerns are the most elusive elements of a truly capable response. Effective programs and activities are evolving slowly from the trial and error, and success and triumph, in our economic opportunity programs. But they are vital components and those who would have us return to New Deal days—of simply providing dole for the poor until their children or their childrens' children struggle forward to a state of middle class blessedness—place more faith in economics and less faith in other social skills than I do.

At rockbottom, I cannot believe that we do not have the ability to engage our urban poor in democracy today nor any prospect of increasing their competence to deal with urban life today.

I cannot accept the proposition that there is no hope for my contemporaries in this urban world who did not have the luck of a good education and equal opportunity for a job.

I cannot believe that the only way to assure eventual economic well-being for all Americans is to relive the miseries, pain, despair and human costs of the Industrial Revolution of the 19th Century.

Understanding the pattern of urban development as a complex system fashioning a capacity with manpower and know-how, as well as money, to respond to the urban challenges, these two processes are well underway. But unless we are prepared to deal with our urban future as well as correct the mistakes of our urban past, they will not be enough. That is, no genuine urban response is sufficient that focuses solely on the American core city or identifies only the urban poor as the beneficiary of our public and private policies.

The truth is that the entire pattern of urban development, from central city to suburb to exurb, is robbing us all of genuine freedom. We are all losing the choice of a clean, healthful and pleasing environment—with pure air and water, a landscape unimpaired by destructive building processes. We are all losers when we are hit in the pocketbook by excessive and unnecessary costs in the construction of housing and provision of community facilities and services today. Unplanned, unguided, sporadic urban development cheapens our common environment and places prohibitive prices on land and improvements.

As we prepare for the generation of city building that lies just ahead—when we distribute 100 million more Americans across the continent in the next 30 years—these spiraling costs, this waste, and the despoilation are common concerns. They shape a common cause among the urban poor, the urban middle class, the urban rich—Caucasian, Negro, Mexican-American, and Puerto Rican.

There is a final common concern and challenge. How do we build our new urban communities on a geographical and numerical scale unanticipated even twenty years ago and still retain a sense of genuine community? What modern counterparts do we have for barn-raisings, street dancing, Fourth of July celebrations? Where are our new village greens and town commons?

To rediscover community on a larger scale will surely mean making real again the old colonial adage, "you are as good as any man—and better than none." Today, this means, at a minimum, freedom of choice for any family to live anywhere that its home economics makes possible. Open occupancy is a rudimentary necessity of an urban civilization today. Our increasingly urban character only serves to make more compelling than ever the fulfillment of the promises of democracy.

But genuine community building in our urban circumstances will require more positive action. Urban and suburban communities must recognize more explicitly that they have common concerns and common obligations.

We now, for example, at HUD are using some of our assistance grants in mass transportation to carry workers from poor neighborhoods in the central city to factories on the suburban fringe.

This is, we believe, a socially beneficial and well justified policy. It is, however, only a substitute for workers freely following their jobs and taking up residence close to where they work. If that freedom already existed, we could use this investment for other vital transportation needs.

Indeed, if we provide genuine variety in occupations, in income, in race and religion in cities and towns across our metropolitan regions, we accomplish two other things simultaneously, we insure that no single part of the new urban community has to care for the majority of the poor, the old, and the helpless; we provide the excitement of variety and complexity to the human experience in all parts of the community. For our children, free exchanges and encounters in early life can prevent prejudicial confrontations later on.

These are aspirations of community life yet to be realized of course. Major changes in public attitude, in private industrial performance, in labor practices, in governmental patterns of behavior must occur before these aspirations are realized. But they are the objectives to which present, established national policy is committed.

Let me add, that one of the most encouraging developments of this summer has been the unmistakable evidence of the community commitment by the private sector. Representatives of business associations, of individual industries, of community enterprises: group after group have been visiting with us in Washington. They all seek effective ways to expand their commitment to our urban communities. They no longer withdraw, retreat, or simply complain about the urban condition. We welcome each and every step in the direction of massive commitment by private enterprise.

Those, then, are the bases for urban optimism. Urban programs fashioned by reason and not illusion, emphasizing practical and tangible results, committed to quality, are now underway.

They will not immediately quiet urban discontent nor instantly make competent citizens of the newest migrants from rural circumstances. They will not magically introduce effective local land development and tax policy nor will they easily eliminate hazards to health and beauty. They never will—without expanded and sustained commitment from the private sector and the academy on a scale never before undertaken. Thus, in the unspoken words of Franklin Roosevelt, "The only limit to their realization will be our doubts of today."

But given such commitment and common effort the America of the 21st Century can offer its urbanites greater hope than the newly urbanized nation entering the 20th Century offered earlier generations.

This nation will have come to peaceful terms with the urban destiny that it now no longer refuses to acknowledge. It will have arrived at the time the President pictured when he said: "Those who came to this land sought to build more than just a new country. They sought a new world. . . . let us from this moment begin our work so that in the future men will look back and say, 'It was then, after a long and weary way, that man turned the exploits of his genius to the full enrichment of his life.' "

TOM WICKER'S MEMOIR OF WASHINGTON

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the New York Times Washington bureau chief, Tom Wicker, has written a deeply moving memoir of his feelings about the Capital City. His love of this city and his emotional reactions to it reflect much of what I have experienced. I believe that others will find his beautifully written article in the September 9, 1967, issue of the Saturday Review of interest. The article is a preview of Mr. Wicker's introduction to the forthcoming book entitled "The New York Times Guide to the Nation's Capital." 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:

WASHINGTON: A REPORTER'S MEMOIR

(By Tom Wicker)

In the summer when I was nine years old my parents gathered up what cash the Depression had left them and took my sister and me to see Washington, I never got over it.

My father worked for the Seaboard Air Line Railway, whose passenger trains his family consequently could ride free; this was the great privilege of my youth and caused me to admire my father wildly. He could also get a mysterious document called a "strip pass" from other—I thought lesser—lines, and for this excursion we got one from the Richmond, Fredericksburg, and Potomac (R F & P, we called it). That meant we had only to pay the Pullman fare, and in those days a family of four could make out perfectly well—at least we did—with a lower for the parents, an upper for the kids, and a box of sandwiches and fried chicken.

The trip was overnight, from Hamlet, North Carolina, and I don't recall much about it except that my sister and I kept the car awake half the night and I didn't want the porter to move the ladder. But I remember coming out of Union Station the next morning, in brilliant sunshine, and looking across the great plaza to the Capitol; a fierce, choking patriotism blazed in my breast. I thought the dome against the sky was the most beautiful sight I had ever seen, and I still do.

I remember the little Negro children who were playing in the huge fountain before the station—marvelous privilege of the city child! I remember more cars going past than I had ever seen, and the trolleys sliding to a halt under the stone facade that seemed to tower miles above me. I remember the trees and the grass and the people sitting on benches and a man selling balloons. Along the right side of the plaza there was a row of hotels, elegant and expensive—or so I thought, and that made it true. Only children know how to arrive.

We stayed in a rooming house. As I recall, it must have been somewhere out on East Capitol Street; the trolleys went past the door, and it was only a short ride to the Capitol. We went there one night to sit on the grass and listen to the United States Marine Band play on the very spot—someone told us—where Franklin Delano Roosevelt had been sworn in as President. The glorious ring of that name—Roosevelt!—made the

place hallowed to me. (I have seen Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson sworn in there, but I am a child of the Depression and I will always think of it as the place where Roosevelt personally saved my father's house and job and where the Marine Band played in his honor and maybe my family's on a hot summer night when I was nine years old and knew more than I ever will again.)

My mother wept in the Lincoln Memorial, and why not? A smiling man took us on a sightseeing tour. We stood in the blistering heat outside the Washington Monument, waiting for the elevator, and when we reached the top my father held me under the arms so I could see out the small barred windows. We talked about the man who had tried to catch a baseball somebody dropped from one of those windows and what would happen if an airplane flew into the monument. We marveled at the green money flowing from the presses at the Bureau of Engraving and we stared in silence at Lindbergh's *Spirit of St. Louis* and the Wright Brothers' plane suspended above us at the Smithsonian Institution, and took in the waxed dummies wearing all the First Ladies' inaugural gowns; but I liked the old cars and locomotives best, and the engine that even small boys could operate. We toured the FBI and saw the fingerprint machines and were told how they got Dillinger. I was proud to have been a Melvin Purvis Junior G-Man. We went through the White House in a long line, even though the smiling man who drove us on our sightseeing tour said Mr. Roosevelt was off on his sailboat somewhere. My mother said she liked to think of him getting a good rest.

We shrieked with laughter at the Monkey House in the zoo and recoiled with shudders from the snakes. We took the boat trip to Mount Vernon and ate ice cream on the deck and hung over the rail to watch the water curling back from the bow. Then, up the steep green hillside and through that fascinating place with its smokehouse and separate kitchen and slave quarters and the bed where George Washington died. Then we went cautiously down the path, a little fearful, to stand in silence before the tomb where George and Martha lay; my sister and I held our breaths, because we believed the signs implicitly and thought that if we made a single sound we would be dishonored forever.

Later we gawked at the fish in the little aquarium in the Commerce Building, watched the guard changed at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, and walked with special Southern reverence through the beautiful house where Robert E. Lee forsook the Union. We went to Ford's Theatre, too, and saw the door with the little hole in it through which John Wilkes Booth peeped on the fatal night; and then crossed 10th Street to the drab, small, somehow shocking house where Abraham Lincoln passed to the ages. I did not like it much; I had wanted to take the Cabin John trolley to Glen Echo amusement park and ride the roller coaster, but my father drew the line at that.

And a final treat: we had dinner, our last night, in the Occidental Restaurant. Someone had told us it was the place where the famous men of Washington ate; I only remember it was crowded, noisy, brilliant with light. (Now, sometimes, I have lunch there and it is still crowded and noisy and I wonder what table our family had that night—those two wide-eyed children, my father, my mother, spending money they could ill afford to make sure our trip was complete. If I thought it was a bad, out-of-the-way table I could never go there again.)

The next year in school I reported to the fourth grade on what we had seen in Washington. My teacher said I was a lucky boy, and I think I was. I never forgot that fair city—the long, broad avenues with the trees of summer hanging over them, the view from the Monument, the old cars at the Smithsonian, the silence at Washington's tomb, the green slopes at Arlington.

Now I live in Washington—one of the few desires of my life that, fulfilled, has not disappointed me. For one thing, out past the crowds of tourists and the downtown streets and the great monuments and buildings there is a pleasant, quiet, almost placid city where at least the fortunate among us can raise our families and spend our leisure in something like comfort—a commodity in increasingly short supply in urban America.

One of Washington's distinctions, I think, is that it is mostly a residential city. Beyond its fairly restricted government and downtown areas Washington is a city of houses and quiet streets and power mowers on Sunday morning. One can have a house and yard not unlike the ones I knew in the South years ago and still walk a half-hour to work in the heart of the city—a pleasant walk, too.

There has been an apartment explosion and a lot of people live ten floors up, with or without a balcony and a pool on the roof. But the basic living unit here is the house—rowhouses with quiet rear gardens in Georgetown, big old barns with surrounding yards like mine in Cleveland Park, imposing mansions, boxy cottages, duplexes, triplexes, ramblers, split-level homes. People give a lot of dinner parties at home, in all styles from black tie with three wines to walking shorts with charcoal grills. Almost everyone I know is something of a gardener, and when Bill Henry, the former chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, left town in 1966, his parting gift to close friends was a dogwood tree for each.

It is also a city for children. The schools are starved by Congress but the place is full of parks and playgrounds and out in Rock Creek Park there is the zoo, with a white tiger and the world's largest bird cage; even farther out, there is the nature center where children can watch bees making honey in a glass hive, learn about the plant life around them, and see movies about mountain lions and horned owls. Small boys can fish in Rock Creek or on the banks of the Potomac, and everywhere you look there is a picnic table and a fireplace. Perspiring fathers can puff along after their progeny on the Nature Trail in Glover-Archibold Park. It is as easy to play tennis here as it is anywhere in the world, although there is a dismal shortage of public swimming pools—Congress again. In Montrose Park there is a spectacular hill where sledders can risk their necks between the trees, and that is only one of many well-sledded trails.

A baseball game goes on all summer long at the Macomb Street playground near my house and probably at dozens of others. You can still rent a barge and get yourself towed up the C&O Canal, or walk the towpath if you prefer. And when a child's birthday demands a special treat, it's hard to beat the FBI tour, the Smithsonian, the Marine Retreat, or the displays in the National Geographic building. For more serious outings, there are the National Gallery of Art, the enthralling Phillips Gallery, and the children's concerts of the National Symphony. D.C. Stadium is one of the best places anywhere to take a boy to see a big-league ball game, and there's always softball or touch football on the Ellipse within sight of the White House and the Washington Monument.

Nor is Washington really, as myth has it, either a provincial or a stuffy city. As Russell Baker points out, most of us are not natives and all too few of us can count on permanency here or afford to leave the fences unmended on the old home place. For numerous Washingtonians, what goes on elsewhere in the country is of extreme importance—what the voters are thinking in Missouri, for instance, or what economic conditions are in Oregon, or how the Governor of Michigan is faring. For many others the events of the whole wide world are just as vital.

Thus, while "shop talk" is the staple of conversation here—where is it not?—it is apt to be of sweeping variety. At any one dinner party the shop talk can range from the problems of NATO to the primaries in California, from the war in Vietnam to the moods of the President, from the latest odds on the Secretary of State's tenure of office to the progress of school desegregation. Provincial? Not half as much as what one hears at similar dinner parties in, say, New York, where it is well known that the country is bounded on the west by the Hudson River; or San Francisco, where it is not certain that the Eastern Seaboard exists.

On the other hand, when Otto Preminger filmed *Advise and Consent* here and passed the word for extras, Washingtonians turned out like so many small-town gawkers to get themselves in the movies. They will turn out, too, for almost any parade, whether for an astronaut or the Cherry Blossom Festival; and almost any foreign dignitary can count on a good audience if the President takes him for the short ceremonial whirl from the White House along E Street to 14th, up 14th to New York Avenue, then along New York and Pennsylvania Avenues back to the White House.

They say most people who live in New York never go to the Broadway theater, and I suppose most people who live in Washington never get to the Capitol or the Lincoln Memorial or the Supreme Court, either. That is not the point. They are there, and one has only to hail a taxi or catch the bus. I like to think that I can take my children down to watch the House of Representatives in session almost any time I want to and that the black car speeding past my house is the President's and that on Inauguration Day, naturally, we'll be there in the crowd. When I took my little girl to the circus at the D.C. Armory we stopped on the way to ride the little underground railroad between the Capitol and the Senate Office Building. We can take a five-minute walk through Normanstone Drive, past the house where John Foster Dulles used to live, past the Canadian Embassy residence, up Massachusetts Avenue a bit, and examine the new statue of Winston Churchill which has one foot on American soil and the other on the territory of the British Embassy. Then we can cut behind the embassy and come out in Montrose Park, which is next door to Dumbarton Oaks, where they planned the United Nations and where there are some of the most beautiful formal gardens in America.

On my way to work I can pass through the block of N Street between Connecticut and 17th; a few fine old houses live above the parking lots in there, where Franklin Roosevelt resided when he was Assistant Secretary of the Navy in Wilson's Administration. When I walk from my office to the White House I go past Dolley Madison's old house, and Stephen Decatur's, within sight of the block where John Hay and Henry Adams used to live side by side, down the opposite side of Lafayette Square from the spot where Gen. Dan Sickles, hero of Gettysburg, shot his wife's lover, and half a block east of Blair House, where a White House policeman named Leslie Coffelt died on the sidewalk in 1950 defending Harry Truman's life. Across Pennsylvania Avenue is one of my personal favorites, the old State-War-Navy Building, a massively detailed Victorian pile with high ceilings, tiled corridors, and some of the few remaining offices with real fireplaces.

My own office building is on one of the city's busiest corners—Connecticut Avenue, K Street, and 17 Street—but trees line the sidewalks and I look out over Farragut Square all year long. Office girls eat lunch on the grass in favorable weather—a pretty sight indeed. President Kennedy came back from Europe with an idea for beautifying the city trash cans and it worked; ours are the handsomest anywhere. Now officials are planting

flowers and trees in every available space and Washington is blooming. (I'm not sure I approve of the magnolias they planted up the middle of Connecticut Avenue over the old trolley tunnel; I don't believe they'll have enough root space and I am against cramped trees.)

Other cities, of course, have their own distinctions and style. And just as those cities have their dark undersides, so does Washington.

Pierre L'Enfant's splendid, flawed plan for the original city—never fully put into effect has been distorted by numerous subsequent planners and even more by haphazard growth into something infrequently magnificent, at times ridiculous, at times nightmarish. Of its main features, only the twin centers of the Capitol and White House, the Mall L'Enfant envisioned as a magnificent American promenade, and the broad avenues (yielding a high annual rate of pedestrian mortality) survive as anything like this creator intended. His multiple intersections, instead of being bustling islands of urban activity in a sea of residential tranquility, are honking horrors of circling traffic; the great vistas he hoped for are swallowed in urban tangle, save for the Mall—which is too sunbaked for summertime strolling. And if, as Paul Spreiregen commented some years ago in the *Journal of the American Institute of Architects*, a city plan influenced by the Baroque concept of Versailles really was "an assertion of a bold new republic in a barely touched wilderness," today it seems more nearly like some nineteenth-century millionaire's castle transported brick by brick from its European setting to an esthetically uncertain America.

Worse, if the "plan" of the federal city has been distorted by growth and in its turn has distorted growth, then beyond the limits of L'Enfant's sketch maps there is little but helter-skelter. Far into the Virginia and Maryland countryside sprawl the suburbs, some tight and lovely like Kenwood with its cherry trees, most flung down with a builder's giant careless hand on treeless plains that were formerly forests, some waiting hideously to become official slums. The freeway builders, frantically flinging as much traffic as possible into Washington's already strangling thoroughfares, are at once behind in their work and agitating for the privilege of pouring concrete over everything. Rapid transit does not exist, although a limited subway system soon will be under construction; some federal workers who live in far-out suburbs actually arrive in their parking lots at 5 and 6 o'clock in the morning to avoid rush-hour traffic, then sleep behind the wheel until time to punch the clock. What they suffer on the way home is ghastly to contemplate, especially in the special torture Washington reserves for creeping motorists—August.

East of 16th Street, whole areas are entirely populated by Negroes living in the poverty and slum conditions they have endured so long in other cities. Many of them can see the Capitol dome from the littered alleys and cluttered sidewalks and bare, sunbaked porches that are their escape from the tenements; it can hardly be an inspiring view.

Washington is famous for crime and rape and muggers—although I know of no statistics which prove it the worst in this regard, or even an unsafe city. The fact that it has a majority of Negroes, and its hierarchy of Southern politicians, combine to foster the myth that black men make this a terrified place. But there is no part of Washington so sullen as the Watts district of Los Angeles or Oakland's Negro ghetto, so seething as New York's Harlem, or more dangerous than its Central Park.

The petty bureaucracy of what is laughingly called the District of Columbia government is inefficient, impervious, and immovable. Congress is responsible, in many ways, for inadequate school budgets, shocking welfare payments and institutions, and low prices at the whiskey stores (you can buy better wines more cheaply in Washington than in any city I know—a poor consolation). Nobody has the right to vote anybody out of office, much less in, and there is so much slow, sloppy, and untimely street construction and repair that the old saying perfectly fits: "It'll be a great city if they ever get it finished." Old landmarks go under here as they do elsewhere—the house where Woodrow Wilson married Mrs. Galt got the wrecking ball a year or so ago, and only the Kennedys saved part of Lafayette Square opposite the White House from becoming a concrete canyon; two sides of Farragut Square have been completely rebuilt while I have watched from my office window, and what they have done to Capitol Hill in a decade ought to be a federal crime.

In the summer the Potomac is apt to smell, and any time, as Bobby Kennedy said of New York's East River, if you fall in, you don't drown; you dissolve. In winter the streets are either glassy or slushy and snow removal is hopeless. When I lived on R Street, hard-packed snow stayed on the pavement for six weeks after the Kennedy Inaugural blizzard.

But all of this is not really the Washington I first saw that brilliant morning thirty years ago when I came out of Union Station to the edge of the great plaza, holding my father's hand, and stood stricken in the giddy light, dumb with wonder and belief.

This is not merely because the surface of the city is so much altered from the miracle place of my boyhood. The trolleys are gone now, and I don't suppose tourist families stay in rooming houses on Capitol Hill any more. The Smithsonian has a massive new building. John Kennedy lies at Arlington with the Unknown Soldier. They have restored Ford's Theatre to look like a theater, and everyone drives down to Mount Vernon on a four-lane highway. There is a cheap new façade on the Capitol, and Harry Truman put a balcony on the White House; Mrs. Kennedy filled its public rooms with antiques, and Lyndon Johnson filled its private offices with Dallas modern and piped-in Muzak. Union Station is cavernous and gloomy now, and the last time I was there the fountain where the children played was dry and full of dead leaves. Jimmy Hoffa's marble temple for the Teamsters' Union stands along the plaza where one of those elegant hotels did, and the rest of them are no longer elegant, if they ever were. Now the great entrance to the city—the most beautiful entrance in the world, I think—is the long ride in from Dulles International Airport, along the Potomac on the George Washington Parkway, with the spires of Georgetown University rising across the river and the Washington Monument shining in the distance.

That is not, of course, real change, and neither is the relatively new Jefferson Memorial on the Tidal Basin or the Theodore Roosevelt Bridge or even the monstrously ugly third House Office Building. (There always has been a touch of the grotesque about Washington—the old Smithsonian, for instance—and perhaps in time even this crouching eyesore on Capitol Hill will seem, like others, at home in the city.) No, the essential Washington is just what it was thirty years ago, and more, having survived architects, engineers, politicians, bureaucrats, demonstrators, and urban planners. It is just what it was because Americans still weep in the Lincoln Memorial and small boys still stand in awe in front of George Washington's tomb and troop happily through the old cars at the Smithsonian and dream their secret dreams at the FBI and burst with pride when they first see the nation's Capitol. Parents still bring their children here and show them the Declaration of Independence under glass and listen to the tour guide's spiel in front of the Supreme Court and take pictures of the statue of Albert Gallatin in front of the Treasury.

Perhaps few of them know who Gallatin was, or care, but the meanest of them know he was part of something, and they are part of it, too. I have seen fat women in ridiculously tight shorts walking carefully around Statuary Hall in the Capitol, peering closely at banal bonze figures of men so obscure even historians would have to look them up, and high school kids wearing Confederate caps and popping gum line up for blocks to take a quick walk through the White House. They are part of the same thing: secret sharers, bearers of a seed.

But not merely sharers of the showplace, the museum, the history lesson. Behind those facades, those bronze doors, down this echoing corridor, the collective work of a people is in progress. The President really is at his desk in that great house on Pennsylvania Avenue, making his way like the rest of us, enduring his trials, doing his best. Those men down there on the floor of the Senate and the House, those small posturers glimpsed from the crowded galleries, really are representing us, really are trying to make our case, whatever it is. And there behind the great stone faces of the Commerce Department and the Justice Department and the Federal Trade Commission and the Pentagon and the State Department our business is going forward, or maybe backward, but going somewhere, getting done. We are at the heart of the matter here. Washington's business is the people's business, for better or for worse.

That is what Washington really is and what we all share—the place where the past has produced this present, and this present will go on to whatever future, carrying us all with it, influenced by each of us as we must be by it. It is what we have made of things, and shall make. It is where America lives—all of us in spirit if only a few in fact, in our vigor and our dreams, our carelessness and haste, our glory and our burden, our borrowed finery from another world that gave us birth, our native grace, our coarse pretension. It is all here—what we remember, what we hope; what we are and what we ought to be—in this city of the strong but chastened heart.

I did not know, that morning all those years ago, that carved above me in the patient stone of Union Station I could find the truth about Washington:

"He who would bring home the wealth of the Indies must carry the wealth of the Indies with him."

I did not know the words, but I found that truth anyway. Americans must bring Washington here in their hearts, if they would carry it with them when they go.

WILDCAT STRIKE IN STEEL HAUL INDUSTRY DEPLORED

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Teamster General Vice President Frank E. Fitzsimmons today deplored the violence and irresponsibility of wildcat strikers in the steel haul industry.

Fitzsimmons made the International Brotherhood of Teamsters' position clear in a statement today to both Labor Committees of Congress. Fitzsimmons said:

This is a wildcat strike. It is not sanctioned by the International Union. These people have an agreement, which is a supplement to our Master National Freight Agreement. It was properly put before the 450,000 members covered under the agreement and overwhelmingly ratified. The vote, a mail referendum, was supervised by the U.S. Department of Labor.

Neither do we condone the violence which

has accompanied this wildcat strike, and we are somewhat amazed that state officials have let the violence continue—

Fitzsimmons said.

We have held meetings with these people trying to determine their grievances, if any exist. These meetings have been unsuccessful.

Both the union and management take the position that these workers have a signed contract which has proper machinery for the processing of grievances. The Union has consistently tried to get these people to use this grievance machinery, and has consistently and still urges them to return to work. Doing this, we will be able to air the grievances in concert with the terms of the agreement—

Fitzsimmons said.

The International Union stands ready and willing to assist when the parties to this wildcat action indicate a responsible approach to the problem. In the meantime, we take the position that it is a wildcat strike, it is not sanctioned by the International Union, and are quite in accord with the sentiment that the violence must be stopped—

Fitzsimmons declared.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF LANGLEY RESEARCH CENTER

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I received word that the President signed Senate Joint Resolution 109 today. This was the joint resolution introduced by me, with Senator WILLIAM SPONG as cosponsor, setting aside the first week in October to celebrate the 50th anniversary of Langley Research Center. It is a fitting tribute to an installation that has contributed for 50 years to American advancement in aeronautical and space research.

I spent Monday morning touring the facilities and exhibits at Langley Research Center at Hampton, Va. I have seldom spent a more enlightening and informative morning.

This week, through Friday, the personnel of Langley will be happy and proud to show everyone through the facilities. Were it not for the press of business in the Senate, I would urge all Senators to take advantage of this opportunity to witness firsthand the advancements that are being made at this vital research center.

THE THRUST OF OUR VIETNAM POLICY

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, as the presidential election campaign approaches, the great Vietnam debate grows more persistent, more passionate, and, unfortunately, more political. Twelve months ago it was not this way. Then, too, there were disagreements with the administration's Vietnam policies. Then they were more in the nature of *scholarly* efforts to evaluate different courses of action. The change has not been altogether subtle. Now much of the criticism has become politically motivated. It is based on whatever advantage may be gained by appealing to an apparent antiadministration attitude on the part of the general public. Both Democrats and Republicans are busy releasing position papers to the news media. They hurry to put their own plans for peace before the television cameras. In some of this, there is cynical disregard for the tremendous responsibility involved in the ultimate choice of national policy.

Many of the proposals are based on the delightful but unrealistic theory that "faith, hope, and charity" abound in the world; that wishful thinking will somehow affect the actions of Hanoi and Peking. Others subscribe to the "eye-for-an-eye" or "might makes right" principle, by which peace may be realized only through complete and overwhelming military victory. Attractive as these proposals may be, at the moment and on the surface—each to some segment of American public opinion—none of them bears up under careful examination in the light of what is best for the future security of the United States.

The thrust of our Vietnam policy must be maintained far above the reach of politically motivated consideration. It must be based on lessons learned from recent history. It must be influenced by hardheaded understanding of the Communist doctrines of expansion and aggression. In sustaining a policy based on these factors, President Johnson is much too experienced a politician not to appreciate the resulting political disadvantage. Nevertheless, while riddled by the sniping of politically motivated criticism, the President has remained firm.

This resolve has not gone altogether unnoticed in the press. A recent editorial in the Claremont, N.H., Daily Eagle gave an objective analysis of the President's problems. It cleared away a considerable amount of political fog and penetrated to the heart of the issue. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Johnson Still Gets Our Vote," published in the Claremont, N.H., Daily Eagle, be printed in the RECORD.

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

JOHNSON STILL GETS OUR VOTE

President Johnson's popularity in the polls is slipping because of his Vietnam policies and because some voters believe that the Johnson administration and the Democrats, generally, have a soft-line policy on Negroes.

The President is vulnerable in both areas as witness the defection amongst the governors and leaders in his own party.

Many believe that he cannot win reelection, even if Nixon is the Republicans' candidate.

Governor Romney of Michigan says he's been brainwashed by the administration on Vietnam. He is now counted out of the GOP race as a man with demonstrable shortcomings.

Governor Rockefeller says that, unless some new course of action is taken, this country will have civil war in the cities.

Rockefeller declines candidacy, but is far and away the ablest man the Republicans can field.

Senator Percy is now being pushed by Senator Dirksen and others as the new moderate Republican candidate for President to replace Romney, who has been cashiered.

Percy declines the candidacy publicly, but is making pronouncements on Vietnam, such as the most recent, stating that the President is lying to the American people.

Strong words, we think, for a man with no experience in international affairs and a very junior senator from Illinois.

Our posture in Vietnam was inherited by President Johnson. He had, of course, at that time, the option to reverse things, but he did not do so.

Since then the situation has worsened and the war has been accelerated to the degree that no one could have forecast—except the Vietnamese—two or three years ago.

President Johnson has been resolute and firm in the execution of his Vietnamese policy.

This he has done in the face of continuing losses in popularity with the voters and, of course, with the politicians in his own party, many of whom need coat-tails.

In addition to this, much of the press has become hostile and more recently, a misguided, however sincere, couple returned to the President a posthumous award sent to them from the White House.

This was the President's war, they said, and their son need not have perished.

Even presidents get hit below the belt.

Governor Romney, a states' righter of the first water, is, however, the first to run to Washington for military assistance in Detroit rioting last summer.

He is fighting yet with the President about this and no one is really sure which run of the argument to accept, save that the President is being blamed for slow response to Michigan for "political reasons," thereby allowing the riots to spread.

We are not sold on the Administration's position in Vietnam, but it is a position that has been taken by President Johnson and a position that has been maintained without wavering since its outset.

To a great degree our Vietnam situation is a national commitment, beyond anything but academic debate.

We are there.

Men have been and are giving of their lives for the commitment.

President Johnson's high purpose and resolution in Vietnam seems to have escaped many Americans.

While he continues to take a pounding on all sides, even more praise-worthy is his restraint in dignifying some of the criticisms with a response.

The President is unpopular at a time when the country enjoys the greatest prosperity any nation in the world has ever known; but he gets no credit for this; only blame for what is not going well.

This newspaper supported President Johnson for the presidency in 1964 with some reservations, but as the only sensible choice.

Many supported and voted for Johnson as "the lesser of two evils."

Some supposed that the man really lacked the moral character and fibres to be anything more than the "wheeler-dealer" politician.

We believe time has shown that there is more to Lyndon Johnson.

Johnson has demonstrated some characteristics in office that confound and belie the Johnson saga.

In Vietnam he may be dead right, or dead wrong.

Who is really to say?

But he has set a course of policy and has had the courage and determination to adhere to it, despite loss of popularity and personal abuse.

It is said that the President would lose an election today, but there isn't one Republican candidate yet on the horizon whom we'd support.

Lyndon Johnson still gets our vote.

THE ABM ILLUSION

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, Mr. Edwin Diamond, senior editor of Newsweek magazine, has written a devastating analysis of the illusory notion that we are buying security by constructing

a costly anti-ballistic-missile system. This perceptive analysis appears in the October 2, 1967, issue of Newsweek. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE GRAND ILLUSION

(By Edwin Diamond)

Secretary McNamara's decision to go ahead with an anti-ballistic-missile (ABM) system is based on a set of brilliantly reasoned, highly sophisticated, and strongly persuasive arguments. But the decision is wrong, and the consequences of this error will burden every American for years to come.

Instead of strengthening the national security, the ABM decision may well undermine it, for it upsets the present delicate balance of nuclear terror based on the twin implicit assumptions of a strong (four-to-one) but not overwhelming U.S. offensive missile superiority and a modest Soviet defensive advantage. Worse, the ABM move signals another dangerous upward spiral in the nuclear-arms race which may lead to a renewed drive by both the U.S. and Soviet Union to add new offensive weapons to the overkill arsenals each already possesses. Roswell L. Gilpatric, McNamara's own former Deputy Defense Secretary, fears the ABM means a U.S. global strategy based more on conflict than accommodation. The go-ahead, he said, "is certainly a move in the wrong direction."

Let's put these abstractions in concrete terms—and concrete is exactly where we are now heading. At the very least, this new nuclear escalation means the expenditure of untold billions in exchange for a wholly illusory security blanket. Whether the U.S. spends $4 to $5 billion for the "thin" ABM system to guard its Minuteman strike force, or $40 billion for the "thickening" of the blanket to protect major American cities, or $400 billion to protect smaller cities, the end result will be the same: all of us will still be 30 minutes away from nuclear annihilation.

MOLE SOCIETY

Indeed, with the ABM escalation, the possibility of this supposedly "unthinkable" missile Armageddon is greater, not smaller. All of us have now been propelled by the logic of nuclear events that McNamara grasps so well toward the next era of the atomic age—the mole society where the cities and civilians of the 1980's may have to burrow underground to join the concrete Minuteman silos sunk in the 1960s and the subterranean ABM control centers built in the 1970s.

Unlikely, you will say; right out of some science-fiction paperback. But who would have believed, ten years ago, at the time of Sputnik 1 and the "missile gap," that the U.S. within five years would possess the nuclear missiles to destroy the Soviet society and population five times over?

What evidence have I that McNamara—one of the most brilliant and dedicated minds in the nation—is wrong about the ABM? What proof is there that the U.S. has embarked on a dangerous new course? The evidence is abundant. Precisely because McNamara has such a firm grasp of the complexities of the age, he himself has supplied some of the best arguments against the ABM and a new arms race. In fact, if an analyst were to overlay McNamara's speech with one of the cryptologist's sheets that cover some paragraphs while revealing others, the case for the present stabilized strategic situation would become compelling.

"ACTION-REACTION"

First of all, as McNamara makes clear, the U.S. now has "a numerical superiority over the Soviet Union in reliable, accurate and effective warheads [that] is both greater than we had originally planned, and is in fact more than we require." This, to use the blunt term, is what overkill means. And overkill, to be blunt again, is the legacy of politically motivated "missile-gap" cries of the late 1950s. The panic button was pushed in the U.S. and a real missile gap did eventually materialize. But as McNamara points out in his speech, this gap favors the U.S. At present the U.S. has 2,200 strategic nuclear weapons in readiness against 700 for the U.S.S.R. The Russian response to this U.S. superiority has been to concede an offensive disparity. In effect the Soviet Union acknowledged that the richness and ingenuity of American technology could not be matched. But it began an ABM system—the Russian military has been traditionally defense minded—as part of what McNamara calls the "action-reaction" of the arms race.

McNamara has been conspicuously unworried by this deployment. As he explains it, the offense always has an advantage over the defense and any ABM system "can rather obviously be defeated by an enemy simply sending over more offensive warheads, or dummy warheads, than there are defensive missiles capable of disposing of them."

The logic of the situation calls for one of the superpowers to forego the next turn in the vicious cycle of action-reaction. A Soviet McMamara—they have their sophisticated strategists and their war gamesmen, too—might argue that the Soviet ABM deployment represented a limited and measured response to U.S. superiority, a move intended to assure Russian second-strike capability and thus make the Soviet deterrent credible. Why not leave the arms race in this trade-off situation? Why upset the fearfully delicate balance of terror with a U.S. ABM system?

McNamara's answer last week was: because of the looming Chinese nuclear-missile threat of the 1970's. The proposed U.S. ABM system, in McNamara's words, is "Chinese-oriented," designed to deter Chairman Mao or his successors from an attack on the U.S. It is at this point that McNamara's computer logic breaks down.

MAD ADVENTURE

First, if Peking is suicidally mad enough to mount an attack on a country possessing 200 times more nuclear power than it has, then no amount of objective reality in the form of an American ABM barrier can dissuade the Chinese from their insanity. If the Chinese are bent on nuclear genocide, they could smuggle an atomic bomb into San Francisco harbor aboard a freighter and detonate it. No ABM system can protect against such mad adventures.

Second, the Soviet Union can also argue that its ABM is "Chinese-oriented," and merely a matter of insurance against an irrational attack by a country that shares on uneasy border with Russia and is violently hostile to it. After all, the same madness that might lead the Chinese to attack the U.S. might also push Mao over the brink with the Russians. Would we believe the Russians if they said, "It's the Chinese we are worried about—ignore our ABM"? Yet we expect them to believe our ABM is China-oriented.

The truth is the ABM decision was dictated not by strategy but by politics. Computer logic breaks down because men aren't computers; they are imperfect beings shaped by history and emotion as well as reason. There are really two McNamaras. One McNamara cooly attempts to manage the arms race by force of argument and intellect. He even on occasion does the Russian's thinking for them, patiently elucidating the nuclear strategic options available and their consequences in speeches and in briefings held for the press, but aimed at Moscow. The second McNamara is an American, a patriot and a member of the Johnson Administration (just as his opposite in the Kremlin is a Russian, a patriot, and a member of the Communist Party).

It is well known in Washington that Secretary McNamara for months has opposed deployment of the ABM system despite the urgings of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, of Democratic hawks and of Republicans sensing a hot campaign issue for 1968. As James Reston suggested last week, the ABM system launched by McNamara is not aimed at blocking the Chinese or even the Russians, but the Republicans. By acceding now to the clamor, McNamara has blunted the GOP charge that he is "indifferent" to the defense of the American people.

GOOD GUYS

Yet, isn't the U.S. asking—a bit illogically—the Soviet McNamara to be indifferent to the defense of his people? More fundamentally, isn't the U.S. saying—also a bit illogically—that when it comes to the crunch, two standards apply: we are the good guys and would never attack first; you are the bad guys and you might attack first, and that is why we must have a four-to-one offensive superiority and defensive parity (at least)—and a lead in whatever else we decide to build.

Last week was the time for patience and courage—patience to lecture the Russians once again on the reasons behind the eminently equitable U.S. plan to put a freeze on all missiles, offensive and defensive; courage, in the words of former Kennedy science adviser Jerome Wiesner, to run the risks of deescalation instead of the risks of new escalation; and patience and courage to explain to the American people, even in a preelection year, why the ABM is not good for their security.

Instead, Washington gave us the ABM. By some curious alchemy, the Administration has convinced itself that the thin ABM system doesn't really change the balance of terror: only a thick system would do that. But thin leads to thick. It is all like that celebrated biology experiment: a frog is placed in a tank of water; daily the temperature is increased one degree; the frog exists as always—until one more degree . . . the water boils . . . the frog dies.

A SMALL BUSINESS IS SAVED

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, a business employing 75 persons in three different plants is a very substantial enterprise in North Dakota. Those interested in promoting the economic well-being of the State and its citizens became justifiably alarmed when, in 1963, such a firm appeared to be reaching the end of its life cycle.

The company was highly regarded, having been in business for almost 60 years. The firm had a healthy backlog of unfilled sales orders but working capital had been devastated by excessive growth of inventory and accounts receivable.

On a May morning in 1963, the company's shareholders petitioned a North Dakota court to appoint a receiver to reorganize the company. The court complied, appointing as receiver a North Dakota businessman with a growing reputation for saving insolvent companies, Mr. Richard Barry, of Fargo.

Within a year after petitioning the court, the company was reestablished on a sound, profitable basis. What had occurred in the intervening months was a testimonial to what can be achieved by smooth-functioning cooperation among business, labor, and Government.

The patient forebearance of creditors was rewarded by full payment of their claims against the company. Funds for repayment came from the proceeds of

a Small Business Administration loan. Careful analysis of the company's financial records and outlook had convinced SBA officials of the firm's basic soundness. Sensing the importance of quick action, the SBA expeditiously approved a $225,000 loan to the reorganizing firm.

During the time the company was in receivership, the employees, with the concurrence of their Teamster Union officers, agreed to reductions of about $1,000 per month in certain fringe benefits to which they were otherwise entitled under their union contract with the company. Unless the company's working capital had been relieved of this burden it is doubtful the company could have survived this critical period.

Today this company remains an important contributor to the economy of North Dakota. Without the enlightened cooperation of the receiver, the employees and their union, creditors, and the Small Business Administration, the company would merely have become an addition to our business failure statistics.

HARD-CORE POVERTY PROBLEMS

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, many programs have been pursued by our Government in its efforts to resolve the hard-core poverty problems of our cities and our rural areas.

There have been successes and there have been mistakes. There have even been a few failures. But there is no doubt in my mind that our efforts have been serious and reflect a genuine concern for the disadvantaged of our Nation.

One of the key attacks on poverty has revolved around the question of providing meaningful jobs for those who have not been able to obtain them—and of training those who are not qualified so they can become employable. In this respect, such concentrated employment programs as the Neighborhood Youth Corps, on-the-job training, and institutional training under the Manpower Development and Training Act, and new careers and special impact have resulted in thousands of jobs for disadvantaged persons in our society who held little hope for employment before.

But if there has been any one thing which has made it difficult to step up our efforts, perhaps it has been the multiplicity and complexity of programs and the intricate network of agencies and bureaus which often confront those who wish to help with discouraging confusion.

Mr. President, President Johnson has just announced a new Government-wide pilot program to mobilize the resources of private industry and the Federal Government to help find jobs and provide training for thousands more of America's hard-core unemployed. As I understand the President's proposals, this new program will go far toward cutting through the redtape which has sometimes delayed and even prevented the flow of action needed to move forward with this much-needed task.

The President's new program aims at providing one-stop service for interested businessmen and coordinates effort by the five Cabinet-level departments and three independent agencies which have principal responsibility in this vital field of jobs and training.

Using some $40 million of funds already available, the initial efforts of the coordinated program will be applied to the slum or ghetto areas of five cities and two or three rural poverty areas.

I am particularly pleased to note that our Nation's Capital has been selected as one of these pilot cities. There is not only a real need for this approach to our problems in the District, but, by example, the seat of our National Government should provide leadership to the rest of the Nation in solving our serious urban problems.

Any of us who thinks that this country does not have such problems and a responsibility to solve them has but to look back over the past summer months at the riots which took a tragic toll in lives and cost us millions in property losses.

I am convinced that business and industry shares with us the acute awareness that solutions must be found, and found quickly, to the root causes of these devastating upheavals. It is not only a matter on our collective conscience, it is a matter of economic survival.

The President's new approach deserves our earnest support. It can put the Federal Government and private industry into a new partnership which may very well be the saving of our cities and, indeed, our society. At the very least, it can develop new and quicker avenues of communication, can open up the intricate paths of bureaucracy to something more like an expressway for those who want to help take action.

Surplus Federal property and equipment will be used, present training and job programs will be focused, risks such as vandalism—which have kept business and industry away from the ghetto—will be insured to encourage development of employment where it is sorely needed, in the heart of the problem.

Mr. President, I commend the President for these new proposals and urge Senators to join with me in seriously considering and supporting this new and significant effort.

SENATOR PROUTY ADDRESSES OMAHA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, last week the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] took time out from debating the poverty bill to address 100 members of the Omaha Chamber of Commerce who were in Washington on a study tour.

The topic of the Senator's speech was the Human Investment Act approach to the unemployment and underemployment problems of our Nation. This subject has great relevance today because of our concern over the problems of poverty and our search for solutions to them. I ask unanimous consent that the text of Senator PROUTY's speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

I am delighted to have this opportunity to talk to you today. It is always a pleausre to be able to address high-minded and knowledgeable groups who take time out to familiarize themselves with the legislative process, and crucial issues of the time. Perhaps after this trip to Washington, you can return home and make some contributions of your own by educating fellow citizens and by vocalizing your own views.

Incidentally, I imagine that many of you are also members of the National Federation of Independent Business. This organization performed a very useful service lately when it conducted a survey about job loss resulting from the minimum wage extension. Only after we have necessary data such as that contained in this worthwhile study, can we in Congress formulate laws which will benefit both our workers and our industry.

Gentlemen, all of this week, the United States Senate has been considering and debating the 1967 amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act. This legislation is vitally important to each of us—not only because large sums of money are involved, but because the issues involved are crucial to our well-being and to the well-being of the nation.

Last Monday I made a major speech on the floor of the Senate outlining my views on the Act itself and the War on Poverty in general. Today I would like to speak to you briefly about one aspect of the War on Poverty and present a challenge to you which I hope you and other members of the Chamber of Commerce across the United States will meet.

In 1964 Congress enacted the Administration's Economic Opportunity Act—touted as the ultimate effort in the battle against poverty. All of us—to varying degrees had hopes that a mammoth governmental effort in this sphere of activity would result in the rapid reduction of the evils and ills of poverty in both rural and urban areas of the country.

Our naivete add complacency were shattered less than a year later when Watts erupted in violence. The conflagration has spread to other cities—Chicago, Minneapolis, Newark, Plainfield, New Haven, Detroit and yes—even your own great city of Omaha. Obviously, in the cities we have failed. And it appears as though the poverty war has not made much headway in the rural sections of our country either. Sargent Shriver indicated in a March 11 letter that OEO had spent only 30% of its funds in rural areas and admitted that, "we have not been able to get enough programs active in the rural areas." Obviously, we cannot declare "victory" in our war on poverty. We seem to have reached a stalemate.

The increasing frequency of violence and civil disorder is indicative of the fact that discontent and frustration and resentment are rising among the poor, and that our previous efforts at alleviation of their anguish have failed.

Thus far the only answer to the riots has been an application of force. Force has been necessary since in all cases it was imperative that law and order be restored immediately. However, force cannot speak to the underlying causes of riots. Until we understand these causes and relieve them, force in and of itself can only serve to buy us time.

What are these causes?

Your own Mayor, A. W. Sorensen, who I was pleased to note, was cited by Vice President Humphrey as one of the five mayors in the United States who had done the best job this past summer to head off riots, spoke to this issue last summer.

In August of 1966 he was one of the distinguished leaders of city government who came before Senator Ribicoff's Subcommittee to discuss the crisis in our cities. He came only a month after the July 4 riots in Omaha, during the course of which he was forced to appeal to the Governor to bring out the National Guard to preserve law and order.

With this fresh in his mind, Mayor Sorensen gave the Subcommittee a pentrating analysis of the underlying causes of poverty and unrest. As he saw them, those causes were—overcrowded and substandard housing in the ghetto—the lack of adequate recreational facilities for Negro teenagers—inadequate education opportunities for slum children—inequality of opportunity in choosing a home—poor relations with the police and last, and perhaps most crucial, inadequate job training and jobs.

Those of us who sit on the Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty saw nothing new or startling in this list. What was startling was Mayor Sorensen's repeated and emphatic assertion that the causes of the rioting have not been diminished although the Federal government has initiated program after program to solve the underlying problems of poverty.

"The Negro in Omaha," Mayor Sorensen testified, "wants first class citizenship now instead of a lot of headline promises from government . . . The Federal government is constantly making statements and reports . . . about the millions upon millions of dollars which are available to relieve every social evil that we have . . . The sad fact of life is . . . that much of what we have done, constructive as it may have been, did not reach down to the teenager who was actually causing the riot." (Hearings part 4, p. 1047 (Govt. Op.)

What Mayor Sorensen is saying, it seems to me, is simply this: if government makes extravagant promises that it cannot fulfill, the potential for violence and destruction becomes greater than it would have had no promises been made in the first place. In my judgment, the Government has done just this.

Enthusiastic public endorsements of Great Society programs, particularly the Economic Opportunity Act have tended to raise the aspirations of millions of poor Americans. Yet the expectations of these poor have not been met. Several billion dollars have been voted for the implementation of sorted and sundry programs but very few people have actually benefited.

Let me give you just one example. I am convinced that any real solution to the poverty problem must include massive job training for meaningful employment. One of the main purposes of the EOA, as I understood it, was to give skills to the unskilled, giving as much attention as possible to members of families whose income was below the poverty level.

The job training programs have not been successful, however, and there are great problems which plague the whole effort. There is, for example, too much training for non-existent jobs, and for jobs in which there is already an over-supply of labor. There is so much overlap that it is now an established fact that some programs actually compete for and assist the same needy clientele.

This is understandable if we note that the Federal government alone administers 79 separate training and education programs under the aegis of 15 different bureaus and agencies. The W. E. Upjohn Institute reports that funds for job recruitment can be obtained from nine manpower sources; funds for adult basic education from ten; funds for prevocational training and skill training from ten and funds for work experience from five. On the job training can be subsidized by five programs and supportive services can be funded from nine programs.

Despite all these programs, only some 280,000 persons are being trained in 1966–67—out of an estimated four million who need training. Moreover, follow-up surveys have indicated that the programs are failing to successfully place people in jobs. One half of the public assistance recipients who entered Work Experience and Training programs return to public assistance when they leave it.

The most successful program, in fact, is one which was enacted before the EOA. I speak now of the MDTA which was passed by Congress with strong bipartisan support five years ago.

The legislation for MDTA was written essentially in two parts. The first part, administered by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, authorized educational training and vocational courses, to be conducted by schools of various kinds, for the preparation of the workers. The second part, administered by the Secretary of Labor, authorized contracts with employers for the on-the-job training of workers in skills needed for better jobs.

Although only 14% of all MDTA graduates were unemployed when last contacted, the two parts of MDTA have not been equally successful. Of the institutional graduates almost 25% were unemployed when last contacted. Under this training course type of program, the trainee had no assurance whatsoever of finding a job upon successful graduation.

By contrast, the on-the-job training provisions of the MDTA Act have been vastly more successful. Over 90% of the trainees under this program were actually carried on the payroll of the private firm providing the training. They were trained for jobs with that firm. They filled jobs which were open and waiting for a qualified applicant. Knowing that graduation meant immediate employment with a familiar company in familiar surroundings, their motivation to achieve was high and their dropout rate low. And when their training was completed, over 90% of these OJT trainees were bringing home a paycheck.

In fairness, I must add that OJT trainees were, by and large a better qualified group of workers to begin with. But even with that qualification, there can be no doubt any more that the most effective and economical way to bring jobs to the unemployed is to give them on-the-job training, not under government auspices, but in the private enterprise system.

This point ties in again with Mayor Sorensen's testimony. He said to the Subcommittee that—

"Industry in Omaha has been very generous in cooperating with me in trying to provide jobs for our disadvantaged people. I would like to recommend some Government incentive in providing job training, in jobs for the unskilled, because our industry has been so exceptionally cooperative. Given Federal incentives I believe that private industry can do a tremendous job and will do a tremendous job."

More and more people are coming to the conclusion that the Federal government has not succeeded in its war on poverty, nor can it succeed in the future by its own efforts. Even the most liberal of our leaders and scholars are beginning to agree. Senator Abraham Ribicoff recently admitted with regard to urban renewal, that "it is self-evident that the job is too big to be accomplished by government alone." D. V. Moynihan just the other day stated that "liberals should divest themselves of the notion that the nation . . . can be run from agencies in Washington."

This opinion is not universal, however, as witnessed by the recent efforts of some Senators to attach an "Emergency Employment Act" to the EOA. This would not provide training or supportive services, but would spend an inordinate amount of money—over $2.8 billion for make-work employment. This is not a long-range nor an economically efficient way to solve the unemployment and underemployment programs. I submit, however, that there is a feasible approach which is both economically efficient, and which represents a long-range solution.

Three years ago, in a report signed by myself and Senator Len Jordan of Idaho, I suggested that Congress should provide an incentive to private enterprise to expand job training opportunities—opportunities leading directly to jobs. The simplest method, and the method least susceptible to governmental interference in the affairs of business, was that of a tax credit.

As businessmen, you are all familiar with the 7% investment tax credit enacted at the request of President Kennedy in 1962. That tax credit, applied across the board to all new investment in equipment and machinery, gave American manufacturers a strong incentive to invest in new equipment. The result, taken together with other tax revisions made at the same time, gave a significant boost to the economy. This I can say with the benefit of hindsight, for in 1961 when this issue was before the Senate I was among those who seriously doubted that the proposed credit would lead to the kind of upturn its backers foresaw.

So when a small group of Senators joined me in February of 1965 in introducing legislation to give private enterprise a tax credit toward certain job training expenses, they did so because they believe that investment in human capital—the skills and talents of our labor force—was at least as important to the health of the economy and to the well-being of our people as investment in machines.

That legislation, developed and refined by the efforts of dozens of Congressional staff experts, labor lawyers, economists, training specialists, and businessmen, is now embodied in S. 812, the Human Investment Act. It is sponsored by 29 Senators and some 140 members of the House. I am proud to say among this number is a great United States Senator from Nebraska, my good friend Roman Hruska.

In its original form, the Human Investment Act allowed a tax credit, in addition to the ordinary deduction, of 10% of allowable training costs with maximum of $25,000—plus 50% of tax liability in excess of $25,000. These expenses are defined in the Act. They are, briefly:

1. Apprenticeship wages.
2. Wages of OJT enrollees.
3. Wages of workers in cooperative education programs.
4. Tuition and course fees for workers attending trade, business, or vocational schools or colleges.
5. Tuition and course fees in accredited correspondence schools.
6. Organized job training programs conducted by the taxpayer.
7. Organized job training programs conducted by one taxpayer on contract with another.
8. Organized job training programs conducted by a trade association, joint labor-management council, or other such group.

There are several reasons why the Human Investment Act is preferable to alternative programs that have been advocated in some quarters.

First, it is not unduly costly. A Congressional Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation has stated that the tax exemptions allowed under the Act would result in an annual loss of only "$200 to $350 million of federal revenue," depending on the extent to which the tax credit stimulated new training programs. These dollars would have a multiplied effect, however. With a 10% deduction, each $10 of Federal cost would result in a $100 expenditure on the part of industry for training.

Second, the human investment approach is founded on the strength of the Nation's greatest job trainer, the private enterprise system. Private enterprise alone has the know-how and the equipment to do this job. The private employer knows the needs of the labor market, far better than government officials in Washington.

Third, by using the tax system in this

creative way, private enterprise is spared the intrusion of legions of government officials into company affairs. Red tape, delay, and frustration are held to the minimum. The only government agency the employer deals with is the familiar Internal Revenue Service.

Fourth, the act would quickly help break through the severe skilled labor bottlenecks that have plagued business over the last two years, and which have hampered our war effort abroad. Under the act, investment in human capital is not limited to the hard core unemployed. Employers would have a much needed new incentive to expand programs to upgrade the skills of those already working as well as the unemployed. Thus, as a machinist's assistant becomes a drill press operator, a sweeper may move to machinist's assistant, and an unemployed man may come in to start his climb up the job ladder as a sweeper.

The importance of concept of the skill ladder was clearly described in the Republican views in the Joint Economic Report of 1964:

"The solution to the problem of technological displacement demands a broad national effort to upgrade the labor force by small stages all along the line—providing the unskilled with minor skills, preparing the semiskilled for skilled work, turning the skilled into advanced technicians, and rehabilitating the handicapped. Workers on all levels of the skill ladder must be encouraged and helped to move up into higher and more demanding jobs, leaving the positions which they once held to be filled by less skilled but striving applicants."

Fifth, the Human Investment Act would have an anti-inflationary impact. The shortage of skilled workers leads to rising costs and rising prices. An expansion of the supply of workers with needed skills would help to hold inflation in check. This point is forcefully made in the October, 1966, monthly letter of the highly respected First National City Bank of New York, whose economists specifically recommended the extension of the investment tax credit to investment in human beings.

Sixth, the Human Investment Act would yield disproportionate benefits to the small firm. A Labor Department survey of firms hiring 37 million workers in 1962 revealed that small businesses—those with less than 500 employees—conducted more than their share of job training programs for unskilled, semi-skilled and skilled workmen; big businesses, by contrast, devoted more of their training resources to managerial, administrative, sales and personnel training, which would not be covered by the human investment credit.

These are but a few of the advantages of the Human Investment approach. But rather than exhaust your patience by recounting them further, let me close by describing the progress which this approach has made and the challenge which remains.

Private industry is finding itself more and more unable to fill good jobs because of the shortage of trained, even adequately literate applicants. I was heartened to read in the September 7, 1967, Reporter that some large companies are instituting tape recorded crash courses in the three R's to functional illiterates either already employed or applying for jobs. I was, also, heartened to hear last Sunday on Face the Nation, that some of Rochester, New York's industrial concerns are taking it upon themselves to hire and train the city's 2,000 unemployed. This is but a drop in the bucket of need, however. Larger industries may be able to afford these programs; they may prove too expensive for smaller businesses. The Human Investment tax credit can benefit all business.

Tuesday I offered a modified version of the Human Investment Act on the floor of the Senate as an amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act. My version, which provided $200 million in grants for the purpose of paying 15% of training costs to private industry, unfortunately lost. It was supported by 27 Republicans and only one Democrat.

I am convinced that the Human Investment approach is the major way private industry can be encouraged to enter into job training on a massive scale. Although the tax credit has been a traditionally Republican approach, I do not believe that we can afford the luxury of party politics any longer, when the need for increased training is so desperately great.

Jobs are going unfilled while men remain unemployed. This represents a challenge which must be put to those of us who are concerned about the economics of poverty, and who believe that only if government acts in concert with private industry can solutions be found.

In closing, let me reiterate the points I have made today. For thirty years the Federal Government has become increasingly involved in almost every area of human life. Every time there was a need, someone advocated a new government program to meet it. All too often, in my opinion, the Congress has rushed to enact these programs into law. As a result of this trend, the law books have grown thicker and there has been a proliferation of government agencies, officials, experts, and administrators.

But now it is becoming apparent to all, even those who advocated governmental activity, in the first place that the creation of new programs is just not likely to do the job.

This realization has led to the growing feeling that this Nation can solve its problems only if the immense strength and resources of the private sector is mobilized for that purpose.

I have spoken today about providing the private sector with an incentive to expand job training programs through the Human Investment Act. This is only one example. Basic education, pollution control, public transportation and slum rehabilitation are now increasingly the concerns of private business. Businessmen are beginning to step forward to tackle the problems that government has failed to solve; and government is very slowly beginning to think of itself more as the stimulator and guarantor, rather than an executor and controller.

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States and the Chambers of the individual states have played an active role in spurring this most salutary development. With the brains and dedication of business—and labor, and the colleges, and the churches, and the community organizations—I believe America can and will move forward into a new and brighter era; an era where true opportunity, available to all, makes anguish, despair, poverty and violence in our cities a matter for historians, rather than journalists to discuss and ponder.

FISHERIES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1967

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, on September 18, 1967, I introduced for myself and the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the proposed Fisheries Development Act of 1967, S. 2426.

Both of our offices have had many requests for copies of the bill, and I believe it would facilitate the dissemination of it, were it printed in the RECORD.

Consequently, I ask unanimous consent that the text of S. 2426 be printed in the RECORD.

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

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Fisheries Development Act of 1967."

TITLE I

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 101. The purpose of this title is to coordinate all fisheries extension activity of the Department of the Interior in a Fisheries Extension Service in the Department, to give certain additional authority to the Secretary of the Interior for fisheries extension activities, and to provide certain additional assistance to the fisheries industry.

FISHERIES EXTENSION SERVICE

SEC. 102. (a) In order to aid in diffusing useful and practical information on subjects related to commercial fishing operations, the processing of fisheries products, and the marketing thereof, and to encourage the application of such knowledge, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the Secretary) is authorized to establish in the Department of the Interior a Fisheries Extension Service and to exercise through such Service the existing extension authority of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, as well as the extension authority under the provisions of this section. All such extension activities shall be coordinated with the fisheries extension activities carried on by the States and by the sea grant colleges.

(b) In determining which industries and geographic areas shall receive priority for the purposes of initiating extension activities authorized in this section, the Secretary shall consider such factors as (1) the size of the industries to be affected; (2) the state of their technology as compared to that of similar industries in foreign countries; (3) the extent of the potential resources and markets; (4) the amount of information resulting from relevant research activities; and (5) the economic benefits to be derived from the practical application of such information to commercial operations.

(c) The Secretary is authorized to carry out fisheries extension work pursuant to this section which shall consist of the giving of instruction and practical demonstrations in commercial fishing, in the processing of fisheries products, and in the marketing thereof, to persons engaged in such activities for economic gain, and of imparting information on said subjects through demonstrations, publications, and otherwise. Such work shall be carried on in such manner as may be determined by the Secretary after consultation with appropriate State and local officials, and local representatives of the industries to be benefited by such work.

(d) There are authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this section $10,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1968, $15,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1969, and $20,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1970. Not more than 15 per centum of the funds made available pursuant to this section in any fiscal year may be used to assist the fishing industry in any one State.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS

SEC. 103. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make technical assistance grants to fishery cooperatives, marketing associations, and other private agencies or organizations, to pay in whole or in part the costs of implementing technological improvements in the fisheries for demonstration purposes.

(b) In determining whether to make such a grant, and in fixing the amount thereof, and the terms and conditions on which it will be made, the Secretary shall take into consideration the amount available for grants under this section; the number of applications for such grants; the financial condition of the applicant; and the benefits which are expected to accrue from the proposed demonstration project.

(c) Payments pursuant to a grant under this section may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments as the Secretary may determine.

(d) There are authorized to be appropri-

ated for the purposes of this section $5,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1968, $7,500,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1969, and $10,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1970.

FISHERIES LAW STUDY

SEC. 104. (a) The Secretary is authorized to undertake a comprehensive study and review of existing fisheries regulation at the local, State, and Federal levels. Such study shall include but need not be limited to (1) a review of existing Federal, State, and local regulation of commercial and recreational fishing, and (2) an assessment of the effectiveness of such regulation in promoting the efficient and beneficial use of marine resources.

(b) The Secretary is further authorized to develop a series of model codes suitable for adoption by the various coastal States. These codes shall be designed to harmonize the conflicting interest of commercial and recreational fishing, and to promote the conservation and efficient exploitation of marine resources.

(c) The results of such study and such model codes shall be incorporated into a report on the state of fishery regulation and shall be presented to the Congress and the President on April 26, 1969, and kept up to date by an annual supplement presented on May 31 of each following year.

(d) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this section $1,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1968, plus such additional sums as the Congress may deem necessary for each fiscal year thereafter.

IMPORT STUDY

SEC. 105. In order to aid the Congress in adopting the Nation's tariff policies to the needs of the domestic fishing industry, the Secretary shall submit beginning as soon as practicable a seminannual report to the President and the Congress on the importation of fisheries products into the United States. Such report shall include, but need not be limited to (1) a profile of the quantity and value of the fisheries products imported into the United States in the preceding six months, broken down by tariff category and country of origin, (2) a projection of imports of fisheries products anticipated in the following six months, and (3) an analysis of the effects of these past and projected imports on the domestic fisheries.

FISHING VESSEL CONSTRUCTION SUBSIDIES

SEC. 106. (a) Section 2 of the United States Fishing Fleet Improvement Act (46 U.S.C. 1404), is amended by striking out "and (8)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(8) that the vessel conforms to all applicable water pollution control requirements, and (9)".

(b) Section 5 of such Act is amended by striking out "an amount equal to the difference, as determined by the Maritime Administrator, between the cost of constructing such vessel in a shipyard in the United States based upon the lowest responsible domestic bid for the conclusion of such vessel and the estimated cost, as determined by the Maritime Administrator, of constructing such vessel under similar plans and specifications in a foreign shipbuilding center which is determined by the Maritime Administrator to furnish a fair and representative example for the determination of the estimated total cost of constructing a vessel of the type proposed to be constructed but in no event shall the subsidy exceed 50 percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "50 percent".

(c) Section 12 of such Act is amended by striking out "$10,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$20,000,000".

FISH PROTEIN CONCENTRATE

SEC. 107. Section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to develop through the use of experiment and demonstration plants, practicable and economic means for the production by the commercial fishing industry of fish protein concentrate", approved November 2, 1966 (80 Stat. 1089), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $1,500,000 for each fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1967, to carry out the research authorized by the first section of this Act, and a total amount of not to exceed $1,000,000 for the construction of one experiment and demonstration plant authorized by section 2 of this Act. There is also authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $1,555,000 annually for a period of five fiscal years, beginning with the fiscal year 1968 for the leasing of one additional experiment and demonstration plant, and for the operation and maintenance of experiment and demonstration plants leased or constructed under this Act. Sums appropriated under this section are authorized to remain available until expended. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to amend, repeal, or otherwise modify the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to carry out fish protein concentrate research under any other provision of law."

TITLE II

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 201. The purpose of this title is to conditionally exempt voluntary associations of handlers of certain fish and fish products from certain provisions of the antitrust laws, so that they may, through marketing agreements, promotional and product development activities, marketing research, and other related activities, better regulate the fluctuation of prices and the marketing of fish and fish products which create the unstable and chaotic conditions in the fishing industry.

VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 202. (a) In order to effect the purpose of this title, the Secretary shall have the power, after due notice and opportunity for hearing, to permit the voluntary association for the purpose of this title of fishermen, processors, and others engaged in the handling of any fish or fish products (hereinafter referred to as "handlers").

(b) Such voluntary associations may be formed for the purposes of the issuance of marketing agreements, the development and promotion of a specific product or products, and the establishment of market and product research programs designed to improve the quality or increase the consumption of the product.

(c) The making of any such agreement shall be lawful and shall not be held in violation of any of the antitrust laws of the United States if such agreement meets the requirements of this title and such additional requirements as are prescribed by the Secretary for the purpose of this title.

PURPOSES OF MARKETING AGREEMENTS

SEC. 203. Agreements made pursuant to section 202 may—

(a) limit, or provide methods for limiting, in a fair and equitable manner the total quantity of any fish or fish product, or any grade, size, or quality thereof, produced in any specified manner during any specified period or periods of more than three months each, which may be marketed in or transported to any or all markets during any specified period or periods by each handler or all handlers, but such limits shall be subject to minimum limits determined by the Secretary;

(b) allot, or provide methods for allotting, in a fair and equitable manner the amount of any fish or fish product, or of any grade, size, or quality thereof, which each handler may purchase from or handle on behalf of any and all other handlers during any specified period or periods;

(c) establish or provide for the establishment of reserve pools of any such fish or fish product, or of any grade, size, or quality thereof, and provide for the equitable disposition of the net return derived from the sale thereof among the persons beneficially interested therein;

(d) require or provide for the requirement of inspection of any such fish or fish product produced during specified periods of marketing;

(e) determine, or provide methods for determining the evidence and extent of the surplus of any fish or fish product, or of any grade, size, or quality thereof and provide for the control and disposition of such surplus, and for equalizing the burden of such surplus elimination or control among the handlers thereof;

(f) prohibit unfair methods of competition and unfair trade practices in the handling of any fish or fish product;

(g) provide that any fish or fish product, or any grade, size, or quality thereof shall be sold by the handlers of any class or handlers in the manner provided in such agreement;

(h) provide to the association the powers and duties—

(1) to administer such agreement in accordance with its terms and provisions;

(2) to make rules and regulations to execute the terms and provisions of such agreement;

(3) to receive, investigate, and report on complaints of violation of such agreement; and

(4) to recommend amendments to such agreement; and

(i) make such other provisions incidental to, and not inconsistent with the terms and conditions above specified and necessary to execute the provisions of such agreements.

AGREEMENTS NOT APPLICABLE TO RETAILERS

SEC. 204. Agreements formulated under this title shall not be applicable to any person who sells fish or fish products at retail in his capacity as retailer.

AUTHORITY TO PREVENT SHORTAGES

SEC. 205. The Secretary shall not permit to continue in effect any agreement which reduces the supply of any fish or fish product below a quantity sufficient to provide for normal domestic consumption, exports, and carryover.

SHARING OF EXPENSES

SEC. 206. Each association formed under this title and approved by the Secretary may require that each member thereof shall pay to the association such member's pro rata share (as approved by the Secretary) of such expenses as the Secretary may find are reasonable and are likely to be incurred by such association, during any period specified by him, for such purposes as the Secretary may determine to be appropriate for the maintenance and functioning of such association, other than expenses incurred in receiving, handling, holding, or disposing of any quantity of commodity received, handled, held, or disposed of by such association for the benefit or account of persons other than members. Such pro rata shares shall be computed on the basis of the quantity of the fish or fish products distributed, processed, or shipped by such association, and such other activities as the Secretary may approve.

SEC. 207. (a) All parties to any marketing agreement pursuant to this title shall severally, from time to time, upon the request of the Secretary, furnish him with such information as he finds to be necessary to enable him to ascertain and determine the extent to which such agreement has been carried out or has effectuated the declared policy of this title, and with such information as he finds to be necessary to determine whether or not there has been any abuse of exemptions from the antitrust laws. Such information shall be furnished in accordance

with forms of reports to be prescribed by the Secretary. For the purpose of ascertaining the accuracy of any report made to the Secretary pursuant to this section, or for the purpose of obtaining the information required in any such report, where it has been requested and has not been furnished, the Secretary is authorized to examine such books, records, papers, copies of income tax reports, accounts, correspondence, contracts, documents, or memorandums, as he deems relevant and which are within the control of (1) any such party to such agreement from whom such report was requested, (2) any person having, either directly or indirectly, actual or legal control of or over such party, or (3) any subsidiary of any such party.

(b) All information furnished to or acquired by the Secretary pursuant to this section shall be kept confidential by all officers and employees of the Department of the Interior and only such information so furnished or acquired as the Secretary deems relevant shall be disclosed by them, and then only in a suit or administrative hearing brought at the direction, or upon the request, of the Secretary, or which he or any officer of the United States is a party, and involving the agreement with reference to which the information so to be disclosed was furnished or acquired. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to prohibit (1) the issuance of general statements based upon the reports of a number of parties to an agreement or of handlers subject to an agreement, which statements do not identify the information furnished by any persons, or (2) the publication by direction of the Secretary, of the name of any person violating any marketing agreement, together with a statement of the particular provisions of the agreement violated by such person. Any such officer or employee violating the provisions of this section shall upon conviction be subject to a fine of not more than $1,000 or to imprisonment for not more than one year, or to both, and shall be removed from office.

SEPARABILITY

SEC. 208. If any provision of this title is declared unconstitutional, or the applicability thereof to any person, circumstance, or commodity is held invalid the validity of the remainder of this title and the applicability thereof to other persons, circumstances, or commodities shall not be affected thereby.

SYMPATHY AT DEATH OF MRS. HANNAH NIXON, MOTHER OF FORMER VICE PRESIDENT RICHARD NIXON

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it was with regret that I learned last weekend of the death of Mrs. Hannah Milhous Nixon, in Whittier, Calif.

Mrs. Nixon was a lady of character and dedication. She was an excellent example of the mother who realizes the importance of rearing her children in an atmosphere of Christian discipline, in this case it being based upon the Quaker religion.

The mother of five sons, one of whom died at age 7, Mrs. Nixon was typical of the mothers of the Western part of our country in that she worked to help support her family in addition to filling her role as mother and wife.

The election of her second eldest son, Richard Nixon, to the office of Vice President in 1951 and his subsequent service during the following 8 years often brought her into the public spotlight. She was a lady of few words, but when quoted in the press her comments were always worth hearing.

I wish to extend to the former Vice President, his brothers and other members of the family my heartfelt sympathy at the passing of Mrs. Nixon.

I ask unanimous consent that an article by the Associated Press, in which Mrs. Nixon's death was reported, in the October 1, 1967, issue of The State newspaper, Columbia, S.C., be printed in the RECORD.

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

NIXON'S MOTHER DIES AT 82

WHITTIER, CALIF.—Mrs. Hannah Milhous Nixon, mother of former Vice President Richard M. Nixon, died today in a convalescent home. She was 82.

Nixon's aides said Mr. and Mrs. Nixon and their two daughters would fly to Los Angeles Sunday afternoon from their home in New York.

Mrs. Nixon died in the Whitmar Convalescent hospital, where she had stayed the past two years. She had been ill several years.

Mrs. Nixon moved west to Whittier with her father, Franklin Milhous, in 1897. In 1908 she married Francis Anthony Nixon, who had moved from McArthur, Vinton County, Ohio, to Yorba Linda in 1906. He died in 1956 at the age of 77.

The couple had five sons, Harold, the oldest, died of tuberculosis at 33. Arthur died at 7 of tubercular meningitis.

Richard, the second eldest, was born in Yorba Linda, Jan. 9, 1911. The others are F. Donald, sales executive with Carnation Co., and the youngest, Edward C., a Navy officer.

The elder Nixon, a Methodist, embraced his wife's Quaker religion after they married. They had met at a Quaker church party.

Nixon was a streetcar motorman when he moved to Los Angeles in 1906. He gave that up and became a citrus rancher a year or so later. After marrying, he went into business, opening a market and a gasoline station in Whittier, across the street from Quaker church. The store building formerly had been the church meeting hall.

Mrs. Nixon worked in the store during the day. She always insisted she was sparing with physical punishment during the future vice president's early years:

"For some reason, I could never bring myself to spank Richard. My friends warned me that I'd spoil him, and then I'd have only myself to blame. But it didn't work out that way, did it?"

In 1953, the year after Nixon became vice president, his mother traveled from Whittier to Florida, and made the trip in a chair car instead of a more sumptuous sleeper.

"You meet so many nice people in the coach," she said.

The quiet Quaker woman attended services regularly at the East Whittier Friends Church and reared her sons in the same religion. She was particularly pleased when her vice president son attended with her. On one occasion he flew from Washington to Southern California for a speaking engagement.

"He drove all the way from Anaheim to Yorba Linda, just to take me to . . . church for Sunday morning service," she remembered.

In 1960, when Nixon was seeking the presidential nomination, his mother was asked whether she would campaign for him.

"It's been a campaign since the day he was born," she said. "All his life I've been his campaigner."

Survivors include four sisters, Mrs. Martha Gibbons of Alameda, Calif., Mrs. Oliver Marshburn of Whittier, Mrs. Edith Timberlake, Riverside, Calif., and Mrs. Jane Beeson, Lindsay, Calif.; a brother, Ezra Milhous, of Lindsay; and seven grandchildren.

OMBUDSMAN

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, on several occasions, I have informed Senators of the Ombudsman-like role which our daily newspapers are now performing. In Washington, our Ombudsman today is the "Action Line" column of the Evening Star. In Philadelphia, the Bulletin runs a "Mr. Fixit" column which also takes on Ombudsman-like functions.

Recently, British Prime Minister Harold Wilson's son, working at the University of Pennsylvania, ran into some Internal Revenue Service bureaucratic redtape. With the assistance of the Philadelphia Bulletin's "Mr. Fixit" column, Mr. Wilson's problem was solved.

More and more, we are beginning to see the need for some form of Ombudsman-like creature, whether at the Federal, State, or local level. Early this year, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and I cosponsored a bill to create a small claims tax court of the United States. We were pleased with the overwhelming support for this bill from the majority of my colleagues. Unfortunately, the Committee on Finance has not yet scheduled hearings on this important bill. Had this small claims tax court bill been enacted, Mr. Wilson and countless other taxpayers—citizens or otherwise—would be assured of continuing relief from their problems with the Internal Revenue Service.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, an article published in the September 28, 1967, issue of the Evening Star, which discusses the matter.

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

PEOPLE IN THE NEWS: NEWSPAPER HELPS OUT PRIME MINISTER'S SON

PHILADELPHIA.—Even British Prime Minister Harold Wilson's son runs into red tape when involved with the U.S. government.

Robin Wilson had earned $2,500 last year as a freshman math instructor at the University of Pennsylvania and, as an alien working here temporarily, he was entitled to a full refund of the $250 taxes he paid.

But, after repeated prodding, the Internal Revenue Service sent him only $39.54.

So Wilson wrote the Philadelphia Bulletin's "Mr. Fixit'" column, whose operatives diplomatically informed Washington of the delicate international situation that existed.

The remainder of the $250 was refunded promptly, the Bulletin reported.

DEATH OF JACOB M. LASHLY, OF ST. LOUIS, MO.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, our Nation suffered a great loss with the death of Mr. Jacob M. Lashly on Sunday. Mr. Lashly, of St. Louis, was one of our country's leading lawyers. He was a former president of the American Bar Association and the St. Louis Bar Association. After World War II, Mr. Lashly served as chairman of a special committee established by the ABA to aid lawyers in war-devastated countries. For his service in this capacity, he was awarded

the Medal of Exceptional Service to the Bar by the ABA in 1961. In further recognition of his ability he served as a member of the United Nations Administrative Tribunal from 1953 to 1958.

Mr. Lashly's public service was by no means limited to the bar and related activities. He was former board chairman of the chamber of commerce of Metropolitan St. Louis, former president of the St. Louis Municipal Opera Association, and former president of the board of directors of the St. Louis Public Library. Having served so devotedly and given so much of himself to his community and country, he will be greatly missed.

Mr. President, I want to extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Lashly and the family in this time of grief.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a St. Louis Globe-Democrat editorial and a St. Louis Post-Dispatch article on the life and service of Mr. Lashly be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Oct. 3, 1967]

JACOB M. LASHLY

St. Louis has lost one of its most distinguished citizens in the death of Jacob M. Lashly. An attorney more than 60 years and a former president of the American Bar Association, Mr. Lashly excelled as a leader in local, national and even international affairs.

A man of unusual gifts, he was of distinguished service to his community, his country and his profession. During World War II, he directed the reorganization of military law. After the conflict he was an enthusiastic supporter of the United Nations and one of seven members of the world body's administrative tribunal which acted as a court of last resort of internal disputes.

Mr. Lashly served as president of the Municipal Opera Association from 1942 to 1954, and as president of the board of the St. Louis Public Library from 1953 to 1964. It is fitting that a new branch at 4537 West Pine Bl. was named in his honor.

In other community fields, Mr. Lashly served as a member of the executive committee of the St. Louis Area Boy Scout Council, and as chairman of the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce.

Possibly the honor that Mr. Lashly valued most—and one that he richly deserved—was the Medal of Exceptional Service to the Bar, the highest award conferred by the American Bar Association. He received this in 1961 in recognition of his humane assistance to lawyers in countries devastated by World War II.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Oct. 2, 1967]

JACOB M. LASHLY DIES; LAWYER, CIVIC LEADER

Funeral services for Jacob M. Lashly, St. Louis lawyer and civic leader who died yesterday will be at 11 a.m. Wednesday at Trinity Presbyterian Church, 6800 Washington avenue, University City. Burial will be in Lake Charles Memorial Park.

Mr. Lashly, 85 years old, died of infirmities of age at his home at 20 Windermere place. Members of the family said he died quietly when taking a nap about 1:30 p.m.

He was an attorney here for more than 60 years, and retired from active law practice about two years ago. He was senior member of the law firm of Lashly, Lashly, Rava, Hyndman and Rutherford with offices at 705 Olive street.

HEADED BAR GROUPS

Mr. Lashly was a former president of the American Bar Association and the St. Louis Bar Association, former board chairman of the Chamber of Commerce of Metropolitan St. Louis, former president of the Municipal Opera Association and of the board of directors of the St. Louis Public Library.

He was born in Randolph county, Illinois, and received his early education in the public schools there. He received his bachelor and master of arts degree from St. Louis University and his bachelor of law degree from Washington University.

He was admitted to the Missouri Bar in 1906 and had maintained his law office here since that time. He formerly served as a part-time instructor and lecturer at Washington University.

AIDED WAR EFFORT

Mr. Lashly served as president of the American Bar Association in 1941. As president of the association, he directed the reorganization of military law and marshaled attorneys throughout the country to support the war effort by making citizenship speeches.

After World War II, he served as chairman of the association's special committee on aid to lawyers in devastated countries. He spent several weeks in Europe in 1947 in connection with his duties as chairman of this committee.

In recognition of his services, the American Bar Association's highest award for exceptional professional service to the bar was presented to him in 1961.

The citation stated that he "helped to spread the spirit of comradeship between American lawyers and their colleagues abroad who had suffered privation and indignity."

OTHER SERVICES

In the American Bar Association he served five years as chairman of the committee on commercial law and bankruptcy and two years as chairman of the section on commercial law. He served a three-year term on the general council as a member from Missouri and later was a member of the board of governors for three years.

Mr. Lashly served as a member of the United Nations Administrative Tribunal from 1953 to 1958. The seven-member body was set up by the UN to serve as a court of appeal for discharge employes.

He served as president of the Municipal Theater Association for 12 years, 1942 to 1954. After his resignation as president of the association, he was made an honorary life member.

HEADED LIBRARY BOARD

Mr. Lashly served as a member of the St. Louis Public Library Board for more than 25 years and was president from 1953 to 1964. Two bond issues providing funds for construction of branch libraries were authorized in his term as president.

Surviving are his wife; two daughters, Miss Jean Ellen Lashly of Washington, and Mrs. Elizabeth L. Ferris of St. Louis; a son, John H. Lashly of St. Louis, and a sister-in-law, Miss Mabel M. Henderson of St. Louis.

REVELATIONS ON HOME IMPROVEMENT PRACTICES

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I am sure that many Senators have been reading with interest the series of articles in the Washington Post on the practices of some home improvement firms in the District of Columbia.

I have found these articles interesting and informative, and would like to commend Leonard Downie, Jr., and David A. Jewell, who wrote them, and all others who worked on them, for a superior job of reporting. The articles are splendidly written, and contain a wealth of factual information that must have been difficult to obtain.

I should like also to commend the Montgomery County Sentinel for the series of articles by Martha Robinson, on the subject of home-improvement fraud, which was published last February.

Also, WWDC, the Washington radio station, last winter broadcast a series of editorials dealing with this same subject.

All of these journalistic efforts demonstrate one essential point: The need to protect the consumer against high-pressure and often fraudulent door-to-door salesmanship.

Earlier this session, the distinguished chairman of the Commerce Committee and I introduced legislation aimed at just this problem.

I am pleased to note that the Consumer Subcommittee has scheduled hearings on this bill, S. 1599, the Door-to-Door Sales Act, for early next winter. Once the facts have been gathered, we should act quickly to pass this measure into law. There can be little doubt that it is badly needed.

At least one of the tragic situations reported in the Post this past Sunday could have been avoided if S. 1599 were now public law.

The article states that the day after she signed a contract with the Monarch Construction Co., Mrs. Alberta K. Smith, of 778 Irving Street NW., called Monarch and ordered the firm not to do any work.

If the Door-to-Door Sales Act, S. 1599, were law, she would have been able to cancel her contract within 24 hours of signing.

Instead, she was stuck with her "bargain," and was sued by Monarch for the contract price of $4,500. Fortunately, Mrs. Smith took her case to court, where she was awarded substantial punitive damages—which she has not been able to collect.

S. 1599 would prevent this sort of situation, and spare people like Mrs. Smith considerable worry and expense.

Let me illustrate the whole problem of door-to-door sales with a few examples from Maryland. In my State, about seven out of every 10 homeowners are planning some kind of home improvement. Most of these jobs will be done by contractors, many of whom solicit door-to-door.

The series of articles in the Montgomery County Sentinel showed that Marylanders had been bilked out of sums up to $5,000 because they signed home repair contracts without having time to consider what they were agreeing to.

As a result, nearly 600 complaints a year have been made to the Maryland Home Improvement Commission. Some of these complaints have dealt with shoddy work or other problems. But a large number result from contracts which the homeowner was rushed into signing.

The executive director of the commission, Thomas J. Guidera, has said that the chief characteristic of unscru-

pulous operators is their hurry. They never want the customer to "sleep on the proposition." They want a signed contract right away.

Mr. President, the American consumer needs time to reflect on the implications of a contract signed with a door-to-door salesman. He needs a "cooling-off period."

Often the contracts are signed late at night. A brief period of grace is particularly needed by low-income consumers like those described in the Washington Post article—people especially vulnerable to the tactics of high-pressure salesmen who linger in their homes for hours. S. 1599, the Door-to-Door Sales Act, is designed to protect these people, and shelter them from the abuses detailed in the Washington Post and elsewhere.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the articles by Leonard Downie, Jr., and David A. Jewell in the Washington Post editions of October 1, 2, 3, and 4, 1967, be printed in the RECORD.

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

FIRM DUPED THEM, SAY RESIDENTS

(By Leonard Downie Jr. and David A. Jewell)

A current Washington ghetto synonym for "you've been had" is "you've been Monarched."

The genesis of the term goes back to 1963, when the Monarch Construction Company began its massive canvassing here of low- and middle-class homeowners, selling private "urban renewal": the "American Townehouse Front," other home improvements, debt consolidation, the works.

By the beginning of last year—after Monarch disbanded and its president, Nathan H. Cohen, left town—Monarch had sold contracts to hundreds of Washington homeowners and grossed $2.5 million, according to one estimate.

Cohen said yesterday he would not answer any questions about Monarch operations, whether the company was still in business, or about court suits alleging fraud.

He was reached in Baltimore where he and his mother, who was also a Monarch officer, operate the Baltimore Business School, 303 E. Fayette st., a computer training school.

In more than 25 civil suits in General Sessions and U.S. District Courts here, homeowners have charged that Monarch used high-pressure salesmanship and fraud to get their signatures on contracts and home mortgages.

Monarch's Townehouse Front usually is a combination of white aluminum siding, black aluminum shutters, new windows and door, carriage lamps and trim put on the front of a row house. It can look handsome from a distance, but some owners have complained that the work is shoddy and deteriorating.

Interviews with dozens of Monarch customers draw similar complaints: the Monarch salesman mentioned something about urban renewal and being forced to make improvements; the Townehouse Front looked so nice in the photographs; there were apparent endorsements of Monarch by Negro leaders and Congressmen; there was so much shuffling and signing of papers; finally, there was the debt—often thousands of dollars more than the price they remembered quoted or the worth of the job. Almost always, the note was secured by a deed of trust.

In a civil suit in the Court of General Sessions, Judge Catherine B. Kelly found that Monarch was guilty of using "fraudulent representation" to procure the signature of Alberta K. Smith, 778 Irving st. nw., on a home improvement contract.

Mrs. Smith testified that the Monarch salesman said he was a "representative of urban renewal," that her home "would not be torn down" if she signed the contract and that "urban renewal" would pay $2000 of its cost.

When she called the Redevelopment Land Agency the next day, she testified, she was told it had no connection with Monarch. Mrs. Smith called Monarch immediately and ordered the firm not to do any work.

Monarch sued her for the contract of $4500. Judge Kelly in July, 1966, awarded Mrs. Smith $1525 punitive damages instead. She has not been able to collect.

Monarch might be termed the "granddaddy" of the nearly dozen firms here that have engaged in second mortgage schemes. A number of companies are under investigation by four Federal agencies and by the U.S. Attorney's office.

Usually, Monarch got the customer's signature on a mortgage to his home, too. Several homeowners complained in the court suits and interviews with reporters that they did not know they were signing mortgages, that no notary public was present, or that the amount of the debt was not the same or did not cover all the work as they had been told.

When Monarch obtained mortgage loans insured by the Federal Housing Administration through a reputable bank, the amount was usually $3500 total cost for the job plus $837 financing charges.

MAXIMUM ALLOWED

The final $4337 amount on the mortgage is the maximum allowed by the FHA under its Title I home improvement program. Usually the customer received the American Townehouse Front which, court suits show, cost Monarch about $1500.

The FHA allows 15 per cent overhead and 40 per cent profit. This would total about $2500 for a Townehouse Front. Monarch usually charged about $3500, plus interest.

Like the customers of nearly a dozen other home improvement firms investigated by reporters from The Washington Post in the past four months, the homeowners who were "Monarched" must pay or lose their homes.

At least three homeowners have lost their homes after signing Monarch contracts. At least six more are in court trying to stave off foreclosures.

Clarence and Georgia Winters, who live in a modest row house at 1102 Park st. ne., are trying to fight that inevitable fate.

Winters 61, has worked as a skilled laborer for a Washington construction firm for 20 years. His wife, who is 54, has worked for the past seven years as a cook for Sen. Stuart Symington (D-Mo.).

GOOD CREDIT RECORD

In buying furniture, appliances and cars on time over the years, the Winterses have maintained a good credit record. During the 16 years they lived in the house on Park Street, they whittled the first trust on their home down to less than $1000. That is, until Monarch came along in December, 1964.

What happened since to the Winterses is recounted by them under oath in separate depositions filed in their suit in the U.S. District Court:

A woman had called Mrs. Winters talking about improvements to be made in her neighborhood. It was not until two men came to her house a few days later that she knew the call came from Monarch. (Monarch, is believed to have called 6000 homeowners while it was in business.)

The salesmen "were so friendly and nice" and showed them photographs of other Negro homeowners, some prominent Washington Negroes and homes "improved" with an American Townehouse Front.

"They said that Roy Wilkins sent them there," Mrs. Winters attested.

One salesman "said he was going to do the whole entire front, and he was going to remove the windows and give us new windows, and build a brick wall all around the front, and a cement porch, and the aluminum siding."

The Winters said their kitchen was what really needed work. The salesman told them that the kitchen work would be included, too, and the whole job would be $2000 cheaper than usual "by letting him write it up in December."

The Winters family says the prices quoted that night and on other nights by Monarch salesmen varied from $2500 to $4000. They said they signed one set of contracts the first night, which were taken away from them and replaced by others when the salesmen came back later.

Then, one night three months later, the salesmen came to the Winters home again and asked the couple to sign the top page of a "big pad" of documents.

In their depositions, the Winters couple states further that one of the men identified himself as Nathan Cohen and explained that the other papers were copies of the top page.

"It is just as much for your benefit as it is for mine," Mrs. Winters says Cohen told her as they sat at the dining room table. "We have to get some more copies."

When Winters asked why so many copies were necessary, a man who had accompanied Cohen told Winters to "calm down, you're getting all upset." He took Winters into another room to look at the Winters furniture. The man told him that some of it appeared to be "antiques."

Cohen placed the thick pad in front of Mrs. Winters and told her to "press hard, press real hard," according to her deposition. When Winters came back into the room, he saw his wife's signature and signed himself.

It was only later, the Winterses said, when they got a payment book from Citizens Building and Loan Association of Silver Spring, that they discovered their signatures were on a mortgage (deed of trust) on their home for $4,337 and on a completion certificate for the work.

As work progressed on their home, the Winterses found several things that displeased them: cement splashed on the front door, rags and other refuse left on the front lawn, sticky windows, a loose lamp.

Winters, who worked as a carpenter's helper on his construction job, was particularly upset by "the rough job" a workman was doing in his kitchen: such as wooden panels installed upside down, with wide gaps between them.

REFUSE TO PAY

He stopped Monarch's carpenter from doing anything further on the kitchen and began calling Monarch to complain. The Winterses said they never got a satisfactory answer to their complaints and, when they received the payment book from the bank, called to say they would not pay until the job was finished right.

That was when they found the Citizens Building and Loan had already paid Monarch its $3500 out of the $4337 loan insured by the Federal Housing Authority. The bank said Monarch had presented a signed completion certificate required by the FHA.

The Winterses insist they never signed a completion certificate, since the work was never finished. The completion certificate the bank's attorney has introduced into the court record has no date on it, in violation of FHA regulations.

The bank has introduced into the suit the mortgage it holds to secure the Winters loan. It bears a different date than the mortgage recorded with the District Recorder of Deeds.

Complaints about Monarch first surfaced

in the autumn of 1964, after it had been in business for a little more than a year.

In a story published in The Washington Post on November 1, 1964, several owners of homes on unrestored fringes of Capitol Hill complained about Monarch's sales tactics. One woman had already filed suit in U.S. District Court, charging Monarch with "trickery" and "false pretenses."

The homeowners said that Monarch's telephone solicitation, sprinkled heavily with references to "urban renewal" and "talking to you about schedules for your property and your street," led them to believe the Government was somehow behind it.

NO MONOPOLY

Cohen told a reporter then that "we don't think the Government has a monopoly on the words." He said then: "Our program is to rehabilitate a large part of Washington over a period of ten years. If we'd remodel the insides of houses nobody'd see them, while on the outside you can see the change right away."

At the same time, the Capitol Hill Restoration Society, complained about Monarch to Government agencies. Some homeowners and a former Monarch salesman went to talk with prosecutors in the U.S. Attorney's Office about Monarch in 1964.

Yet Monarch's business continued to flourish. In January and February of 1965, it took out full-page newspaper advertisements criticizing Federal urban renewal as "far more urban removal" and boasting its own "private urban renewal program" as having "created $2,149,500 in new first trust loans" and "$300,000 worth of approved Title I FHA loans."

But the FHA was investigating Monarch by then and, on May 11, 1965, placed the firm on its "precautionary measures list."

Notice went out to all banks handling FHA-insured loans that FHA had information "indicating that the subject has not conducted his operations . . . consistent with the purposes and objectives of the FHA Property Improvements Program."

Banks were instructed to deal with Monarch only in cases in which bank officers personally checked the contractors' work and to have completion certificates signed in the presence of bank officers.

Monarch no longer obtained FHA insured loans. Instead, it sold some of its second mortgage notes to Allstate Mortgage Corp., now of 1111 Massachusetts ave. nw. Allstate, in turn, sold some of the mortgages to the Atlas Credit Corporation of Philadelphia (recently renamed Sunasco as a result of mergers). Atlas assigned the notes to its subsidiaries to collect payments from the Washington homeowners.

Monarch also was still able to obtain, from reputable banks, new first mortgage loans not insured by the FHA for its customers. Money from these mortgages was used to pay off the customers' old mortgages and, in some cases, also to pay Monarch for home improvements.

In many of these cases, records indicate that Monarch also obtained the customers' signatures on a new second, and sometimes a third, mortgage. Money from these also went to Monarch for home improvement contracts.

After being involved in more than 50 suits in Washington's courts—more than 25 involving charges of fraud against it—Monarch has suffered one judgment against it and lost four other times on dismissals when it failed to answer questions filed by opposing attorneys.

Monarch and the dozen other firms under investigation are a minority of the home improvement contractors who do business in the city. Most contractors are reputable businessmen who tell customers just what they are getting and how much it will cost.

SUITS HIT MORTGAGE PRACTICES—MISLED ON LOAN TERMS, CLAIM HOMEOWNERS

(By Leonard Downie Jr., and David A. Jewell)

Custom House Construction Co. went into the business of home improvement construction on March 3, 1966, in an office at 7849 Eastern ave., Silver Spring.

Almost six months to the day later, Custom House went out of business, according to its president, Harvey W. Davis.

Records in the D.C. recorder of deeds office show 55 second mortgages worth $250,000 made out to Custom House.

In the past four months, a team of reporters from The Washington Post interviewed 23 Custom House customers.

All are low-income Negroes, elderly and often widowed, and in each case the price of the job done or products received (such as a paint job or a color television set) was secured by a mortgage on their homes.

DIDN'T KNOW OF MORTGAGE

Four Custom House customers said they had no idea there was a second mortgage on their homes until they were told so by reporters. The other 19 said they first learned of the mortgages from United State postal inspectors, who are investigating Custom House.

At least one customer, Chester Thompson, has lost his home through foreclosure on the second mortgage. Six others—faced with foreclosure—filed court suits charging that their signatures on the mortgages were secured through fraud.

A pattern appeared in the complaints:

The customers were contacted by Custom House, not vice versa.

The customers said they signed what they thought was a contract but later turned out to be a note and mortgage.

The customers said there was no notary public present when they signed the "papers" although the mortgages on their homes bore notarization seals.

All said they received payment books in the mail from companies they had never heard of demanding payment of notes they didn't know they had signed.

The 23 additional Custom House customers interviewed by reporters said the same points apply in their cases.

Custom House is one of nearly a dozen home-improvement firms under investigation by Federal authorities for their second mortgage dealings in Washington. The U.S. attorney's office expects grand jury action within two weeks.

The vast majority of home-improvement firms in Washington enjoy good reputations.

PRICE ABOVE APPRAISALS

Sources said that one professional appraiser who dealt with Custom House said that when he had done appraisals for Custom House the firm automatically increased its prices well above the appraisals.

Suits in court indicate that Custom House would then quote prices to the customers but give them contracts to sign, the face values of which would be double the quoted prices.

In two court suits, customers have claimed notes and mortgages were filed against their home for at least double the amounts quoted on the jobs by the Custom House salesman.

The contract in one case tells the story:

One customer had the front of his house painted "for the total sum of $2350." The contract says that the customer agrees "to pay the sum of $2350 upon completion, secured by a note of $5875 plus 8 per cent interest in monthly installments of $58.75."

When reporters asked the customer, an elderly man who cannot work because he is being treated for cancer, why he agreed to $5875 for work that cost "the total sum of $2350," the homeowner replied:

"I thought just the monthly payment was $58.75."

USED TELEPHONE SALESGIRLS

Custom House employed a battery of girl telephone solicitors. One of the girls told an investigator about the sales talk:

The girls were given phone numbers of houses in low-income Negro areas selected from a cross-index file.

They were told to hang up if they judged a white person had answered.

Otherwise, they were to find out within 60 seconds if the resident of the house owned or was buying the house.

If it was discovered the resident was only renting, they were under orders to terminate the conversation and make another call.

Otherwise, they would try to interest homeowners in anything from a television set to a new roof. If the prospects seemed good, they would then turn the files over to salesmen.

One of Custom House's first jobs was on the home of Albert and Mattie Smalls, at 401 11th st. se.

SMALLS FILE SUIT

After being threatened with foreclosure, the Smalls filed suit against Custom House charging "willful, deliberate and malicious fraud."

The Smalls' suit says the salesman told them he could fix up the front of their house for $800.

They thought that would be nice, but lamented that they already had debts of $4900 and didn't feel they could afford it.

The salesman then said he could arrange to get them a loan that would permit them to pay off the $4900 as well as cover the cost of fixing up the house front, according to the suit.

They agreed to this, and signed papers they thought were contracts and loan application forms.

The job was done. They learned later, however, that only $575 worth of outstanding debts were paid off, leaving them with $4397 in old debts plus a mortgage on their home for $500 that they didn't know they signed, the suit says.

The couple paid $1000 on this note until they contacted attorney John J. Carmody Jr., who filed suit. On July 24, 1967, U.S. District Court Judge Joseph C. Waddy issued a temporary restraining order against the present holder of the Smalls' note, prohibiting the holder from making any further collections until the court case is decided.

ACCEPTANCE CORP. NAMED

The Smalls' suit also named as defendant a company called Universal Acceptance Corp., located at 6400 Georgia ave. nw.

According to official D.C. records, a founder, a director and president of Custom House is Harvey W. Davis of 8313 Raymond st., Potomac.

According to these same records, Harvey W. Davis is also secretary, treasurer and a director of Universal Acceptance, with an address at that time of 8804 Lanier dr., Silver Spring.

Davis told a reporter: "I really can't answer your questions. I really don't know much about that. I took in a partner who knew the home-improvement business. He did the selling and I did the bookkeeping. I never knew any contracts were fraudulent."

All notes and mortgages generated by Custom House were sold immediately, sometimes within hours, to second parties, known legally as "holders in due course."

The Smalls' case was no exception. Their note was sold to Universal Acceptance. Much of the paper generated by Custom House went to Universal.

The Smalls' suit contains the following allegation:

"Davis conspired with both Custom House and Universal to hatch a scheme whereby Custom House would fraudulently obtain a promissory note, reinforce its right to enforce the terms of the note by fraudulently

obtaining a deed of trust (mortgage) against the property, fail to perform the consideration for said note, sell the note to Universal at a fraudulent discount rate, allow Custom House to lapse into insolvency thereby defrauding potential creditors and hide the whole behind the sham shield of the 'holder in due course' defense of Universal."

NOTE DISCOUNT CLAIMED

The suit also alleges that Universal bought the Smalls' $5500 note from Custom House for $2200—at a discount of 60 per cent.

Many Custom House notes were sold at discounts ranging from 40 to 60 per cent.

The U.S. Court of Appeals here has characterized discounts of 40 per cent or more as "outrageous" and stated that such discounts, if there are also circumstances such as the purchase of notes executed by unknown persons whose credit has not been investigated, constitute a "badge of fraud."

An answer to this suit was filed on behalf of Universal by Bernard T. Levin, a local attorney. The answer denied all allegations of fraud and maintained that Universal had purchased the note in the ordinary course of business.

In its answer, Universal argued that it was merely a "holder in due course," and it also filed a counterclaim against the Smalls for $5,119.55 not yet paid on the note, plus attorney's fee.

Custom House Construction Co. has not yet answered the allegations contained in the Smalls' suit.

The signature of the notary public who swore she witnessed the Smalls' signatures on the $550 mortgage on their home was Louise Beane.

In January of this year, Louise Beane, a licensed notary public in Maryland, was indicted and charged with the false notarization of two mortgages in Washington.

NOTARY PLEADED GUILTY

Mrs. Beane pleaded guilty and received a suspended sentence in U.S. District Court here.

Those two mortgages had been generated by Custom House. Mrs. Beane notarized a total of 27 mortgages generated by Custom House.

In six court suits, homeowners have claimed that they did not know they signed mortgages, that no notary public was present when they signed papers and that they had never seen anyone named Louise Beane, either in their homes or in Maryland. Numerous other homeowners made similar claims to reporters.

Seven Custom House notes were purchased by a District realtor named Leonard Freedman, of 761 17th st. nw., for what investigators say were 40 per cent or greater. Freedman denies the discounts were that large.

One of those mortgages was on the home of an elderly widow, Alberta Kibler, or 1737 D st. se.

After her home was threatened with foreclosure, she filed suit against Custom House and Freedman, charging that her mortgage was secured by fraud through a conspiracy between Custom House and Mrs. Beane.

Her suit alleges that Custom House's dealings with her were "part of a conspiracy in which Louise Beane similarly made many false notarizations for Custom House."

It says that she was quoted a price of $2750 for a new kitchen and discovered a mortgage against her home she didn't know she had signed for $5550.

FIRM DENIES FRAUD

Custom House answered this suit with a denial of fraud and conspiracy and denied that Mrs. Beane was an agent of Custom House.

Freedman answered by saying he was without sufficient knowledge to admit or deny the charges since he was merely a "holder in due course" and he denied any conspiracy existed. He said yesterday that "all I can do is check the District records to see that it's a legitimate mortgage. I dealt with Custom House the same way I dealt with everybody else."

One Custom House customer, Amanda Green, 56, of 829 Sheridan st. nw., bought four air conditioners for what she thought was "a little over $2000" and later learned there was a mortgage on her home for $5800, plus 7 per cent interest.

Her paper was purchased from Custom House by Freedman. He showed her a note bearing her signature that called for payments of $33.50 a month for 60 months.

At this rate Mrs. Green could not have paid off the interest due on the note by the end of the 60 months, much less the principal.

Since by the 60th month she would have only paid $2010, much of it having gone to pay off interest, Mrs. Green stood to lose her home unless she could pay the balance or obtain a new loan for it.

If she refinanced the note for the same schedule of monthly payments, she would not have been able to pay off the principal due in her lifetime, Federal investigators say.

Mrs. Green hired an attorney before making any payments. He hired an appraiser who valued the air conditioners at $974. U.S. postal inspectors had them appraised for $971.

Mrs. Green's attorney reached an agreement with Freedman whereby he wiped off the mortgage on her home in return for a payment of $1000.

LABORER SUES

Frank Harris, of 124 10th st. ne., an illiterate, elderly laborer has filed suit saying he was tricked into signing a $7450 mortgage on his home and received only $500 worth of work in return.

His suit claims he signed certain papers because Jack Shulman, Davis' partner and the salesman in this and many Custom House transactions, promised him that Custom House would pay off two previous mortgages on his home.

On the original two mortgages, he was paying a total of $100 a month, Harris said, in the suit. He also said that he had to pay $80 a month on the new mortgage held by Custom House, plus the same old $100 he had been paying.

He earns $65 a week.

Shulman, of 5300 Westbard ave., Bethesda, and Custom House answered the suit and denied any fraud or wrongdoing.

MENTIONED IN SUITS

Shulman is mentioned in most of the Custom House suits as the salesman involved and by most of the customers contacted by reporters.

Shulman told a reporter that none of the mortgages signed up by him were obtained by fraud.

"You will find they were all legitimately signed," said Shulman.

Shulman said that in each instance he was accompanied by a notary public, including those in which Louise Beane's signature appears on the mortgage.

The activities of Custom House, and several other home-improvement contractors, are being looked into by Federal authorities. Most home-improvement contractors are reputable businessmen who tell customers what they are getting and how much it will cost.

Five Custom House mortgages ended up in the hands of Atlas Credit Corp. of Philadelphia, which has been renamed Sunasco, Inc., following a merger. Atlas is now also under investigation by Federal authorities.

Atlas buys second mortgage paper from firms in 40 states and two Canadian provinces.

INTERCOM BUYERS EXPECTED PRIZES, BUT GOT MORTGAGES

(By Leonard Downie Jr. and David A. Jewell)

"The salesman made it seem so nice," one housewife remembered. "It looked as though we could cut the total price way down—maybe even make a profit."

She did not make a profit. Instead, she is paying more than she expected for a very special kind of status symbol—a home intercom system. And she had a second mortgage on her home that she never knew she signed.

She is one of scores of customers of six local firms who sold inte.coms and water softeners during the past five years and whose sales practices are now under investigation by Federal authorities.

There are many reputable electrical firms in Washington that sell such equipment without questionable sales methods and without obtaining second mortgages to secure payment of the sales price.

The salesmen of the six firms under investigation went door-to-door in ghetto and other inner-city neighborhoods where the intercoms and water softeners are surprisingly big sellers.

The six firms used "chain referral" sales schemes in which salesmen offered homeowners a chance to get large amounts of their money back by referring new customers to the firm.

Their customers have complained, in court suits and interviews with reporters of The Washington Post, that they did not get much or any money back and that they wound up with second mortgages on their homes—mortgages they didn't know they had signed.

The six firms are among a dozen under investigation by local and Federal authorities for their second-mortgage practice.

Reporters went through real estate records and called homeowner after homeowner listed as having $1389 second mortgages on their homes. Time after time, it turned out that the homeowner was a customer of one of the firms, Allied Enterprizes Inc.

Many said they had not known that the mortgages existed. Those who did know about them said they had not found out until they were contacted by police or Federal investigators, or called the finance company that was collecting their payments.

The homeowners all told the same story:

An Allied salesman came to their home to tell them about the intercom system—complete with am-fm radio, and burglar and fire "panic" alarms.

The $1389 price seemed high to the homeowner. (One electrical contractor told reporters that a maximum for this type of job would be $600, without financing charges.)

PROMISED PRIZES

But the Allied salesman told them they could get money back in "prizes" for referring friends to Allied as customers, according to the homeowners.

The homeowner was told he would become an "equipment-owning representative" and receive $100 for each person referred who bought an intercom. And he could receive up to $1000 in additional prizes for making 45 "qualified demonstrations" of his intercom system to prospective customers.

But a Federal Trade Commission examiner found earlier this year that "few, if any" of Allied's customers received "enough referral commissions to obtain their intercom at little or no cost."

Allied's salesmen made "false, misleading and deceptive" statements to customers that the intercom was "being sold at a reduced price as an introductory or advertising plan," the FTC examiner ruled.

And, he added, Allied's salesmen, "for the purpose of inducing the sale" of its product, failed to inform customers that they were signing a second mortgage on their home.

The FTC examiner ordered Allied, and its president, William R. Marion Sr., to "cease and desist" from using chain-referral selling schemes or any "false, misleading or deceptive" statements in trying to get names of more prospective customers.

WENT OUT OF BUSINESS

At about this time, when the FTC order was issued last January, Allied went out of business. It left behind more than 200 homeowners with nearly $300,000 worth of second mortgages, according to District real estate records.

Five homeowners have brought suit against Allied in U.S. District Court charging that the firm defrauded them through misleading chain referral sales schemes, and obtained their signatures on second mortgages without their knowledge.

Marion, who lives at 211 Dorset rd., Laurel, Md., said last night the suit against him "is nothing but paper. They know I didn't do anything wrong."

He said he did not know what his salesmen told his customers but they were periodically told at sales meetings not to misrepresent the referral program. "But lying is a salesman's business," he said. "You know that. I know what they do.

"These people (his customers) were trying to get something for nothing."

He said that each deal he made was consummated by Samuel C. Cratch Jr., Marion's public relations director, so there would not be any misrepresentation.

He said that after a customer's credit was approved Cratch would call on the customer at his home, accompanied by a notary public, so the signatures could be witnessed. In each case, he said, the customer was made aware that he was signing a second mortgage on his home and the signature on the mortgage was notarized on the spot.

ABOUT $30,000 IN PRIZES

Marion said while he was in the intercom business he paid out about $30,000 in referral prizes. He said the highest was $600 to Josephine Hill of the Deanwood area and "Lots got two, three, and four hundred dollars."

He added that most of the customers did not give his firm genuine referrals.

Marion called the FTC action against him "meddling."

One homeowner who has filed suit against Allied, Lugenure Talbert, of 1224 Farraday pl. ne., said in her suit that Cratch persuaded her to buy an intercom after he had explained the sales referral plan.

After the intercom was installed, she said, Cratch returned with more papers to sign. "You signed the contract improperly," Mrs. Talbert quoted Cratch in her court complaint. She signed again.

She said she did not realize that she must have signed a mortgage at that time until she got a letter from the Atlas Credit Corp. in Philadelphia informing her that it had bought her note, secured by a second mortgage. Her note was for $1389, the price of the intercom plus financing charges.

Cratch, in his answer to Mrs. Talbert's complaint, denied any wrongdoing. Atlas answered that it bought the note without knowledge of any fraud. Allied has not yet answered the suit.

Mrs. Talbert also charged that no notary public was present when she signed the papers in her home. The other four homeowners who sued Allied also said that they never appeared before a notary public during their dealings with Allied.

Yet in all five cases, the name and seal of the same notary public in Prince George's County, Md., appears on second mortgage in favor of Allied filed in the D.C. Recorder of Deeds office.

Several Allied customers interviewed by reporters said they would not have bought the intercoms if they had realized they were signing second mortgages to secure the notes for them. They also said they would have rejected the deal if they had known they wouldn't get any referral "prizes."

FEW GOT PRIZES

Only a few of the Allied customers interviewed said they got any money back from Allied at all. No one interviewed said they received more than $100.

Allied broke down its $1389 price for the intercom into $992 for the equipment and installation and $397 financing charges. The system included the intercom master panel with an am-fm radio, six speakers and fire and burglar alarm devices.

The same brand of intercom system was sold by yet another firm operating here until late last year. This firm was called United Home Enterprises Corp., which also sold water softeners. United did at least $120,000 worth of business here in two years, real estate records show.

In February, two of its officers, Robert M. Cederloff and Adrian J. Barba, were indicted by a U.S. grand jury, which charged them with forging the names of eight Washington homeowners on eight mortgages in favor of United Home Enterprises. Their case is still pending and they are free in custody of their counsel.

Three of the homeowners named as complaining witnesses in the criminal case have filed suit against United Home Enterprises, claiming that their signatures were obtained on second mortgages by "fraud, trick and device" or by forgery.

They charge that they were talked into buying intercoms or water softeners at prices "in excess of the fair value of the equipment," again through the device of being offered money "prizes" for customer referrals.

In all three cases, the homeowners also charged that they never appeared before a notary public while signing papers for the United salesman.

In two cases, the seal and signature of a Prince George's County notary appears on the mortgage filed with the D.C. Recorder of Deeds. In the third case, the notarization is by a D.C. notary public.

NOTARIZATION DISPUTED

Other United Home Enterprises customers whose mortgage signatures were notarized by these two notaries told reporters that they never appeared before a notary public.

Cederloff said he told all the homeowners that they were signing "a second trust," although he added that he did not explain what it meant. "If you are a property owner, you should know what that means," Cederloff said.

When asked about the use of a chain referral sales method that homeowners have claimed is fraudulent, Cederloff said that "my firm is not being accused of this in the indictments."

Cederloff said the firm stopped doing business last year. "I don't feel that I misrepresented anything to the people," he says.

Besides Allied and United, at least four other firms have sold intercoms or water softeners to Washington homeowners using the chain referral sales method and obtaining signatures unknowingly in second mortgages, according to homeowners' court complaints.

According to court suits, interviews with homeowners, and information in the D.C. Recorder of Deeds office, the majority of the notes and mortgages generated by Allied Enterprizes and United Home Enterprises was bought by the Atlas Credit Corporation of Philadelphia (since merged into Sunasco, Inc.), through a Washington mortgage broker.

Atlas is named as a defendant in seven of the eight court suits by homeowners against the two intercom firms. In each case, Atlas answered by saying that it bought the notes as a third party "without knowledge of any fraud" in the obtaining of the notes.

The law generally presumes that the third party—the "holder in due course"—has bought the note in good faith and has the right to collect on the note it paid for.

CITY HIT FOR "SLOWNESS" IN PROBE OF MORTGAGES

(By Leonard Downie Jr. and David A. Jewell)

The General Improvement Contractors Association of Washington criticized the city government yesterday for being "so slow" to move against the Monarch Construction Co., a home-improvement firm whose second mortgage practices were revealed in The Washington Post.

John H. Haas, executive vice president of the Association, said his group complained to the city about Monarch in mid-1963, when Monarch first started selling its "American Townehouse Front" here.

Haas said a hearing was held at the District Building as a result of his group's complaint, under the aegis of the city's Department of Licenses and Inspections.

Haas said that an L & I spokesman said Monarch's activities would be considered, but that nothing ever happened.

Between that hearing and December, 1965, when Monarch went out of business (and its president, Nathan Cohen, and secretary-treasurer, Thelma Cohen, left the city), Monarch had contacted 6000 homeowners and had written $2.4 million worth of contracts, according to Federal investigators.

Monarch and nearly a dozen other home-improvement firms are being investigated by four different Federal agencies.

Haas said yesterday that the home-improvement firms cited in The Washington Post were "an exception to the rule as far as home-improvement contractors in the District are concerned." He added:

"I can only say now, 'We told you so.' We tried to bring attention to Monarch and these other firms before, but no one listened."

Haas said his Association had also complained to the Federal Housing Authority about Monarch.

The FHA put Monarch on its precautionary measures list on May 11, 1965, 7½ months before Monarch ceased operations.

Sen. Charles H. Percy (R-Ill.) said yesterday that he had written the FHA asking for recommendations on remedial legislation that would assure no repetition of the practices described in the newspaper articles.

Sen. Percy said he was "shocked" at the revelations.

Meanwhile, Corporation Counsel Charles T. Duncan said he was ordering his staff to examine the city's licensing regulations for home-improvement contractors "to see whether any changes are needed and to take whatever steps may be necessary."

Duncan said that "the regulations are not self-enforcing and we have not received any complaints from citizens since I have been here. Perhaps people aren't aware the regulations exist."

Rep. Wright Patman (D-Tex.), chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, said he felt there were "some mighty big people in on" the second mortgage practices occurring here.

He said he intends to confer today, with Rep. William B. Widnall (R-N.J.), about how best to conduct an investigation into the situation here. "Things such as this have caused riots," Widnall said.

Widnall called Saturday for a House investigation of the home-improvement firms cited in the articles.

Rep. Leonor K. Sullivan (D-Mo.), chairman of the House Banking Committee's subcommittee on consumer affairs, said the revelations prove her point that the new Consumer Credit Protection Act she is sponsoring needs a clause governing first mortgages.

She said that opponents are attacking a

first-mortgage clause on grounds that first mortgages rarely are connected with questionable business practices.

Some of the home-improvement contractors cited in articles have secured new first mortgages on customers' homes, while the customers have claimed they thought they were signing only loan contracts.

Also yesterday, U.S. Attorney David G. Bress said his special fraud squad was undertaking an "intensive investigation" into the second-mortgage field here.

He said again that he expected that his office would make presentments to a grand jury within two weeks. Bress' fraud squad, however, consists only of Assistant U.S. Attorney Seymour Glanzer, and Glanzer reportedly was not detached from his regular duties for the investigation until yesterday, after articles had appeared about the practices.

Glanzer is being assisted by John Risher, an attorney lent for the purpose from the Department of Justice.

Sen. Joseph D. Tydings (D-Md.) has been working up a bill on consumer protection, and the bill is expected to be submitted shortly. There was some speculation yesterday that he may try to hold hearings this month about the disclosures on second-mortgage practices.

RETIREMENT OF CLYDE T. ELLIS FROM GENERAL MANAGERSHIP OF NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC ASSOCIATION

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, when the Rural Electrification Administration was established May 11, 1935, by an Executive order of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, only 11 percent of the Nation's farms had electric service. Now 98 percent of our farms have electricity. Great progress has been achieved under the REA program. Farm families have improved their standard of living and American consumers have benefited from increased efficiency of production.

Much of the advancement enjoyed by our farm families is directly attributable to the dedication and leadership of one man, Clyde T. Ellis, whose name has become synonymous with the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. As the general manager of the association since its establishment in 1943, he worked untiringly toward a better life for American farmers. His efforts are clearly shown in the loans of approximately $6 billion to over 900 cooperatives throughout the country.

When he retired September 8, his service to electric cooperatives did not come to an end, for Mr. Ellis will continue to serve as a consultant and special adviser.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial concerning his retirement, published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of September 23, be printed in the RECORD.

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

SALUTE TO CLYDE ELLIS

Clyde T. Ellis's retirement from the general managership of the National Rural Electric Co-operative Association marks the end of an era. NRECA and Clyde Ellis have been practically synonymous since he became its general manager when it came into existence a quarter-century ago; and during all that time, which comes only four years short of half his own life to date, he has served with an intensity of dedication exceptional for any man. His strength became the strength of his organization, given unstintingly and endlessly, and it was and is great.

He entered the service of bringing electricity to the countryside when the decisive question was whether it could be done at all, having never before been attempted. He has ever since been in the thick of an unremitting fight to protect the rural electric cooperatives from hostile power companies and their partisans in Congress. For the past several years he has been engaged in the challenging effort to adapt the co-ops' financing to meet expanding demand for electricity despite a static amount of credit available in Government loans.

The plan for a gradual transition to open-market credit which has resulted is to our mind one of Mr. Ellis's most brilliant achievements. That it has thus far not become a reality is no failure of Mr. Ellis, but that of Congress. In retiring from the arduous duties of general manager Mr. Ellis will continue to serve NRECA as a consultant and special adviser. He carries with him the gratitude and regard of those many whose lives he has helped so much to better. We warmly wish him all the satisfactions of having been in the forefront of a strenuous endeavor.

STUDY OF VIETNAM BY RIPON SOCIETY

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous approval to have printed in the RECORD of a recent study published by the Ripon Society.

This research report reflects not only outstanding scholarship in detailing the history of Vietnam and the nature of the conflict in the South but its proposals also reflect an awareness of political realism.

The Ripon Society has offered the American people an alternative to a course of action that the President, for too long, has told us has no alternative. Its proposal recognizes the need for a political rather than a military solution to Vietnam. It also recognizes that the responsibility and determination to pursue this solution must rest with the South Vietnamese and not with the United States.

I recommend "The Realities of Vietnam" to anyone who is seeking an honest analysis of the situation in Vietnam and a creative and hopeful alternative to the fruitless and dangerous policies of the Johnson administration.

I hope the Society's proposal for a confederal solution to Vietnam will be given very serious consideration by my congressional colleagues and by the American people.

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

THE REALITIES OF VIETNAM: AN ALTERNATIVE FOR REPUBLICANS

(A Ripon research paper, the Ripon Forum, September 1967)

(NOTE.—This paper was written for the Ripon Society by Josiah Lee Auspitz and approved by the National Governing Board of the Ripon Society, Inc. The Appendix was written by Christopher W. Beal, who also prepared supporting research for the main body of the paper. A fully footnoted version of the paper and Appendix will be published separately by the Ripon Society, along with a transcript of its Vietnam symposium and several studies on specific aspects of the Vietnamese war. The map on page 17 [map not printed in RECORD] is reprinted by courtesy of the United States Government. The Society would also like to acknowledge the helpful suggestions of several of its members and the number of non-members who are intimately acquainted with the materials covered.)

"Better is a poor and wise youth than an old and foolish king who will no longer take advice . . ." (Ecclesiastes 4:13).

With one eye fixed on remote posterity and the other on the Gallup polls, President Johnson has had little vision to spare for the real constituency of his Vietnam policy: the generation of men who are expected to fight the war and live with the results.

As members of that generation, we have sought the advice of experienced men; we are conscious of the informed and responsible counsel that is available to the makers of American foreign policy. But even seasoned observers agree that on the subject of Vietnam *rigor mortis* has set in. A bureaucratic coalition within the administration has reached a rigid consensus that repels knowledgeable advice. It has set its own terms of discussion, enshrined its own version of the facts and has for the most part succeeded in imposing its internal verities on public debate as a whole.

Flurry of diplomacy

Thus, the American people have been asking whether more bombing, more troops, more diplomacy, more refugee relief, better elections, or more economic aid hold the key to our difficulties in Vietnam. And the administration has graciously suffered "dissent" on these questions. Small wonder, when dissent on tactical issues is easily preempted by bureaucrats who have the power to act: when "hawks" have the public ear, the administration can intensify military activity; when "doves" seem ascendant, it can treat them to a flurry of diplomacy. But the basic structure of administration policy remains untouched by these fluctuations. The larger questions of our involvement in Vietnam remain to be asked.

Why has a conflict which has been repeatedly defined as "political" and "essentially Vietnamese" become a largely military, largely American undertaking? Why, after six years of "limited" war, punctuated by glowing predictions of success, has no upper limit yet been reached on American troops or expenditure? Why, despite American talk about bringing peace and democracy to South Vietnam, has American policy led to the further entrenchment of a regime of generals, who are dependent for their power on the continuation of the war?

Prideful commitment

Answers exist to these questions, answers that demand an unflinching reappraisal both of the structure of our Vietnam policy and of the conduct of our foreign affairs as a whole. The Johnson administration is incapable of carrying out this reappraisal. It is motivated, as the President and his advisors assure us, by a sense of commitment. A commitment to a brave little nation? To the cause of freedom and democracy? To the containment of aggressive Communism? No, these broader goals have been obscured behind commitments of a different sort: a prideful commitment to continuing a misconceived policy, an ignoble commitment to covering over mistakes, an imprudent commitment to the unlimited use of American resources and moral energy in a dubious cause.

The time has come for simple commitments to reality and the national interest. Vietnam is the place to begin. The course of this war may well shape American thinking on foreign policy for a generation to come, just as the bitter neutrality controversy of the 'Thirties dominates the thinking of many officials responsible for our present position. It is important, therefore, that the proper

lessons be drawn early. And it is appropriate that they be drawn by young men who will have to build from the pieces that the Johnson administration leaves behind.

Agenda for action

The Ripon Society proposes a thorough reorientation of American foreign policy in Vietnam and new departures in our conduct of foreign policy as a whole. It calls for frank discussion of American goals in Vietnam, the costs of fulfilling them, and their place in a larger context of priorities for global foreign policy and domestic spending. It proposes the following agenda for debate and action.

1. There must be an examination of present policies in the light of the facts of Vietnamese political life. It is the conclusion of the Ripon Society that the present structure of policy is built on an expensive fiction about what South Vietnam is and what it can become. The American people should know how much it will cost to make this fiction into a reality.

2. New concepts are needed for Vietnam. Instead of our present military, centralized, "nation-building" approach, the Ripon Society calls for a flexible, political approach to the problem that will reduce American troop commitments in the long run and take cognizance of the strong ethnic and religious rivalries that divide many non-Communist South Vietnamese from the Saigon government.

3. The conflict in Vietnam has increased certain imbalances in American political institutions: the imbalance between our ability to wage war and our administrative capacity to seek peace; the imbalance between Congress and the Executive in the formulation of foreign policy. These imbalances as well as the present administration's failures in foreign policy, provide both an opportunity and a duty for the Republican Party. The Ripon Society calls on the Republican Party to bring the issues of foreign policy to the people in the 1968 elections.

I. THE COSTS OF IMPLEMENTING A FICTION

Visiting Congressmen and journalists who ask to see the success of pacification programs in South Vietnam are often taken to An Giang province. There they are treated to the spectacle of orderly village life directed by respected local leaders who have a long history of resistance to Communist control. These villages, stable and secure from attack, have been electrified; aerial land surveys have been carried out; American-sponsored improvements in sanitary, educational, and medical facilities have been made. To extend similar benefits to all the villages in all the provinces of South Vietnam is the American goal, and it is a noble goal.

But there is another remarkable feature about the model villages of An Giang province. They are under the sway of the Hoa Hao sect, which as recently as 1963 was declared by the Saigon government to be part of the Viet Cong. American officials in nearby provinces and in Saigon fully accepted this interpretation, and U.S. equipment and support enabled Premier Diem to carry out a program aimed at the destruction of Hoa Hao power. Had Diem succeeded, there would be no model villages in An Giang province today. There would be refugee camps, large numbers of U.S. troops, and fragmented settlements that would be easy prey for the Viet Cong.

Local autonomy

Happily, the Hoa Hao were able to hold out against their enemies both in Saigon and in the Viet Cong until Ngo Dinh Diem was overthrown. In 1964 they negotiated an agreement with the new central government: Hoa Hao areas, considerably reduced by Diem's attacks, were grouped wtihin the newly drawn boundaries of An Giang province; the autonomy of local leaders was assured; and, in return for allegiance to the Saigon government, the new province was guaranteed immunity from harassment by the Army of South Vietnam. Almost overnight, An Giang became a "pacified" area, and U.S. teams were able to enter to improve the lives of the villagers and to help them in their long-standing effort to defend themselves against Viet Cong infiltration. Thus, the most successful example of "pacification" is an area that has never had the advantage of occupation by American or Army of the Republic of Viet Nam (ARVN) troops. It is a region in which a local group has been "redefined" from pro-Communist to anti-Communist status and which has been allowed a measure of autonomy in return for allegiance to Saigon.

Other local leaders have not been so lucky as the Hoa Hao. They have been defeated by the combined efforts of the Viet Cong, the Saigon government, and American policy. But since particularism runs deep in Vietnam, local leadership may reemerge, just as the Hoa Hao resurfaced after American officials proclaimed them to have been "for all purposes eliminated as a powerful political and military force."

The tenacity of local loyalties is a product of the ethnic and religious diversity of South Vietnam. South Vietnam is a fragmented country; it is the product of several waves of conquest and a long history of ethnic, religious and geographical rivalries that left divisive hatreds. Even before the arrival of nearly a million refugees from the North, it was rent by localism in the rural areas and factionalism in the cities. A realistic approach to the country must build from this legacy. It must recognize that there are many non-Communists who, like the Hoa Hao, hate the mandarins and the army of Saigon just as much as they hate the Communists.

Three regions

As a first simplification, the real South Vietnam may be divided into three regions, each of which has a distinctive political culture: first, the northern Coastal Strip, an area which is characterized by an imperial tradition and deep-seated contempt for the government of Saigon and where the militant Buddhists are the most important non-Communist faction; second, the Central Highlands, populated by mountain tribesmen who are not ethnically Vietnamese and who are willing to ally themselves with any force that will protect them from Vietnamese cultural domination; third, the southern part of the country (old Cochin China), which is divided among important religious groups (Catholic, Buddhist, Cao Dai, Hoa Hao), each of which has strong political interests. The presence of ethnic Cambodians adds an element of racial diversity to the southern part of the country.

Finally, in all these areas are the Viet Cong, whose cadres control fully one-fourth of the rural population. They have developed an intricate network of front organizations that include youth groups, women's clubs, and civic action groups in villages which, taken together, contain three-fourths of the rural population. For many villages the cadre's authority is inseparable from village life, and indeed, the cadres have become a new social class in rural Vietnam.

Centralized democracy

To build a stable coalition from the non-Communist fragments is an ambitious undertaking that might be accomplished by skillful bargaining. But the American aim in Vietnam is more than ambitious. Under the Kennedy and Johnson administrations the United States has been the partisan of a policy of centralized government in South Vietnam. Instead of seeking to foster a political system built upon grass-roots support, American policy has been preoccupied with a dream of centralized democracy radiating out from Saigon, much as communism is thought to radiate from Hanoi. (In actuality, the North allows some local autonomy to ethnic minorities, a fact which the Viet Con use to good effect in their propaganda campaign among the mountain tribesmen of the Central Highlands.) The American mission in Saigon has accordingly been engaged in a search for a "national leader" capable of carrying out a program of "nation building," a sort of man on a white horse who will be the South Vietnamese counterpart of Ho Chi Minh.

In the beginning this national leader was Premier Diem, and we acquiesced while he persecuted the Hoa Hao and made political prisoners of more than 40,000 of his non-Communist enemies. Later he was Premier Ky, and we supported him in smashing the Budhhists in the northern provinces and in sending lowland Vietnamese with American troops to organize the mountain tribesmen of the Central Highlands. Now our candidate for national leadership is General Thieu, who has been chosen president in an election from which all "neutralists" (including a former Cabinet minister) were excluded.

Government by army

But whoever the man, there must also be a white horse, and unfortunately only one group in South Vietnam has even a remote possibility of being ridden to power over the factions and fragments of political life. This is the army, most of whose top officers were born in the North or fought for the French. The American dream of making South Vietnam into a centralized, unified state thus inevitably means military government. From the experience of other underdeveloped countries, no reason exists to hope that a military regime will turn itself quickly into a constitutional democracy or that it will be responsive to the interests of the rural population. "Nation-building" as it is now conceived in U.S. policy means nothing if not military rule in South Vietnam, and indeed within the State Department the military regime of South Korea is given as a model for South Vietnam. It would be enough if we could hope for a military ruler who was capable simply of administering the countryside.

But even here there are enormous difficulties. The army does not have sufficient contact with the rural areas to understand peasant problems or to administer them effectively. The army of South Vietnam has had only one top-ranking general of peasant origin, General Thi, and Premier Ky relieved him of his command of the I corps area soon after the Honolulu Conference. The social distance between officers and enlisted men is great. Officers despise their troops with the traditional contempt of the high-born for the manual laborer. Enlisted men are rarely promoted into the officer corps; in the last three years only one field grade officer in the army of South Vietnam has been wounded leading his men into battle. The pruning out of ethnic Southerners and former members of the Viet Minh in favor of Northerners has further divorced the officer corps from the country.

Bad bet

The army of South Vietnam is thus not to be compared with the popularly-based armies of some other underdeveloped countries. It lacks their social base and political skills. What is more, the generals cannot even command the respect of the mandarin class, the traditional rulers of the country, who have always asserted the superiority of civilian to military authority.

On its own merits, the Army of the Republic of South Vietnam is not, then, a good bet for unifying the country on a centralized model. But with the thrust of American policy behind it, it is an even worse bet. Just as U.S. military support relieves the ARVN from going into the swamps, so U.S. political support relieves the Saigon generals from

the need to bargain with civilian factions. Indeed, the one ruling general whom the United States Mission publicly criticized, General Khanh (now stripped of power), was also the only one to bring the militant Buddhists into a ruling coalition. But American policy has become fixed around the idea that a nation-building war must be carried out on all political and military fronts at once, against Communist, neutralist, and anti-Communist rivals alike.

Expensive project

Can such a war, carried on without regard to the political terrain, aimed at imposing central government in a country with decentralized bases of power, dependent on the administrative capabilities of a narrowly based and politically unskilled military elite, can such a war be successful? Probably it can. Implementing a fiction is not impossible, merely expensive. It is now costing the United States, according to reputable estimates, upward of 24 billion dollars a year and casualties of 7000 a month. The budgetary figure represents three times the total of American overseas investment for the current fiscal year and about seven times the total foreign aid budget. The monthly casualty figure equals the total number of Peace Corps volunteers who went abroad last year. The troop commitments to Vietnam represent an almost total investment of our available troops for flexible response to unanticipated crises in other parts of the world. If unexpected trouble should occur abroad or in American cities, the U.S. strategic reserve would be inadequate to respond. To ask whether this represents a prudent investment of American resources, manpower, and moral energy is now academic. The question is whether we can hope for any substantial reduction of cost if present policies continue.

Installment plan

The costs of Vietnam have been built up on an installment plan. First a little more bombing, then a few more troops for conventional operations, then a few more for counter-insurgency warfare, then more investments in the "other war." With these four major elements—and with well-advertised elections and peace offensives to legitimize its operations—the Administration has attempted to implement the fiction of unified central government in Vietnam and to protect this government against external aggression. The Administration clearly believes that more installment plan increases hold the best prospect for a long-run reduction in the costs of the war. But what are the likely results of intensification of the four major elements of present policy? What are the prospects for success of the two legitimizing devices?

1. Bombing of North Vietnam

Many impatient strategists who apply a simple-minded interpretation of the lessons of World War II to the Vietnam situation insist that the quickest solution is to intensify the bombing of the enemy, assumed in this case to be North Vietnam.

A. Interdictory: The first kind of bombing, mostly south of the 18.5° parallel, aims at interdicting infiltration. It has not, however, prevented the North Vietnamese from installing missile launching sites and storage depots, nor from surfacing a road within South Vietnam.

And the fact is that even if North Vietnam is bombed to rubble, the war in the South will continue. For although North Vietnam unquestionably aids and guides the Viet Cong, the conflict in the South is not a result of simple aggression. Unlike World War II, and unlike the Korean engagement, the Vietnamese conflict is largely a counter-insurgency war. Right now, the larger part of American troops is employed in securing the South from guerrilla activities, while the smaller part is employed in checking infiltration from the North. Many military and civilian leaders whose ideas were formed by the two previous American engagements have been unable to come to terms with this fact. They have continually tried to define the war as a simple question of stopping aggression and have maintained that air power provides the most economical way of doing this. Now, the insurgency in the South *is* supported by a kind of aggression from Hanoi, but it is not one that can be stopped by bombing. The Northerners have trained guerrilla cadres who operate in the South and bring isolated villages under the control of a centralized Communist hierarchy. To try to eliminate these cadres with airplanes is an admission of failure.

B. Punitive: Bombing north to the 18.5° parallel is usually punitive, designed to "raise the cost of aggression to Hanoi," without directly reducing infiltration. But Hanoi's "costs" are calculated not by the monetary value of the installations destroyed but by the alternative uses for the labor and capital needed to replace bombed facilities; i.e., by the "opportunity costs." The Hanoi regime presides over a largely peasant economy in one of the most densely populated agricultural areas of the world. The regime thus has a more comfortable supply of underemployed labor than most underdeveloped countries. If the Russians and Chinese supply heavy equipment and technicians, the opportunity cost to the North Vietnamese of diverting labor to repair damaged facilities is low.

The only way to overtax the North Vietnamese labor supply is by systematic bombing in civilian areas. The administration denies any intention of doing this. But according to reputable non-Communist sources, American planes began punitive bombing against dikes in the Red River Delta of North Vietnam when the waters were at a seasonal high this summer. Further bombing of the dikes will flood the best rice-producing area of North Vietnam just before the October-November harvest, creating conditions rivalling those of 1946, when a famine caused the death of one million North Vietnamese.

Chinese intervention

Proponents of punitive bombing may also want to humiliate Communist China by destroying the Chinese railway line that cuts through North Vietnam. They claim that the Chinese railway brings supplies to Hanoi, and this is part of the truth. But no Administration spokesman has ever mentioned that the railway also has strategic importance within China: it is a major means for transporting raw materials between Yunnan Province and the rest of China. A measure of its value to the Chinese is that even before the extension of U.S. bombing, 40,000 Chinese paramilitary technicians were assigned to repairing the part of the link that passed through North Vietnam. The intensified bombing of the railway thus represents a calculated risk of bringing China into the war. Will internal difficulties prevent the Chinese from intervening or will they postpone their quarrels in the face of external humiliation?

Some within the administration may not care whether we do provoke a Chinese response. They believe that a war with China is inevitable and that it is better fought now than in the 1970's, when the Chinese will be able to deliver nuclear weapons. When this view is stated in explicit terms, it is easily countered by those knowledgeable in the pattern of Chinese hostility. But it is more often held implicitly. Many leading policy-makers who publicly discount the possibility of Chinese intervention are also those who believe in the inevitability of a war with China.

Bombing also involves a calculated risk of escalation by the Russians, who are committed to preventing the collapse of the government of North Vietnam and to protecting the integrity of shipping to Hanoi. The costs to the Russians in prestige should not be underestimated at a time when they are taunted by the Chinese for collaboration with the West. Finally, the North Vietnamese themselves can escalate the war in response to bombing. North Vietnamese and Communist Pathet Lao troops already hold sway over large parts of Laos. Ho Chi Minh could reactivate the war there at will in the hope that an expansion of the ground war into Laos might take some of the pressure off Vietnamese soil. Nor is this the only possible response by the North Vietnamese.

2. Conventional Ground Forces

Despite U.S. bombing, the North Vietnamese now have the initiative for escalating the conventional ground war. They hold in reserve eighty per cent of their regular army (some 400,000) men and during recent months have been concentrating forces near the demilitarized zone. Constant U.S. bombing by B-52's has not been able to prevent them from building a surfaced road through the A-Shau valley within South Vietnam, nor has it stopped them from storing in the caves near A-Shau supplies sufficient to support several divisions. They have also received six-inch rockets from the Russians that have been installed and are being used inside South Vietnam. During the past six months Communist troops already in South Vietnam have occupied for short periods four of the five provincial capitals in the I Corps region without any protest from the local population. If the Northerners are convinced that the United States means to destroy their country from the air, they might very well try to make this occupation permanent by sending new troops to hold Quang Tri and Thua Thien provinces. Guerrilla activities within both of these provinces have already been shifted from Viet Cong to North Vietnamese Army command. Such action might easily tip the balance in Washington in favor of a plan previously set aside for invading North Vietnam up to the narrow neck of the country.

It should be noted that no increase in bombing is likely to avert an invasion from the North. The more new targets that are bombed, the less deterrent effect the threat of future bombing will have on Hanoi to hold back its ground forces. In effect, the more hostages we destroy, the fewer we have to bargain with. The American public was not made aware of these facts earlier this year when General Westmoreland bargained for 45,000 more troops. They were not informed that any increase of conventional American forces up to 300,000 men can probably be matched by North Vietnam. And any increase above that number is likely to be the result of a full-scale, conventional, Korean-style conflict that has hitherto been avoided.

3. Counterinsurgency

Regardless of what happens in the conventional war against main force units of the Viet Cong and the army of North Vietnam, the counter-insurgency war will continue, and the prospect is for stalemate unless allied forces are vastly increased. The Pentagon's declared ratio for success is ten counter-insurgency troops to one guerrilla.

The reason for a high ratio is that counter-insurgency warfare is essentially a local policing operation. The Viet Cong operate by calculated acts of assassination and terror that can be carried out by small bands of lightly armed men. To protect against such harassment requires a day and night policing function and an intimate knowledge of the political terrain. Guerrillas can harass villages on a rotating basis, but counter-insurgency forces must stay put. The ten-to-one ratio, moreover, is based on the experience of the British in Malaya and other long-term professional counter-insurgency operations. To get a counter-insurgency operation in motion takes more than the standard ratio. Only when once established

can the ratio decrease as the perimeter of effective control spreads out. For American troops in Vietnam who are rotated annually, the ratio may be much higher than the standard estimates. Counter-insurgency cannot be carried out effectively on a short-term basis, and the yearly rotation of American troops makes almost impossible the establishment of necessary relations with translators, spies, and local contacts. What is more, the northern coastal strip of the country does not permit economies of scale. The strip is broken into isolated valleys so narrow that a counter-insurgency operation has no room to spread out. In any case, even the standard ratio would imply a total allied force of more than two million men, as the Viet Cong now have upwards of two hundred thousand native Southerners in the field.

As for the South Vietnamese army, the ARVN will not be much more effective in counter-insurgency than it has been to date. Half of its total of 700,000 is composed of police, local, and regional forces who have been poorly paid and badly treated. They are not an efficient policing force, and in many areas they have a tacit agreement to coexist with the Viet Cong. The regular army, just over 300,000 men, has been an overly centralized force, with too much authority concentrated in too many generals, ever since it was reorganized under American advisers in the mid-1950's. A return to a decentralized force, giving more authority to lower-ranking officers commanding smaller units, more appropriate to counter-insurgency operations, would eliminate the work of half of the ARVN's present generals. Corrupt recruiting procedures and the lack of Vietnamese interest in joining the army so long as American troops are still available means that the ARVN cannot provide forces for a larger counter-insurgency operation.

The fact remains that with more than a million allied troops now in the country, counter-insurgency cannot be carried against all areas contested by the Viet Cong. The area south of the Mekong River has not yet been entered by American troops. The ARVN troops stationed there engage in little fighting, as a result of a tacit agreement to coexist with the Viet Cong. If under American pressure, this area should be opened to active counter-insurgency operations, the level of U.S. involvement would rise. Thus, if present policies continue, the aim of pacifying all sections of the country by counter-insurgency methods would result in a serious and long-term drain on American manpower. And if the Viet Cong recruit an additional one hundred thousand men in the next year, the American manpower requirement for counter-insurgency will skyrocket, regardless of what happens south of the Mekong River.

4. The "Other War"

Because the counter-insurgency and conventional efforts have reached the point where only a massive infusion of troops can change the balance, many spokesmen, including Generals Thieu and Westmoreland, have spoken of a long war of attrition, lasting perhaps ten to fifteen years. But there is no need to be so pessimistic. Within the structure of present policy a solution could be found within three to five years that would make possible a modified form of central government. It is, we feel, an unconscionable solution, but the only way in which centralized control can be imposed upon South Vietnam.

Suppose for a moment that the rice supply of a Communist-held area were destroyed and the population made dependent on imported food distributed in refugee camps administered by the Saigon government. Such a refugee camp solution would give the central government a sure hold on areas that have been impervious to its influence. It might be seen as part of the "other war," the war for the hearts and minds of the people of South Vietnam. It wins the minds of Viet Cong sympathizers by disorienting them; it forces simple villages off their lands, erodes their independence, and destroys the social order in which Viet Cong cadres thrive.

A refugee camp solution to the problem of insurgency is, perhaps inadvertently, well underway. As a result of the war, South Vietnam must now import rice for the first time in its history. "Search and destroy" operations on the ground and bombing from the air have drastically reduced local rice supplies.

Meanwhile, under the U.S.-sponsored Chieu Hoy program Communists everywhere are encouraged to defect on an individual basis, villages are given the chance to flee communist domination, but there is no way in which a Viet Cong cadre can agree to defect and bring his village with him. Thus, regardless of how many defections are recorded, the rice must be destroyed and the villagers removed to "deprive" those hard-core elements that remain of both food and troops. The effect is that sections of Vietnam are being devastated and refugees generated at a high rate.

Between late 1964 and mid-1967, 1.8 million South Vietnamese peasants were made homeless by the war. The present rate is probably greater than one million a year. If refugee generation continues at its present rates—and any intensification of the ground war would make the rates higher—one-third of the rural population of South Vietnam, some 4.5 million people will be in refugee camps or relocation settlements within three years. Since no estimates put Viet Cong control, total or partial, at higher than 4.5 million people, the gathering of that many peasants into refugee camps could go far to eradicate from the countryside the settlements that supply the Viet Cong with their food and troops. Peasants would then be domiciled in manageable units; a central government in Saigon would distribute American aid to one-third of its population; and the dream of nation-building in South Vietnam would become a reality, even if the reality were, as one anti-Communist editor (now deprived of his right to publish) has put it, "a nation of thieves and beggars."

It should be emphasized that though the refugee camp solution is a likely one if present policies are extended south of the Mekong, there are obstacles to the success of even this inhuman course of action. So far, the Saigon government has been incapable of securing the allegiance of even its homeless population. There are not less than 1.8 million refugees of South Vietnamese origin, yet not more than 500,000 of the rural population are under total control of the Saigon government. Indeed, after six years of war, Saigon can claim total or partial control of only 3.6 million of the total rural population of 13.4 million. This number is less than the total of groups who should be rock-bottom allies of the government, namely, the Southern refugees dependent upon it and traditional anti-Communist groups like the Hoa Hao, Catholics, farming refugees from the North, and ethnic Cambodians. (See Tables I and II.) The Saigon government, then, has barely held its ground, despite massive American support. And because of American support it has felt free to alienate actively "neutral" groups like the militant Buddhists and mountain highlanders.

Even so, since it would be easier to convert the ARVN into a refugee police force than into an effective counter-insurgency force, the refugee camp solution is the cheapest way to "win" the war. For refugee relief, though prolonged, is much less costly than conventional and counter-insurgency warfare, and in strictly military terms, it may also be much more effective. Bombing and conventional warfare cannot solve the problem of insurgency; counter-insurgency warfare requires close knowledge of the political terrain and upwards of two million men. Refugee generation, on the other hand, requires no more troops and no costly escalation, it can be accomplished without knowing the language and without making difficult distinctions between friend and enemy. It is accordingly the path of least resistance for American policy; it represents the lower limit of cost to the United States under present policies. The cost to South Vietnam in human terms is of course intolerable, but it is fully consistent with the declared aim of the Saigon government to eliminate Communist influence from the countryside.

5. Peace Offensives

To placate domestic critics the Johnson administration has periodically made public appeals to Hanoi to negotiate. Energy expended on these peace offensives is likely to be wasted. Hanoi remains committed to the Mao-Giap theory of guerrilla warfare: captured documents provide ample evidence that the North Vietnamese leaders believe Viet Cong cadres can keep the United States from winning the countryside and then can induce it to abandon the cities as well. Only an alteration in the balance of factions in North Vietnam, including the demise of the "bitter ender" First Party Secretary, Le Duan, would mark a change in this attitude. During the coming election year, Hanoi will no doubt try to influence American public opinion with diplomatic overtures. But the American effort at negotiations is much better directed at cadres within South Vietnam who are independent of aid from the North. For though Hanoi and the Viet Cong hierarchy remain ideologically opposed to any sincere negotiation with the United States or the Saigon government, the best American sources agree that a large proportion of Viet Cong cadres are not indoctrinated in Communist ideology. What is more, local cadres, who see the scale of American commitment, are much more likely than their leaders to become convinced of the permanency of the American presence in South Vietnam, to admit the hopelessness of taking the cities, and to be willing to make deals with the Americans. Only negotiations which seek local rather than national solutions to the problem of insurgency have even a moderate chance of success during the coming year. Only piecemeal negotiations which bid away their cadres will convince Communist leaders to come to the bargaining table for a total solution. Yet these are precisely the kinds of negotiations that are actively discouraged by both the Saigon regime and the Johnson administration, both of which prefer to polarize the alternatives between all (a capitulation by Hanoi) or nothing.

6. Elections

There is, of course, a widely publicized political element amidst the overwhelmingly military devices by which the United States is trying to build a nation in South Vietnam: the September elections. They occupy in American policy much the same symbolic function that the fort at Dien Bien Phu held for the French: they are yet another turning point in the war; they are a promise of lasting order; they are a glimpse of the new vision that the United States is bringing to the people of South Vietnam. And they would not have been held had it not been for the insistence of the American Mission in Saigon for a sign of national regeneration.

It should be recalled that it was not the military consequence of the defeat of Dien Bien Phu that caused French withdrawal, but rather the public reaction within France to the collapse of a symbol that had been trumpeted by the military as a new approach to the Indochinese war. The Johnson administration has broadcast similar hopes about the September elections, which were its fortress against the realities of Vietnam. These elections were structured not to draw non-Communist factions into a new ruling coalition, but to lend an air of legitimacy to the nation-building war. South Vietnamese

political leaders who could challenge the military junta or who favor negotiating with local Viet Cong groups were and have been systematically excluded from running. To speak of local negotiations was to admit that the problem of insurgency exists, and this Saigon (and until late August the Johnson Administration) has been unwilling to do. Political processes which are open only to those who reject reality are not likely to work wonders. And now in the aftermath of the Saigon elections, as it becomes increasingly apparent that central democracy is spurious, it is time to reassess the costs of American support.

Upper and lower limits

The assessment should be made not by talking of "escalation" and "withdrawal," but by comparing the likely upper and lower limits of present policies with those of alternative approaches.

Within the structure of present policy, the best one can hope for is a refugee-camp solution to the problem of insurgency in South Vietnam. It can be reached, without mentioning the word "refugee," by emphasizing current programs to relocate villagers in secure areas, to promote individual defections, and to deprive the Viet Cong of their rice supply. It would probably require a continuation of expenditures at their present levels for three years, followed by a period in which American troops would be withdrawn and an expensive program of refugee relief and rural reconstruction would be expanded in accordance with the humanitarian aims of the "other war." Such a solution represents the lower limit of cost under present policies. But to win the temporary allegiance of a people by starving them into one's camp is short-sighted and self-defeating.

As for the upper limit to the American commitment, there is none. A different mix of elements—more emphasis on bombing or conventional warfare—could lead to an invasion of North Vietnam, an extension of the war into Laos and China, a confrontation with the Russians.

So long as it is conducted in accordance with the aims of the Johnson Administration, the war will, in sum, get worse before it gets better. It is of course possible that both President Johnson and Ho Chi Minh may flinch and open negotiations. But they are both stubborn men and their terms for bargaining are very far apart.

Skewed priorities

What should the upper and lower limits to the American commitment be? The Ripon Society believes that the proper upper limit of the American commitment has already been exceeded. A prudent policy would demand that the level of present involvement be taken as a ceiling and that steps be taken to reduce the drain on American resources. To do otherwise is to further distort our sense of priorities away from other, strategically more important parts of the world and away from necessary expenditures of money and idealism at home.

But President Johnson's policy, however unrealistic and costly, has also created obligations that put a lower limit on the American involvement. The United States has a moral commitment to the one million refugees from the North who have been resettled in South Vietnam with our aid. It has an obligation to the 1.8 million refugees generated in the South during the past two years of heavy fighting. It cannot lightly abandon these people and the others of South Vietnam who are not Communists to the vengeance of the Viet Cong and their Northern supporters. Nor can we accept a solution that would pose a military threat to *Thailand which, unlike South Vietnam, is a signatory member of SEATO.*

Reduced commitments

The Ripon Society believes that an honorable approach to Vietnam can be found that will work within these new upper and lower limits, *i.e.*, an approach that will reduce American troop commitments in the long run and minimize the destruction of Vietnamese society. It is an approach that does not demand precipitant withdrawal or imprudent escalation; its effectiveness does not depend on the panacea of immediate negotiation. It does demand something perhaps more difficult at this late date: a patient, realistic, flexible, and humane vision of what can reasonably be achieved in South Vietnam.

II. THE NEED FOR A CONFEDERAL STRATEGY

At selected moments in the unfolding of its Vietnam policies, the Johnson Administration has challenged its critics to provide alternatives. After Hanoi failed to respond to the bombing pause, for instance, the Administration asked whether there was any choice but to resume bombing. When intelligence reports showed increases in Viet Cong troop strength, the Administration paused to ask whether it could do anything but increase American troop commitments. And so it has been. By posing stacked questions sequentially, the administration has proven to its own satisfaction that its critics are naive and incapable of posing feasible proposals for a change in policy.

Now the real basis for a responsible alternative in Vietnam is not to be found by manipulating elements within the present structure of policy. The alternative to policy based on a fiction is policy based on reality. In reassessing the American undertaking in Vietnam, two central realities must be confronted.

Political fragments

The first reality is the fragmentation of the traditionally anti-Communist forces in South Vietnamese political life. In addition to the regional, religious, and ethnic rivalries traced in the Appendix to this paper, there is a wide gulf between the French-educated urban middle classes and the rural population. The former have a typically French faith in centralized government, to which the United States Mission has somehow been converted under the conviction that it represents "nation-building." Non-Communist peasants, on the other hand, have fought to resist centralized control, whether from Hanoi or Saigon. If both urban and rural sources of support are to be drawn into a stable non-Communist government, it will have to be on the basis of decentralized rule. Regardless of the protests of the French-educated centralists local leaders will have to have a greater degree of autonomy than they have yet been granted. If they are not, if local leadership, however ignorant and unsavory it may appear to city folk, is further undermined and destroyed, the result will not be a democratic government from Saigon. The result will be no government from Saigon, save for refugee camps and American troops to carry out the policing functions normally performed by local leadership. American troops would then be the objects not merely of Communist hostility but of opposition from all traditional groups seeking to protect their social order from alien interference.

The Vietcong cadre

The second reality is the political and social innovation that is the basis of Viet Cong strength throughout South Vietnam; the local cadre. Viet Cong cadres are the only effective link between many Vietnamese villages and centralized commands, and they are the strongest such link in Vietnamese history. The cadre member is trained to live with the people of his village, to seek out those with grievances against Saigon-appointed officials and local notables, and to provoke incidents which mobilize the peasantry against the government. He is instructed in the techniques of organizing front groups, engaging in the selective use of terror to intimidate his opponents, accumulating intelligence from children and village spies, and coexisting with potentially hostile groups until he is ready to overthrow them. Very often "coexistence villages" that are well-infiltrated by cadres admit U.S. medical teams, vote in elections, and listen to Saigon-trained propagandists by day, while the Viet Cong maintains control by night. Cadres are an important new part of the village social structure in three-fourths of the rural population of South Vietnam, although only one-fourth of the rural population is under their total control.

Careful analyses of their training and internal messages indicates that they have taken on a new social role that is more important to most of them than adherence to Communist ideology. Hence, recent American usage of the term "cadre" does not recognize the Communists' claim to mechanical control. In our usage, "cadre" is not a collective noun denoting a well-disciplined group of men; it denotes an individual, professional agitator.

If the cadres are to be dealt with realistically, both the Saigon government and the American mission will have to abandon the goal of extirpating them from village life. And the United States will have to recognize the futility of a Chieu Hoy program designed to encourage individual defections from cadres without guaranteeing a continuation of their social role. Viet Cong cadres are presently tying down nearly all the ARVN troops and more than half the American troops in the country. To destroy them means either the destruction of a large part of rural South Vietnam or an enormous drain on American manpower. A means must be found to allow them to hold their social function, while neutralizing their military threat.

A *confederal strategy* would deal with these two realities in a way that both Americans and Vietnamese could understand.

First phase

In its first phase, a confederal strategy would aim at developing an effective and stable non-Communist coalition between the cities and the twenty-seven per cent of the rural population that is subject to government control. In cases of conflict among factions, American support would go to those which have effective control of rural areas, since their loyalty and local policing efforts are alone able to free American troops for their proper function of checking infiltration from the North.

The concept of a coalition based on a confederal approach requires the concession to local leaders of formal guarantees of autonomy in the following ways:

Control over local police and militia.

Election of provincial and district officials who are now centrally appointed. (Provincial and district chiefs, most of them military men, now approve candidates for hamlet and village elections and make the major civilian decisions affecting their areas.)

Government officials of local origin. (This is crucial in Vietnam where administrative rules are traditionally loose, allowing for wide discretion.)

Local rule in formulation of land tenure regulations and reforms.

Redrawing of provincial boundaries to correspond to the realities of political control.

Cultural guarantees to ethnic minorities (e.g., preservation of customary law, use of ethnic languages for primary school instruction).

Right to collect local taxes, supplemented where necessary by direct access to U.S. aid. (A recent amendment to Title IX of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1967 permits the United States to find local channels for the distribution of aid.)

In other countries similar measures for decentralization might be accomplished by informal understandings, without written guarantees. But the time for that has passed in Vietnam. Too many promises have been made and broken for regional groups to trust any authority in Saigon. Nor can the United States serve as guarantor of informal bar-

gains, for our Mission, too, has found it convenient to forget pledges made to minority groups in South Vietnam. National elections may give the regional minorities temporary leverage because of their ability to deliver bloc votes, but in a national legislature overwhelmingly dominated by urban Vietnamese the ethnic minorities have no continuing means of enforcing their interests. They will be restive whenever they are not actively courted by the ruling faction in Saigon.

In the September presidential elections, for example, the Thieu-Ky ticket actively sought the support of the Hoa Hao in An Giang province, of the Cambodian minority in Ba Xuyen province, and of the Highland tribesmen. If Thieu is able to deliver on his promises of financial aid and autonomy, these ethnic minorities will no doubt continue to hold anti-government feelings in abeyance. But their loyalty is not to the constitution of South Vietnam, which provides no guarantee of their rights, but to the military faction. Should it break its word or be replaced by a rival coalition (*e.g.*, one composed of Coastal Buddhists, Southern army officers, and Mekong Delta Vietnamese), the ethnic minorities would again feel isolated. Thus, before any form of parliamentary coalition politics can be stable, prior confederal steps must be taken to give all important non-Communist groups a stake in the idea of national government.

A first, obvious step is to make formal and public the arrangements already in force with the Hoa Hao in An Giang province and to ratify similar arrangements for the enclaves of Cham peoples in Binh Thuan province.

Second, the government of South Vietnam should fulfill promises already made to the mountain tribesmen to draft guarantees of cultural autonomy when the National Legislature meets this fall.

Third, confederal decentralization and redrawing of boundaries should be carried out to give other strong local groups authority over their own regional affairs: the Buddhists in the northern coastal provinces; the Cao Dai and the settlements of Catholics and Northern refugees in the lowlands; and, the ethnic Cambodians in Kieng Giang, Ba Xuyen, and Vinh Binh provinces. Measures of this sort, which could be adopted almost immediately, would give non-Communist groups a stake in the South Vietnamese government and constitution regardless of which faction happened to hold the reins in Saigon. There is no other way to deal with the problem of fragmentation of the non-Communist groups.

Second phase

Once the rock-bottom non-Communist groups are consolidated the same confederal framework can be offered to "co-existence" villages, which comprise much of the contested half of rural South Vietnam. Local Viet Cong cadres and ARVN troops who have developed a relationship of tacit collaboration would be encouraged to formalize their relationships in exchange for regional autonomy from Saigon. Provincial boundaries can be redrawn for such areas, just as they were redrawn for An Giang province in October 1965.

These agreements might require the marketing of all surplus rice through Saigon, the payment of nominal taxes, and other signs of allegiance in exchange for separate access to U.S. aid to repair the devastation of war. The second phase would provide an alternative to the ravages of war that does not now exist for these villages. There is at present no way in which a Viet Cong cadre operating in contested villages can submit to popular war-weariness without losing his social function. And villagers have no incentive to denounce cadres so long as the alternative is not local control but administration by a Saigon-appointed military governor.

It is, of course, likely that the Viet Cong cadres would receive orders from above not to participate in confederal bargains, in which case a clear conflict of interest would be established within the Viet Cong ranks. Cadres who are not ideological Communists or not dependent on the North for supplies would perceive differing interests from those trapped in the Communist hierarchy. This would put pressure on the Viet Cong where it is economically most vulnerable, for those cadres who are independent of Northern supplies currently provide surplus rice for the Viet Cong efforts in weaker areas. Bidding away independent villages would begin the process of crippling the Communist movement by alienating cadres whose local social role is more important to them than the ultimate Viet Cong aim of winning the cities.

Third phase

In its third phase, a confederal strategy would be offered to villages under the full control of the Viet Cong, which now hold approximately one-fourth of the total rural population. Such hard-core villages would face increasing isolation as the earlier phases of the confederal approach progressed. At this point the Viet Cong hierarchy would face three alternatives: 1) remaining in the South while their villages are losing food and manpower; 2) fleeing to the North; or, 3) retaining much of their local power in Communist enclaves and participating in the confederal framework. Once their prospects for taking over the entire country are cut off by a consolidation of non-Communist groups, it is likely that the Viet Cong high command would negotiate for the third alternative.

Possible outcome

A confederal strategy provides a vision of a feasible outcome that South Vietnamese and Americans both lack. Urban Vietnamese can now envisage only a French-style solution, with the urban classes playing the role of colonial administrators and the army securing the countryside. The American Mission, on the other hand, seems infatuated with the model of South Korea, where a military junta has taken steps toward democratization. Both of these models fail to cope with the fragmentation of South Vietnamese political life and the new social role of village cadres. A decentralized solution, by contrast, would permit both local leaders and rural cadres to keep a stable base of power now denied to them under the slogan of nationbuilding.

The minimal result of a confederal approach would be a consolidation of non-Communist groups, whose territory the United States could then defend with conventional forces. The maximal application of the confederal framework to the rest of the countryside would make possible a political system that accommodates sharp political differences (as does Italy) and deep cultural diversity (as does Switzerland).

Reasonable Costs

A confederal strategy is designed to reduce the American commitment in installments much as the present policy seems destined to escalate it by installments. Barring massive invasion by North Vietnam, a confederal strategy would operate well within the present troop commitment.

It would save manpower almost immediately by winning the cooperation of the local population in the northern provinces of the Coastal Strip and Central Highlands. It would prevent vast numbers of American troops from being sent for new counter-insurgency operations south of the Mekong River. Saigon can no more surely lose its influence in this area than by permitting the entry of U.S. forces, which Communist propaganda convincingly identifies with the French, to enter.

Finally, by lowering the level of violence in selected "coexistence villages," it would put steady political pressure on the Communists, who would be faced with possible defections by their non-ideological cadres. The present policy of Saigon to root out all cadres gives them no choice but to continue obeying orders from the Communist hierarchy. A confederal strategy would promote factionalism in the Viet Cong and unity among non-Communists; the present policy does the reverse.

It should be emphasized that the confederal concept is a *strategy, not a rigid blueprint*. It is designed to keep the costs of the war below the upper limit recommended in the previous section. It permits a rethinking of Vietnam policy that provides not merely an alternative vision to that of the Administration but alternative emphases at every step of the way. This can be best illustrated by showing how the major elements of present policy will fit into a new pattern under a confederal strategy, how such an orientation cuts across some of the well-known "hawk-dove" distinctions.

1. Bombing North Vietnam

Even if bombing some day leads Hanoi to nominal capitulation and negotiation, the Viet Cong can still conduct intensive guerrilla activities, and they will do so unless they have an alternative that permits popular southern Viet Cong leaders to retain political power. A confederal strategy encourages the formulation of such alternatives. It can be adopted regardless of one's attitude to the effectiveness of bombing in inhibiting infiltration.

But we would claim as an advantage for confederalism the fact that it will allow for a de-emphasis on bombing. The effect of bombing in fulfilling its two major purposes has been very much overrated by the administration.

Punitive bombing north of the 18.5° parallel simply does not save American lives. It risks conditions under which more lives, American and civilian Vietnamese, will be lost. And it is irrelevant to the insurgency in the South, which is the major drain on American fighting forces. *For these reasons, a confederal strategy would heavily de-emphasize bombing the North. Interdictory bombing south of the* 18.5° *parallel would continue as long as it was necessary to cut infiltration and troop buildups.*

2. Conventional Ground Forces

Invasion and insurgency are the two major military problems the United States faces. A confederal approach would employ conventional ground forces to defend areas where the Saigon government had won the loyalty of the people. It would also use them along the demilitarized zone and at crucial mountain passes to prevent an invasion of the northern I corps area.

While military leaders have been debating over bombing, barriers, and infiltration, they have failed to remind the American public that the North Vietnamese seem to be preparing an invasion of the I corps area, where American troops are already stretched dangerously thin. A confederal strategy would release troops from policing and counter-insurgency operations to counter a conventional thrust by the North Vietnamese. South Vietnam is not worth the millions of troops needed to counter both invasion *and* insurgency. Hence a confederal strategy provides a political framework in which present troops could be deployed against the invasion of areas in which the local population ceases anti-government activity.

A barrier

The approval of a limited barrier by Secretary of Defense McNamara is a half-way measure that has more meaning for the bureaucratic struggle over punitive bombing in Washington than for the realities of the Vietnamese situation.

The original purpose of the barrier concept was to threaten the North Vietnamese with interdiction of their supply lines to the South. In the years of its building the barrier would cost more lives than bombing would but afterwards it would be a perma-

nent structure that would reshape politics in Southeast Asia. Supporters of the concept argued that if the Administration made known its firm intention to build a barrier clear across Laos, the only way to cut the Ho Chi Minh trail, the North Vietnamese might have been led to negotiate before the barrier was even completed.

The Administration, however, has committed itself only to a very limited barrier, which does not include Laos. The major hindrance to going into Laos is not the Geneva agreements, for the North Vietnamese army has been operating in Laos for years. Nor is it the "giving away" of Northern Laos to the Communists, since most of it is in Communist hands already. The hard-core objection is that the North Vietnamese might support a conventional military operation in Laos and they would probably receive Soviet aid.

The major function of the *limited* barrier is to demonstrate publicly that there is an alternative to bombing, even if that alternative is no more effective at attacking the main problems of insurgency and invasion. Both punitive bombing and a limited barrier would receive low priority in a confederal strategy.

3. Counter-insurgency

The United States can win the counter-insurgency war, but the standard ten-to-one ratio of conventional to guerrilla forces is not worth the price. Under a confederal strategy counter-insurgency operations would not be extended to new areas of the country. Plans for an offensive south of the Mekong River and based in the town of Can Tho would be permanently abandoned. In areas where counter-insurgency operations are now underway, the promise of selective withdrawal of American forces would be used to increase the attractiveness of piecemeal negotiations under a confederal framework. With counter-insurgency as with bombing and conventional warfare, military action is used in a confederal strategy to advance feasible political goals.

4. The "Other War"

Under present policy the "other war" is too often the camp follower of military initiatives. After bombing, search and destroy operations, and refugee generation have taken their toll, American teams offer food, medical aid, and refugee relief. The confederal strategy would use the economic, psychological, and social programs of the "other war" independently to fulfill political objectives.

A. Chieu Hoy: The Chieu Hoy program, which encourages individual defections of Viet Cong cadres, would operate in a wider context. Defections would still be welcomed, but primary emphasis would be placed on negotiation that permit cadres to retain their social role. Under present policies, defections among high-level units are virtually impossible. The favorable statistics on Chieu Hoy defections trumpeted by the Administration make no careful distinction between political defectors and simple refugees.

B. Land reform: Having ignored for some time the pledges for land reform made in Honolulu in February of 1966, the Johnson Administration is considering putting new pressures on Saigon. Now that it has declared the election a success, the American Mission may demand a centralized land reform program which is designed to win peasant loyalty for the central government.

But a centralized program of land reform is unrealistic. In many areas where land records have been destroyed, the attempt to resolve tenure disputes from Saigon can only be capricious and corrupt. Local administration of reforms is needed, not more centralization.

A confederal approach would subordinate land reform to the political goal of developing local leadership. Saigon might limit the size of family plots; it might provide surveying teams and keep a central record of land transactions. But the administration of reforms and the settling of disputes—a powerful source of patronage—would be left to local leaders. The power to implement land reforms would provide an added incentive for local leadership in coexistence villages to participate in a confederal framework.

C. Economic aid: To make a confederal strategy credible the United States will have to demonstrate its willingness to aid areas that are not under direct American military control. In principle, President Johnson has committed himself to such a course, and indeed An Giang province provides an isolated example of the purity of American intentions. The most dramatic symbol of American aims, however, was the proposed project for a Mekong Dam to aid people of Laos, Cambodia, and South Vietnam who are not under American military occupation. After publicizing the project and engaging in preliminary studies, the Johnson Administration dropped it without explanation. There is perhaps no single act that would better symbolize the American commitment to the long-term interests of Southeast Asians than the revival of this project. Because it would take years to complete, it would make Communists and non-Communists alike believe that the United States has a permanent concern for the welfare of Southeast Asia and that, unlike the French, Americans will not leave when they grow tired of the war.

A confederal strategy will also implement the Foreign Assistance Act of 1967, which stipulates that "emphasis shall be placed on assuring maximum participation in the task of economic development on the part of people of the developing countries through the encouragement of democratic private and local governmental institutions." (Title IX, Sec. 281.) This would depart from present policies which emphasize channeling aid through the Saigon regime, which regularly tries to deny American funds to its non-Communist opponents.

5. Peace Offensive

A confederal strategy will steadily improve the negotiating position of the South Vietnamese government by consolidating its support and enabling it to bid away Communist cadres. It will create a basis for national negotiations that cannot presently exist so long as the Communists perceive that the government of Saigon is inherently unstable. Should Hanoi and the Viet Cong hierarchy become reconciled to the impossibility of a conventional military victory, they will still have the choice of reverting to guerrilla warfare or of trying to bargain for partial control of their enclaves in the countryside in general negotiations. A confederal approach will then make possible a stable solution. It should be emphasized that as long as all efforts for limiting American costs are directed at securing general negotiations, military escalation will go unchecked. A confederal approach, by coordinating military and political initiatives, will assure a lessening of the conflict until such time as peace talks become feasible.

6. Elections

A confederal strategy would attack the endemic cause of instability in an overly centralized system by conceding a measure of power to local leaders. Instead of placing preponderant emphasis on village and national elections, it would promise elections on the district and provincial level. Under present policies almost all provincial and district chiefs are military officers and all middle-level officials are appointed and promoted from Saigon; under a confederal strategy many of these administrators will be elected.

Vietnam's local leaders need something to fight for. An increase in their own authority is a more plausible incentive than the imposition of corrupt officials from Saigon. A confederal strategy would accordingly urge that provincial and district elections be offered to all areas that are able to maintain internal security.

Possible objections

Elements of the French-educated middle class of Saigon and perhaps all the refugees from the North may greet a confederal strategy without enthusiasm, and even with outright hostility. Thirteen years of American support have accustomed many Saigon residents to the illusion that they themselves have ruled the provincial towns and the countryside. French intellectual habits have made them see Saigon as the Paris of South Vietnam, as an administrative capital of a thoroughly centralized regime. Northern refugees, for their part, are likely to oppose bitterly any scheme emphasizing regional bases of power and implicitly denying their right to return.

But Vietnamese political and military leaders, however adamantly they may oppose a change in their comfortable assumptions, have also shown a remarkable ability to adapt to political realities when they are not protected from them by American troops and economic aid. The confederal strategy will remind recalcitrant Vietnamese leaders that the illusion of centralized rule was possible in the past only because of massive American support and that such support will henceforth go to a vision of government that is more consistent with democratic ideals and more appropriate to Vietnamese political realities. The United States can begin distributing its aid in a decentralized fashion even during the period of readjustment to the new idea.

A second possible objection is that thanks to thirteen years of suppression of local leadership, there may be no popular regional and ethnic leaders with which to bargain on a confederal basis. The Appendix to this paper should satisfy doubts on this matter. It demonstrates the tenacity of particularistic loyalties in South Vietnam. American officials and Vietnamese politicians who deny these loyalties should spend more time outside Saigon.

Finally, must not areas be pacified militarily before they can participate in a confederal framework? An Giang province suggests not, as do the repeated demands by northern Buddhists and mountain tribesmen for a measure of self-rule. In a counter-insurgency war the loyalty of the population is invaluable for reporting and resisting Viet Cong infiltrators. Wherever such loyalty can be won by the mere extension of local democracy, massive military pacification is neither necessary nor right.

Closed options

One cannot, of course, reduce the costs of the Vietnamese undertaking without eliminating certain options now open to American policy-makers; and it is only fair to list two options that a confederal strategy forecloses. The first is the possibility of ridding the countryside of all Communist influence. This has been the expressed aim of a few Saigon army officers, but no reputable American official has ever publicly favored sending the millions of counter-insurgency troops required.

The second option is that of destroying North Vietnam and thereby provoking the Chinese into a war in which their nuclear capacity would be destroyed. This would presumedly be done by creating a situation in Vietnam analogous to that in Korea. If the Chinese were convinced that the United States had extended its original war aims to include heavy punishment and possible invasion of the North, they might intervene and provide an excuse for pre-emptive war.

A confederal strategy assumes that the United States can contain the Chinese without destroying neighboring states, much as it contained the Russians in Europe. Those

who disagree with this assumption will of course find the cost of this strategy too high. They will find it intolerable that the United States adhere to its declared war aims, which include a preservation of the South but not the destruction of the North.

Four aims

A confederal strategy is designed to:

I. *Reduce American costs without sacrificing America's moral obligations to its Southeast Asian allies.* In contrast to present policies which increase the level of United States military involvement in installments, a confederal strategy aims at a decrease from the present troop levels. It accepts as a lower limit any troops necessary to defend from conventional attack those areas in which the local population is loyal to the government and constitution of South Vietnam and able to maintain internal stability.

II. *To confront the significant a) political, b) military, and c) diplomatic realities of the Vietnamese situation.* These are: a) the fragmentation of non-Communist political groups and the social role of the cadre; b) the primacy of insurgency and the possibility of large-scale invasion; and, c) the unlikelihood of any diplomatic resolution of the conflict until there is a stable government in Saigon with a framework that will permit the Viet Cong to retain power in the countryside.

III. *Provide a direction for change and a vision of a feasible outcome.*

IV. *Coordinate military and political initiatives so that they are mutually reinforcing.*

A confederal strategy offers a coherent overview of the Vietnamese conflict that specifies *operational* political goals for every province and district of South Vietnam. The present goal of centralized government is unprecedented in Vietnamese history and is accordingly incapable of inspiring any real comprehension or loyalty in the countryside. A confederal strategy reasserts the primacy of the political element in limited warfare and does so on a level where political guidelines can save American lives.

For these reasons the Ripon Society endorses a nonfederal strategy. If great obstacles to its implementation exist, they are not to be found on the terrain of South Vietnam. They are to be found in Washington.

III. THE REPUBLICAN RESPONSIBILITY

It is not necessary to blame the entire structure of present policy on any one man or party, or any small group of officials. For although President Johnson and his advisers seem stubbornly committed to an imprudent and costly course of action, and although they will continue to use every available form of political leverage to avoid being confronted with their mistakes, the fault is not entirely theirs. Their misconceived policies could not have developed unchecked were it not for deeper malfunctions in our political institutions.

Bureaucratic momentum

There has been, to begin with, an administrative imbalance between our ability to take military risks and our ability to take political risks. The Department of Defense, reformed under unified civilian control, has been able to offer flexible responses to world problems. It has adopted a method of planning and budgeting that enables it to see clearly the costs, interrelations, and long-range military implications of its programs. And it engages in planning for contingencies so that it will be prepared for crises.

No comparable comprehensive effort in cost analysis, coordination, and contingency planning has been undertaken among the cluster of civilian agencies charged with economic and political elements of foreign policy. As a result, the relations between military and non-military instruments of foreign policy have often been determined by blind bureaucratic momentum, which naturally favors the better-prepared agencies. Because the Department of Defense is unified, massive and engaged in stand-by operations, while civilian agencies are fragmented and devoted to day-to-day details, American policy has a built-in tendency to drift toward military measures in time of stress.

South Vietnam provides a tragic example. America's power to wage war in that country is enormous. But we have been unable to wage peace, to formulate a political strategy that would limit the loss of life and build a basis for a negotiated settlement. American forces destroy entire villages on less hard intelligence than the Viet Cong use in assassinating a single village chief. Military contingency plans exist for invasion of North Vietnam, for bombing of Haiphong, for bombing of dikes, for counter-insurgency operations south of the Mekong River and doubtless even for use of nuclear weapons. But do similar plans exist for a confederal initiative or for any realistic settlement? Perhaps in a sub-basement of the State Department. But so long as there is no public indication of them American talk of negotiation lacks credibility. Political preparedness, like military preparedness, has to be publicized to be believed. It is meaningless for officials to talk of America's desire for peace and for a "political solution" so long as the administrative means to implement these hopes are not known to exist.

Congressional weakness

A second imbalance, between Congress and the Executive branch, has permitted bureaucratic mistakes to go unchecked. The Legislative branch faces long-term problems in adapting its procedures to the growth of executive power. In recent years it has begun laying plans for such adaptation: plans for Congressional reorganization, for improved staffing, for proper access to information and expert advice. But the Vietnamese conflict came before any innovations could be made and although it has forced many responsible legislators to revise their own roles in the making of foreign policy, it has caught Congress as a whole off guard.

Congress has neither the staffing nor the machinery to assert its prerogatives in the making of Vietnam policy. Its right to be consulted has been compromised into a right to ratify. Bureaucrats come before its inquiries in a contrived atmosphere of crisis with answers which are predetermined by carefully controlled information. Congress' right to know has been reduced to the right to be briefed. Legislators have been informed promptly of the *results* of policy in Vietnam, but no body of Congress has had continuing access to the political intelligence and strategic plans from which decisions are really made. Even Congress' right to set broad aims has been undermined by executive decisions which, although apparently "tactical," have altered the character of the war. Congress, in sum, has been unable to check the bureaucracy from without. Since significant checks are also absent from within, the pattern of Vietnam can easily be repeated: American policy can drift toward military solutions where political ones will suffice; American youth can die because its elders lack decisive civilian leadership.

Presidential style

President Johnson did not create the imbalances in our political institutions, but neither has he tried to correct them. If anything, his personal style of administration has accentuated the difficulties. His is a style of secrecy and silence. He has been willing to consider only proposals that filter noiselessly through bureaucratic channels. He is famous for rejecting out of hand programs that originate outside his administration and for cancelling plans that are leaked prematurely to the press. He has been criticized for this, and he has also been praised for relying more than any recent president on career civil servants.

But the Johnson style has more important consequences than its occasional outbursts of pique or its encouragement of career service. Its charm for the President lies in its ability to stifle effective criticism. By keeping programs secret until the moment of their release, the President gives opponents no time to prepare alternatives. He subjects legislators to a blitz of proposals that overwhelms their meager staffs. The President's practice of withdrawing nominations and programs that receive advance publicity also keeps dissidents within the administration from taking their case to the public. Since a public row means the sure rejection of a proposal, civil servants seldom dare to express their preferences outside official channels. The president's style thus excludes the public (and Congress) from bureaucratic debate and in so doing leaves the natural momentum of the bureaucracy uncorrected by external pressures. In foreign affairs this means that however many skirmishes may be won by proponents of political initiatives, the main thrust of American policy remains in the hands of the strongest agency, the Pentagon. Even if the President should reorient his Vietnam policy, his administration is unlikely to overcome its dependence on military plans and its habituation to military risks. It presents a classic example of self-entrenching bureaucracy that cannot be reformed from within.

Lessons for the GOP

If foreign policy is to change, if the serious imbalances in our institutions are to be corrected, if the lessons of Vietnam are to teach anything, a new administration must be elected. An alternative in foreign policy will have to be Republican.

Not any Republican alternative will do. A Republican administration must be committed to reducing the costs of the American undertaking in Vietnam. We have described a general approach to Vietnam that eschews escalation, that can succeed without the good will of the North Vietnamese, that keeps the cost below an acceptable upper limit, and that can lead to an honorable outcome. It remains for a new administration, undeluded and free to act, to adopt a confederal strategy.

A Republican president must also commit himself to long-range reforms in the administration of foreign policy. Future involvements should be shaped by realities abroad rather than bureaucratic inertia in Washington. Numerous analyses and proposals for administrative reform already exist. It is time to review these materials and to lay plans for a change. Here is one area in which the appointment of a Presidential Commission could be more than a publicity stunt.

A Republican Congress (or at least a Republican House) must adapt Congressional machinery to the demands of global foreign policy. Congress should consider establishing a joint committee on intelligence and strategic planning which would require the Executive Branch to report periodically on America's international position, much as the Joint Economic Committee requires it to report on budgetary policies. * * *

New departures

The need for changes in foreign policy imposes a responsibility on the Republican Party. On all fronts the Johnson Administration has failed to provide prudent, realistic leadership. Its political policies, which remain open-ended, will require many more American troops unless a hard decision is made between countering invasion and countering insurgency. Its diplomatic policies, which ignore local negotiations, have no prospect for success during the coming year. Its failure to take steps for long-term admin-

istrative reform assures that these deficiencies will persist, that American policies will drift by installments toward an ever wider, ever more senseless war. The Republican Party can provide a way out of this fiasco. It can grasp the realities of local politics in Vietnam; it can reassert the limited nature of American aims; it can reduce the costs in human life; it can bring into Government men from our universities, our professions, our business community who are better qualified to run this country's foreign policy than the self-deluded men who try to make reality out of fiction from their desks in Washington. The best men, the best minds in this country are not making American foreign policy.

The Ripon Society calls on Republicans to undertake new departures in foreign affairs. Though the issues are complex, their essentials can be brought to the people. In 1952 the Republican Party demonstrated that it could extricate America from a war on the Asian mainland. The issue now is whether the American people think our present course in Vietnam is worth more deception, more resources, more lives.

If they do not, there *is* an alternative.

SAIGON'S POOR CONTROL OVER THE RURAL POPULATION

The most important conclusions of the following tables are:

1. While the Viet Cong's control over its rural areas is almost always "total," Saigon's is usually only "partial."

2. Viet Cong cadres operate regularly among almost three-fourths of the rural population—the 25% controlled and the 47% contested.

3. The Saigon government has little positive attraction for rural areas, for it controls no more people (3.6 million) than the number who have been alienated by the Viet Cong (3.0 to 4.0 million).

4. Over one-fifth of the rural population north of the Saigon area have become refugees since 1964.

5. While the government probably relies on recent refugees for most of its controlled areas north of Saigon, one-fourth of the rural population in the Southern Lowlands traditionally has opposed the Communists.

The numbers behind these discouraging comparisons are very conservative. The "rural" population under Saigon's control is greatly exaggerated, because it includes district town (and probably also most provincial capitals) which are not really rural and which can be protected by artillery and airpower without control over their inhabitants. The anti-Communist groups are estimated by increasing past numbers with a 2.8% annual population growth, U.S. AID's official figure; but since 1960, the year of Diem's most reliable census, the population has grown even faster. The number of refugees since 1964 is underestimated, because many rural people who have fled to the cities and are now scratching out a living on their own have never been registered with the Saigon government.

TABLE I.—SAIGON'S AND THE VIETCONG'S CONTROL OVER THE POPULATION OF SOUTH VIETNAM

	Number	Percent of total population	Percent of rural population
Nonurban population:			
Saigon's control	3,618,400	21	27
Total control	489,300	3	4
Partial control	3,129,100	18	23
Contested population	6,336,700	37	47
Government leaning	4,360,600	25	32
Vietcong leaning	1,976,100	12	15
Vietcong's control	3,325,400	19	25
Partial control	402,200	2	3
Total control	2,923,200	17	22
Unclassified	152,300	1	1
Urban population	3,732,500	22	------
Totals:			
Nonurban population	13,432,800	78	100
Total population	17,165,300	100	------
Number of voters registered for the presidential election	5,853,251	69	[1] 60
Total eligible population over 18	8,500,000	------	------

[1] Percentage for rural areas registered assumes ½ of the urban population to be eligible and entirely registered.

Note: The registered total corresponds almost exactly to ½ the sum of the urban population, plus the rural areas under total and partial control and the Government leaning portion of the contested areas.

TABLE II.—RURAL GROUPS THAT SHOULD SUPPORT THE SAIGON GOVERNMENT COMPARED TO POPULATION ACTUALLY CONTROLLED

	Rural population groups			Control statistics (for comparison with rural group totals for all of South Vietnam)
	Northern half of South Vietnam (I and II corps)	Southern half of South Vietnam (III and IV corps)	All of South Vietnam	
Most secure Province (excluding Provincial capital): An Giang Province (Hoa Hao sect).	------	440,000	440,000	489,300 (population under total control of Saigon Government).
2 fairly secure Provinces (excluding Provincial capital):				
Kien Giang Province (assumed ½ Cambodian): 22,000 farmer refugees, descendants of 1954 farmer refugees.	------	339,000	339,000	
Ninh Thuan Province: 2,000 descendants of 1954 farmer refugees.	128,000	------	128,000	
Traditional anti-Communist groups:				
Cambodians (170,000 already counted in Kien Giang Province)	------	374,000–624,000	374,000–624,000	
Descendants of 1954, I: Farmer refugees resettled through land development program (24,000 already counted).	76,000	80,000	156,000	
Descendants of 1954, II: Farmer refugees not resettled through land development program and hence still near Saigon or now refugees in Saigon.	------	765,000	765,000	
Southern Catholics: Descendants of Catholics living south of the 17th parallel in 1954 and outside of the main cities (33 percent of total).	89,000	140,000	229,000	
Double counting (item to be subtracted before totaling)	------	194,000	194,000	
Saigon's natural support: Total (3 most secure provinces and other traditional anti-Communist groups).	293,000	1,944,000–2,194,000	2,237,000–2,487,000	3,618,000 (population under total or partial control of Saigon Government).
Refugees since 1964 (in refugee camps, returned to home villages, resettled elsewhere, registered and receiving limited assistance).	1,080,000	720,000	1,800,000	
Minimum additional refugees (assumes recent refugees include as many as possible traditional anti-Communists).	787,000	------	787,000	
Maximum additional refugees (assumes same proportion of traditional anti-Communists among refugees as in general population)	1,018,000	552,000–531,000	1,570,000–1,549,000	
Saigon's minimum potential control: Range: Group closest to Saigon Government control (traditional anti-Communists, 3 secure Provinces, 1954 refugees)	1,080,000–1,311,000	1,944,000–2,725,000	3,024,000–4,036,000	3,618,000 (population under total or partial control of Saigon Government; repeated for another comparison).
Total rural population	5,080,000	8,350,000	13,432,800	13,432,800.
Percent of Saigon's natural support as share of rural population	5.8	23.3–26.3	16.7–18.5	
Percent of refugees as share of rural population (minimum comparison, for rural base does not include both reported and unreported refugees now in cities)	21.3	8.6	13.4	
Range: Percent of group closest to Saigon Government control	21.3–25.8	23.3–32.6	22.4–29.8	27 (total and partial control of rural population claimed by Saigon Government).

SOURCES

Control Statistics: R. W. Apple, Jr., "Vietnam: Signs of Stalemate," New York *Times*, August 7, 1967, p. 14.

2.8% Yearly Population Increase: U.S.A.I.D., Vietnam, Joint Economic Division, *Annual Statistical Bulletin*, No. 9, issued September 1966, p. 2.

Provincial Population Estimates (as of July 1964) *Ibid.*, p. 5.

Listing of An Giang as Most Secure Province; Kien Giang and Ninh Thuan as Next Most Secure, Simon Head, "Pacifying Vietnam," *Far Eastern Economic Review*, May 4, 1967, p. 260.

Number of Cambodians (assumed for mid-1960 to be 300,000–500,000), Joseph Buttinger, "The Ethnic Minorities in the Republic of Vietnam, pp. 99–121 of *Problems of Freedom*, ed., by Wesley R. Fishel, M.S.U. Press, 1961, p. 120, n. 3.

Northern Refugees Resettled before July 1959; William Henderson, "Opening of New Lands and Villages," *Ibid.*, p. 136.

Farmer Refugees from North; Bui Van Long, former General Director of the Refugee Commission of the Government of Vietnam, "The Role of Friendly Nations," pp. 48–53 of *Viet-Nam: The First Five Years, An International Symposium*, ed. by Richard W. Lindholm, M.S.U. Press, 1959, p. 49.

Refugees in South Vietnam as of June 30, 1966; Government of Vietnam Special Commissariat for Refugees, reproduced in William A. Nighswonger, *Rural Pacification in Vietnam* Praeger, 1966, pp. 181.

Refugees in South Vietnam as of February 6, 1967 *Congressional Record*, February 6, 1967, S 1609.

Descendants of Catholics in South Vietnam before 1954; Francis J. Corley, "Vietnam Since Geneva" in *Thought: Fordham University Quarterly*, Vol. XXXIII, No. 131, Winter 1958–1959; reprinted by American Friends of Vietnam, p. 523. Higher estimate is closer, for it includes the Hue vicariate, "most" of whom were south of the 17th parallel.

APPENDIX: THE HISTORICAL BASIS FOR A CONFEDERAL STRATEGY—THE THREE REGIONS OF SOUTH VIETNAM

The following appendix reviews the different political histories of the three basic regions of South Vietnam: the Coast, the Highlands, and the Southern Lowlands. The historic roots and modern survival of crucial regional differences are traced through five periods: pre-French and French (up to 1945); Viet Minh activities (1945–54); the Diem regime (1954–63); the Start of the Insurgency (1957–63); and, Recent Events and U.S. Policy. Because of their greater importance for one region, Diem and the Viet Cong are discussed most fully in the appropriate sections under the Southern Lowlands, and the Buddhists are treated in the last section on the Coast.

Any stable solution in South Vietnam other than complete Communist control will have to respond much better to local differences than is now possible. Even the Communists in the North, with much smaller minority populations, grant more cultural autonomy than the government in Saigon. It is too late simply to make informal concessions to local leaders within a centralized legal structure, because such concessions have been made and betrayed by past Saigon governments, sometimes with American assistance.

Our purpose is not to discredit the desire for centralized unity held by many urban Vietnamese nor to recriminate against American officials who often had to make decisions within incorrect policy assumptions. It is necessary, however, for anyone who wants to avoid the refugee camp "solution" to appreciate the views of the different rural areas, cut off from Saigon and from each other. It is also necessary to realize that past mistakes in American policy cannot be dismissed by well-informed Vietnamese as simply unfortunate decisions by a previous rotation of Americans, because, unlike the French, the American government has great power to change reality to fit its myths.

The United States has great moral responsibilities for South Vietnam's present difficulties, not only for millions of refugees and for military officers and civilian officials with poor prospects under a Communist regime. The United States has steadily supported, in the name of "freedom" for South Vietnam, a great degree of centralization and has ignored political repression. Americans would never accept these actions at home. South Vietnam's fragmented urban political groups and confused countryside are partly the result of thirteen years of independence without reform under Saigon governments able to rely on American aid instead of taxes. Americans should hesitate before being patronizing about South Vietnam's lack of democracy.

A Vietnamese businessman summed it up to an American reporter last month: "You Americans think we are stupid and backward people, but we are progressive, and we will not be given a chance in this election." He had half a chance, and 65% of the country took it to show that they did not like the generals. But, because of military pressure on the Constituent Assembly last summer the South Vietnamese did not have a chance to vote in a run-off between the generals and their closest civilian rivals. Now our government is touting the generals as the first ticket in a "fair" election, but American officials will not mention at home that the generals did not dare enter a run-off. And neither will they mention that the generals, with the encouragement of American policy, are ignoring the persistent regional differences of South Vietnam.

THE HIGHLAND: PRE-FRENCH TRADITION AND FRENCH RULE

The Highlands—comprising well over half of the territory and within an hour's drive of most of the rest of South Vietnam—have always been unattractive to lowland Vietnamese. Malaria, infertile soil, tigers, and hostile tribesmen kept out Vietnamese settlements during a thousand years of Vietnamese migration in adjacent areas.

The tribesmen living in the Highlands are of at least two races, speak many languages, live in settlements of only a few thousand, and have no generally recognized political institutions or tradition of common action. But the tribesmen have one thing in common—fear and hatred of the lowlanders, first of the Cham who drove them from the fertile lowlands into the malarial hills and then of the Vietnamese who kept them there and who sometimes tried to impose upon them the Vietnamese way of life.

Another thing most tribesmen have in common is a slash-and-burn technique of rice growing. Most land is left to weeds, small brush, and trees. Every few years an area is cleared, burned over, and cultivated until the soil's temporary fertility is exhausted. The slash-and-burn technique imposes a low population density and small, scattered settlements on the tribes because most of the land is left to grow wild.

The French did not rule the Highlands with consistent policies. Sometimes they used tribesmen as local administrators, sometimes Frenchmen, and sometimes the hated Vietnamese. The French started schools, invented scripts for tribal languages, and established some modern medical facilities. At the same time, the French brought new products to the lowlands which replaced the cash crops of the tribesmen, reducing their ability to support themselves. The French also impressed tribesmen to work on roads and plantations.

Although the French record in the Highlands was certainly a dubious one—and provoked widespread tribal revolts in the 1930's—the tribesmen south of the 17th parallel can compare them favorably to the last Vietnamese dynasty and to the Diem regime, both of which seized tribal lands, established Vietnamese settlements in the Highlands, and tried to impose Vietnamese customs on the tribesmen.

THE HIGHLANDS: VIET MINH ACTIVITIES

The Viet Minh success was based on an unprecedented adjustment by lowland Vietnamese to the Highland environment and to tribal customs. The anti-malarial pill, which the Viet Minh secretly purchased in large quantities from French merchants, was generally regarded within the Viet Minh as the greatest physical factor (aside from captured weapons and ammunition) behind their success. Viet Minh cadres who worked among the tribes learned their languages, adopted their dress (even breaking their front teeth if local custom demanded), and married tribal women. Able tribesmen were given leadership posts within the Viet Minh, and the most loyal tribe (the Tho) was even represented by a Brigadier General.

Unlike earlier rebels against the French, the Viet Minh were able to use the Highlands for base camps and rest areas and to recruit tribesmen for coolies and soldiers. In the North, the Viet Minh had already advanced into Laos when the French decided to fortify Dien Bien Phu in a vain effort to keep the loyalty of the Tai tribes and to defend Laos (whose French-supported government was the only one in Indochina satisfied with its limited degree of independence) against further invasions.

South of the 17th parallel, the Viet Minh effort came later but with as much success. By 1954, the Viet Minh had infiltrated the Highlands, opened the Ho Chi Minh Trail, defeated the elite French Groupe Mobile 100, and gained a position to cut through to the sea coast if the French refused a cease-fire after Dien Bien Phu. In the post-Geneva regroupment, some 25,000 tribesmen left the area south of the 17th parallel—over twice as many proportionally as the number of lowland regroupees to the North.

THE HIGHLANDS: DIEM AND EARLY U.S. POLICY

Diem was the first lowland Vietnamese ever to rule the Highlands directly, and his policies basically reflected lowland contempt of the tribesmen. He regarded tribal lands as the public domain and granted the choicest valleys to ethnic Vietnamese in order to facilitate direct Vietnamese physical control over the Highlands, to settle refugees from the North, and to relieve population pressure along the crowded Coast. Diem abolished the customary tribal courts established by the French and made Vietnamese the language of instruction in the schools.

Many of Diem's important American supporters approved of his approach to the tribesmen. An Associate Executive Director of the Council on Foreign Relations and one of the Council's Far Eastern specialists dismissed other approaches (presumably the autonomous zones of the French and of North Vietnam) as "reservations." Under Diem, the tribes were to be "made more subject to civil administration" and "ultimately assimilated" into "the surrounding civilization." Another early supporter, the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the American Friends of Vietnam, wrote:

"The tribesmen, unused to Vietnamese friendliness, grew more suspicious with every official assurance of concern; the more they were told that the government would at last do something to remove the causes of their plight, the more opposed they seemed to every new administrative measure." *

Not surprisingly, Diem's policies provoked a widespread revolt in the Highlands. In the revolt were the two tribes which the French had given important administrative posts and hence contacts beyond their villages. The leader, Y Bham, a Rhade tribesman, is now the leader of FULRO, the leading tribal organization.

Early American policy in the Highlands was different from, but no better than Diem's. The French disbanded their commando force, the GMCA, and the American Military Mission did not pick up French contacts for commando or intelligence operations. When two members of the Michigan State Advisory Group in Vietnam returned from field trips with reports of tribesmen cadres from North Vietnam organizing groups in the Highlands, the U.S. Mission ignored them. When even Diem himself, in a visit to Washington described below, warned of infiltration in the Highlands and asked for American aid to counter it he was refused. When the American Mission eventually opposed Diem's project for resettling ethnic Vietnamese in the Highlands, the reason given was the infertility of the soil in the strategic places Diem chose, not the hostility such settlements were arousing among the tribes.

---

* The latter and probably also the former later changed their views on Diem. These passages are not cited to reflect discredit on these men, but to illustrate the general approval given by Americans to even Diem's cultural imperialism. (Pages 125 and 105 of Problems of Freedom, edited by Wesley R. Fishel, Michigan State University Press, 1961.)

Diem had taken office without a clear idea of the Viet Minh path to victory, but by 1957, when the infiltration began from the North, he was very sensitive to the unprecedented danger posed by enemy control of the Highlands. In addition to intensifying his unfortunate cultural imperialism, Diem wanted to build access roads through the Highlands and to turn his Civil Guard into a paramilitary force to combat the infiltration by North Vietnam. In Saigon, the American Embassy and the U.S. Mission preferred more conspicuous roads, between the cities. U.S. officials in Saigon also opposed giving military training to the Civil Guard because it was grouped in Diem's Interior Department instead of Defense! When Diem made a special State Visit to Washington to ask for bulldozers for the roads and for financial and training support for a paramilitary force, he was again refused.

THE HIGHLANDS: START OF THE INSURGENCY

In 1957, just as Diem's repressive policies were taking effect, tribesmen who had gone north in 1954 and who had been trained as cadres in Hanoi began returning and starting cells in their home villages. Since the Viet Minh had earlier taken over the area from the French and since Diem had a much worse record among the tribes (around Kontum, Communist propaganda even promised to bring back a popular French administrator once the South Vietnamese were driven from the Highlands), the newly trained cadres moved easily through the Highlands.

The Communist propaganda emphasized the autonomous zones (on the Soviet and Communist Chinese models) recently created for the tribes in North Vietnam. In the North, tribesmen were given administrative posts within their areas, the Tho general cited earlier was made chairman of his zone, tribal languages were kept in the schools, tribesmen were given higher education in Hanoi and elsewhere in the Communist bloc, and there was no land-grabbing by ethnic Vietnamese, although population pressure was much greater in the North than along Diem's Coast. Supporting the cadres were radio programs in tribal languages broadcast from Hanoi, while Diem's government had discontinued such broadcasts after the regroupment period, 1954-1955.

THE HIGHLANDS: RECENT EVENTS AND U.S. POLICY

A crucial recent development has been the disillusionment of the tribesmen with the Viet Cong. Harsh taxation and impressment of coolies for increased Viet Cong operations over the past few years have destroyed the advantage the Viet Cong once had in the region. While taxes and recruitment have always been great burdens on Viet Minh and Viet Cong hard-core villages, the Communists have generally used political techniques which prevent effective opposition. Short-sighted exactions in the Highlands may have been undertaken consciously, in the hope that victory over all of South Vietnam would come too swiftly for the tribesmen to resist.

Unfortunately, the post-Diem Saigon governments have not moved strongly enough in the Highlands to make up for Diem's mistakes. The first steps have been taken, and many good promises have been made. In February 1964, Y Bham, the leader of the 1958 revolt, was released from jail; in March a Bureau of Montagnard Affairs was established. In October 1964, the Saigon government held a conference for tribal leaders to present their grievances. The tribesmen now have national representation, access to universities through lower admissions test scores than are required of the better-educated Vietnamese, places in noncommissioned officers' schools, a greater hand in local administration, and a promise of a fair system of land titles.

Yet the confidence of the tribesmen has not yet been gained. The conference of October 1964 was held only after a revolt in September, and that revolt was caused by the assumption of command over tribal military units by ethnic Vietnamese ARVN officers. There have been two revolts since, in October and December 1965. The latter revolt was well-organized, being staged simultaneously in five of the seven provincial capitals. Armed tribesmen serving under Vietnamese officers have expressed the intent to throw out the South Vietnamese by force when the Viet Cong are defeated.

A tribal revolt this fall?

This fall there may be still yet another revolt in the Highlands. When the Constituent Assembly was writing the present South Vietnamese Constitution, the tribesmen demanded explicit guarantees of autonomy. The Assembly, largely composed of urban Vietnamese, refused to include such guarantees, though they wrote a long and detailed document with over one hundred articles. A tribal revolt was averted this spring only by promises from Saigon and American officials that similar guarantees of autonomy will be passed by statute when the new House and Senate convene this fall. If the newly elected legislators refuse to honor promises made by the military government and U.S. officials (quite possible for civilian politicians who hate the military government and who fear permanent American domination), then another tribal revolt seems likely. It is important to note that the previous revolts have occurred in the fall, when the rainy season hampers the transport of Vietnamese and American troops into the Highlands.

Y Bham, now living in Cambodia, heads the only tribal political group (FULRO) and claims to have organized the three revolts of 1964–65. In their negotiations with FULRO representatives, the Saigon government and the U.S. Mission have recognized FULRO leadership of past revolts and taken seriously FULRO threats of revolts in the future. FULRO and the Cambodian government have agreed on a common propaganda line, that all the Montagnards of South Vietnam are of the same racial stock as the Cambodians in South Vietnam and Cambodia. While based on false history (at least two racial groups live in the Highlands), FULRO-Cambodian cooperation corresponds to joint self-interest. FULRO gains a safe headquarters on the Cambodian side of the border and access to the outside world. Cambodia gains contacts in the strategic Highlands of South Vietnam which may help less populous Cambodia to restrain any future expansionist ethnic Vietnamese government in Saigon, whether Communist or not.

The United States has always been in a difficult position in the Highlands. In 1961, the sending of the Special Forces (similar to the previously disbanded French commandos) was an implicit repudiation of Diem's tribal policies and aroused Vietnamese suspicions. In 1964, after Diem's fall, the Special Forces were transferred from the CIA to the U.S. Army. Vietnamese ARVN officers replaced Americans commanding tribal units and American officers became "advisers," as in the Lowlands. In the revolt and negotiations that have followed this shift, Americans have played a crucial role in mediating between the tribes and the ARVN. (The only Vietnamese officer the tribes respected in 1964 was jailed as a "neuralist.") But the unremitting hostility between most Vietnamese and the tribesmen (and Cambodians) and repeated decisions by the U.S. Mission in Saigon in favor of the Vietnamese will eventually undermine the prestige of Americans on the spot. The U.S. cannot expect to keep tribal loyalties by giving out medical care and T-shirts emblazoned with the South Vietnamese flag, because the Saigon government is not yet trusted. The only stable solution is a full recognition of tribal autonomy by urban Vietnamese. The U.S. cannot simultaneously mollify the tribes by implying a long American presence and placate the Vietnamese by promising to leave as soon as Hanoi negotiates. Tribal minorities are a general post-colonial problem, for most anti-colonial revolutions were led by well-educated lowlanders insisting that a highly centralized unity was the only way to eliminate foreign domination. In South Vietnam, the U.S. must show that this is not true.

THE COAST: PRE-FRENCH TRADITION AND FRENCH RULE

Coastal Vietnam differs from the Southern Lowlands in several important respects: it has a longer pre-French history; more extensive pre-French social cohesion, smaller change under French colonial rule; and, most important, a far longer history of Communist influence. Because he is more traditional, is less Westernized, and probably has Communist relatives, even the most anti-Communist Coastal Vietnamese is more difficult for Americans to understand than a Vietnamese from Saigon or the Mekong Delta.

The Coastal Region of South Vietnam extends down through the present I Corps, the northernmost military region. But south of the next province, Binh Dinh, the land narrows even further and is disrupted by sand dunes. Many villages (Phu Yen, Khanh Hoa) depend upon fishing instead of upon rice-farming. Still farther south, there is a half-settled area (Ninh Thuan, Binh Thuan) which was once fully cultivated by the Cham people but which the Vietnamese did not maintain or revive.

Vietnam's traditional civilization began in the Red River Delta in North Vietnam. Because the Coastal Lowlands are too narrow to attract quick settlement, the Vietnamese moved down the coast only quite slowly, less than a thousand miles in about a thousand years. Their migration, spurred by internal political disputes and population pressure, was necessarily southward; movement was blocked to the North by the stronger Chinese and to the West by the even less hospitable mountains.

Poor communications made a centralized state impossible, but migration was slow enough that the same structure of village life existed all the way down the Coast when the French arrived in the mid-1800's. These villages were the basis of Vietnamese tradition. Much of the land, averaging 25% and sometimes as much as 70%, was redistributed every few years among the households. Except for trade with neighboring villages specializing in certain handicrafts, the rice-growing villages were self-sufficient communities, independent of outside influence. Anyone from beyond the ring of immediately surrounding villages was regarded as a "foreigner." Except for levying taxes and occasionally recruiting troops, the power of the Emperor stopped at the village gate.

In the traditional village the mandarin class provided the best tie to the outside world. Most mandarins lived in the villages, renting land, lending money, and serving on the village Councils of Notables. Some obtained, through examination or purchase, appointments from the Emperor to provincial and district posts.

Fortunately, the Emperor was not a dictator in the modern sense. Though the Confucian ethic supported his powers over the mandarins in theory, the Emperor was restrained by the mandarins' partial independence of their salaries provided by their rents, interest, and bribes and by the general expectation of all office-purchasers that they would not be removed until they had gained a fair return on their investment. The power of the mandarins over the villagers was restricted by several factors: the large proportion of communal land; the lack of absentee

landowners; a consciousness of extended families, all of whose members, rich and poor, worshipped the same ancestors; and a tradition of compromise and adjustment in interpersonal relations.

Even before the arrival of French officials, this village tradition was challenged by Catholic missionaries in the North and along much of the Coast. The Buddhists had not established a centralized hierarchy extending down into the villages that could compete with the influence of the mandarin class. The Catholics not only set up such a hierarchy, they also developed a village daily routine—mass every morning and regular prayers in the fields at the ringing of the Angelus—which defied the tradition of compromise and forced villages to convert as whole units. Catholic villages were persecuted regularly by their neighbors, often with the encouragement of the Emperor, for their competing hierarchy and foreign way of life.

But despite the Catholic problem, when French officials arrived in the late 1800's, they found a relatively stable social and political system,which they chose to preserve along the Coast. Unlike the Southern Lowlands, the Highlands, and the Red River Delta, the Coast had no minerals or lands appropriate for rice or rubber plantations whose exploitation would require and pay for direct French rule. The French therefore gave the Vietnamese in Hue nominal authority, maintained a small French staff for the Coast, and controlled the Emperor through the Resident, ostensibly just an "adviser." The French even preserved the traditional civil service examination based on the Confucian Classics until 1917, twelve years after the Chinese themselves had abandoned them.

While they had lost some power, Coastal mandarins, unlike those of the North and South, were not closely tied to French officials and businessmen. The French presence along the Coast did not bring great economic changes or disrupt traditional village life. Therefore, Coastal Vietnamese of all social classes, no matter how well they spoke the French language, always regarded the French presence as an insulting, alien intrusion which would eventually be expelled.

THE COAST: VIET MINH ACTIVITIES

From the outset of the anti-French revolt, the Viet Minh controlled most of the Coastal region. The situation was so severe for the French that they did not even attempt population estimates for most of the Coastal provinces—indispensable for taxation and recruitment. These estimates were made even for hostile provinces to the North and South.

Viet Minh influence along the Coast was assisted by the fact that the only political groups active in the region were those the Viet Minh were already defeating in the Red River Delta through better organization, superior tactics and assassination of crucial leaders.

With the exception of the Catholic Bishoprics, and the Emperor Bao Dai, political groups could be started only in exile in China, Hong Kong, and Japan. When Northern and Coastal students conspired in exile for unity, their rivalries were not so much regional as personal or ideological, except to the extent of excluding Southerners, whom the French were more confident of controlling and who therefore were allowed some political activity. When the Communists were able to limit the power of rival exile groups in the North, the power of anti-Communist groups was simultaneously limited along the Coast.

By 1949, according to Lucien Boddard's insurgency map, the Viet Minh controlled all of the Coast north of Dong Hoi, a city just north of the 17th parallel. The French then had a thin strip of four cities down to the 16th parallel: Dong Noi, Quang Tri, Hue, and Danang.

Farther south, the Viet Minh controlled between the 16th and 14th parallels in 1949. During the next four years, according to the May 1953 insurgency map of the French General Henri Navarre, the Viet Minh extended their control down to the 11th parallel, around Phan Thiet. Only two isolated French controlled cities in this area, Nha Trang and Phan Rang, were outside of Viet Minh control in this period. Bernard Fall's insurgency maps for 1954 (the first presumably for January or February, published in March; the second for July) credit the French with regaining control of the countryside between Phan Rang and Phan Thiet, but Fall still conceded the Viet Minh control of the Coast between the 16th and 12th parallels when the war ended. Yet these estimates are clearly biased against the Viet Minh. They include French urban enclaves, but omit at least one prominent rural enclave controlled by the Viet Minh—the famous "Street Without Joy," a strip of villages between Quang Tri and Hue.

Fall revealed the extent of Navarre's bias against acknowledging Viet Minh control in the Red River Delta. The French military map conceded only five small, isolated areas to the Viet Minh in May 1953. On the other hand, the map of the French civilian officials who had to estimate probable tax returns and decide to travel without military escorts was quite different from Navarre's. According to the civilians, France controlled only four isolated areas: the Hanoi-Haiphong area (where many French troops were stationed) and the Catholic Bishoprics of Phat Diem and Bui Chu, where an anti-French Vietnamese clergy, not Frenchmen, enjoyed the support of the populace.

Along the Coast, in 1954 it was not even Frenchmen who were in charge of the non-Viet Minh enclaves. The decisive political figures under Emperor Bao Dai, the French "alternative" to Ho Chi Minh, were Coastal mandarins and adventurers. By the end of the war, these men had finally bargained from the French the financial support for a "Vietnamese" army, predominantly led by French officers. During the Battle of Dien Bien Phu, Bao Dai's followers were even able to obtain a major separate operation along the Coast with troops that might have been better used in the undermanned French fortress to the North.

After the settlement in Geneva just as the French were allowed to occupy Hanoi and Haiphong for 300 days to regroup their forces, the Viet Minh received full legal authority over Quang Ngai and Binh Dinh, a long-time Coastal stronghold between the 16th and 14th parallels. In the two provinces, the Viet Minh established a long-term political base by ordering several hundred of their regular soldiers to marry local girls and leave them behind when they were withdrawn to the North in accord with the Geneva agreements.

In most provinces, the Viet Minh ordered specific members to stay behind, and in many areas, they maintained an intelligence network. The Hanoi government itself produced convincing evidence for such a network when it described in detail to the International Control Commission reprisals by the Diem government in South Vietnam against former members of the Viet Minh between July 1954 and July 1957. According to Bernard Fall's map of Communist Complaints, this intelligence network was especially active in the Quang Tri-Hue-Danang area, which produced over one-third of the descriptions of reprisals.

THE COAST: DIEM FAMILY'S RULE

Diem's family, the Ngo Dinh's, was a leading Catholic mandarin clan centered on Hue. Diem and his older brother Khoi served as provincial governors under French indirect rule in Binh Dinh and Quang Tri Provinces, both along the Coast. When Diem took power in Saigon, his authority along the Coast was exercised by two men whose names did not appear in official government documents: his brothers Thuc and Can. (Diem himself is therefore discussed later, under the Southern Lowlands.)

Thuc played a crucial role in the family and in the regime because he was the eldest surviving brother in the clan (Khoi was buried alive by the Viet Minh) and the leading Vietnamese Catholic prelate. He frequently mediated among the other brothers, especially at the clan's annual meetings in Hue. Thuc also provided a discreet channel between the clan and important foreign Catholics. (He was a former classmate of Francis Cardinal Spellman in the Vatican.) Thuc also provided access to the regime for prominent Vietnamese, many of them non-Catholic, who had complaints or suggestions but who feared Diem and his brother Nhu too much to approach them directly. This mediating role for non-Catholic Vietnamese was crucial for Thuc, because it protected him from criticism against his ideological role in the regime.

The ideology of the regime was "Personalism," an intellectually respectable doctrine originally developed by liberal Catholics in the 1930's. Many non-Catholic Vietnamese, however, regarded it as simply a new political terminology which the Ngo Dinh family could use to communicate with Vietnamese Catholics without encouraging comparisons to the Catholic role under the French. Thuc had started an institute to train people in Personalism during the war against the French, when he was Bishop of Vinh Long. About the time Diem took power, Thuc was elevated to the Archbishopric of Hue. He moved his institute to Dalat and (with Cardinal Spellman's financial assistance) he simultaneously founded the Catholic University of Dalat. Under Diem, Thuc's institute for Personalism was the training school for members of the Can Lao, a secret political group whose members held administrative posts in the provinces and who reported directly to Diem's brother Nhu on the behavior of non-Can Lao (hence mostly non-Catholic) officials.

Diem's brother Can was a complete contrast to the rest of the clan. He did not speak a foreign language and hence had almost no contact with foreigners. Nor did he have much contact with Vietnamese, rarely appearing in public and usually speaking only to his own followers. He ran a skeleton network of secret agents for Diem to watch Nhu and his supporters in the South, predominantly refugee Catholics from the North. Otherwise, Can confined his activities to the Coast. He was a traditional, consistent warlord in the region, promoting his supporters and punishing his opponents with political prisons and tortures that eventually shocked even old Asia hands; he controlled nominations to the National Assembly and provincial and district appointments. After 1956, when Diem abolished traditional Vietnamese village elections, Can replaced doubtful village and hamlet officials as well. Before the elections of March 1956, Can had almost fifteen thousand people arrested, a far larger number than any estimate of Viet Minh agents left south of the 17th parallel and an average of three people per hamlet.

In Western terms, both Thuc and Can were "corrupt." They exploited their public influence to assist their operations in Saigon real estate, forest concessions in the Highlands, and the shipping business. But their system of rule was inherently more stable than that of Diem and Nhu in the Southern Lowlands. Can was predicable in his repressions, so people who never spoke against him in private did not feel threatened; Thuc provided access and an incentive for respected non-Personalists to remain discreet. Both brothers maintained loyal followings through careful promotions.

THE COAST: START OF THE INSURGENCY

The present Viet Cong strength along the Coast is the natural result of the past twenty years. The Viet Minh controlled most of the

rural areas against the French and eliminated their nationalist rivals in the region.

When almost all of the Viet Minh had gone north in 1954–55, Ngo Dinh Can imposed a repressive rule mostly through Catholics which, like that of the earlier French, prevented all political activity along the Coast except for secret activity. As under the French, exile groups formed (in Paris instead of South China), but no new indigenous organizations could be started.

People hostile to Can had few alternatives. They could remain silent and do nothing, although this was impossible under Vietnamese custom for anyone with a friend or relative imprisoned or tortured. If they were rich enough, they could go to Paris. Anyone who stayed and wanted to resist had to join the Viet Cong, the successor to the Viet Minh and the only organization with the clandestine techniques sufficient to survive Can's secret police.

The Viet Cong were therefore able to regain the position held by the Viet Minh along the Coast without nearly as many demonstrations and assassinations as in the Southern Lowlands. In the first period of Viet Cong violence tabulated by Bernard Fall, April 1957 to April 1958, there were only two assassination along the Coast, compared with more than fifty to the south. When Fall made his second analysis, April 1959 to April 1960, he did not even survey most of the Coast. Douglas Pike's list of "struggle movements" publicized by the Viet Cong between December 1960 (founding of NLF) and September 1964 credits (aside from eleven places whose region cannot be identified) only sixteen movements to specific places along the Coast and one hundred seven to places in the Southern Lowlands.

At the same time, in the years after 1956, surviving Viet Minh agents along the Coast were supplemented by the return of Viet Minh members who had gone north for further training in 1954. While the word "insurgency" is used here to describe the Viet Cong, it is not meant to imply a spontaneous rebellion. The tragedy of South Vietnam, especially along the Coast, is that the only form of resistance available on the spot was a Communist movement already repudiated, at least implicitly, by the urban elite that had not already joined the Viet Minh. This tragedy was the responsibility of Ngo Dinh Can along the Coast. The role of North Vietnam was clear: retaining an intelligence network after the partition of 1954, supplementing that network with well-trained local men who had been picked to go north in 1954; and, supplying the Viet Cong with limited arms and ammunition, in addition to those captured and secretly manufactured. Though not "aggression" in a conventional military sense, these acts were unequivocally aggressive.

When Can realized the growing Viet Cong strength in his region, he responded, not by shelling and relocating villages as Diem and Nhu did to the south, but by training cadres to live with the villagers as the Viet Cong do. Can's cadres minimized the level of violence by firing only at individuals only when fired upon, and they kept the struggles on a political basis which did not force the villagers to choose sides. Can's cadres, some of whom were even being trained for the Mekong Delta when Diem fell, were the direct antecedent of the present "Revolutionary Development" cadres now gaining much attention.

THE COAST: RECENT EVENTS AND U.S. POLICY

Only an extraordinary group of men could have organized a new political group without succumbing to the secret agents of Can and the Viet Cong. Fortunately for Vietnam, such men appeared, inspiring millions of Vietnamese along the Coast and in Saigon. They were the militant Buddhists, based in the imperial city of Hue. While their successes were wholly unexpected, they were not without their weaknesses, the simple products of their past.

In addition to arousing Vietnamese and foreigners to the hopelessness of the Diem regime and bringing down several post-Diem governments, the militant Buddhists negotiated two coalitions which promised them dominant influence around Hue and some national representation in Saigon. The first coalition was suppressed by force, the second was betrayed by Ky. Both the suppression and the betrayal had U.S. support. The refusal of other non-Communist Vietnamese and of American policy-makers to develop a coalition with these men was a mistake which may have been irrevocable.

The militant Buddists' leader, Thich ("Reverend") Tri Quang, is completely different from the urban Vietnamese politicians and ARVN officers Americans prefer to deal with. He lacks both a manadarin education and foreign contacts, both of which are now in disrepute along the traditionalist Coast. Originally respected for his knowledge of Buddhist scripture and self-denying ascetism, Thich Tri Quang has been out of Vietnam only once, for a short visit to Japan. His sudden popularity was both a reflection of his intense, inflammatory speaking style and a repudiation of first the Diem regime and then successive Saigon governments as hopeless alternatives to the Viet Cong along the Coast.

The first political effort of the Buddhists was against the Diem regime, beginning publicly in May 1963 with an incident at the Buddha's birthday celebration. According to Ngo Dinh Nhu, Tri Quang had actually started the movement in Hue in 1961 by tricking Ngro Dinh Can into paying subsidies for an inner group to prevent Communist infiltration of the Buddhist organization around Hue. Even if he did plan extensively in advance, Tri Quang was by no means in a position to overthrow Can when at the celebration his police prevented the normal flying of the Buddhist flag without the simultaneous display of the South Vietnamese flag. After several celebrators were killed, the Buddhist leadership tried to prolong the ensuing tension. When Diem met their demands for assistance to the victims' survivors, they insisted that the aid be described as "compensation," thus trying to force an implict admission of police guilt.

Two great strokes of luck turned the Buddhist leadership from a conspiracy seeking a cause into a factor in world politics. On June 11, when the Buddhist leadership was straining to keep resentment alive, an old monk burned himself to death in Saigon. While the Buddhist tradition respects such suicides, nothing like it had ever been done before in Vietnam. Instead of gaining simply a mild boost, the Buddhists found a transformed population. In Saigon the popular response was extended by memorial services and the display of a heart, said to have survived the monk's immolation and a final cremation. As a Saigon official told a Time reporter, "We have been living under a regime of terrorism, but after Quang Duc [the immolated monk] I no longer feel fear."

The second event occurred in August, when Nhu sent the police into the pagoda used as the Buddhists' Saigon headquarters. The United States had already urged Diem to mollify the Buddhists, and in other Buddhist countries Asians were blaming the Catholic President Kennedy for the supposed repressions of Buddhism by the Catholic President Diem. After the pagoda raid, President Kennedy hinted that Nhu's overthrow was necessary and made his famous remark "they [the Vietnamese] have to win it." The coup that followed two months later was the result of complex military intrigues and complicity by United States officials. Though the Buddhist leaders did not play a direct role in the coup itself, they emerged from Diem's fall with immense prestige throughout all of South Vietnam, far beyond the reach of their small organization.

Factionalism after Diem

Unfortunately, in 1964–65 the Buddhists lost much of their general popularity and, after an initial effort at unity, the militant Buddhists from Hue split from the Saigon groups, composed of refugees from the North and unorganized Southerners. The Buddhist loss of popularity and internal division occurred during the post-Diem "decompression" period of fierce factional infighting in Saigon. With almost fifty thousand political prisoners freed from the jails, a generation of exiles returning from abroad, and an internally divided army suddenly freed from Diem's security agents, too many people wanted to rule South Vietnam. Since the civilian politicians had no organizations, their powers for good or ill, were confined to teahouse intrigues, to deciding which group of civilians would provide external respectability and internal political skills for the rulers of the day in the army. Shifts within the army caused most of the ten changes of government in nineteen months, but most of the troop movements were swift and bloodless.

Since the Buddhists were the only group able to summon mass support, their factional efforts were the most conspicuous and the bloodiest. Their mass support frightened Vietnamese Catholics and urban politicians. It seems probable from later events that U.S. officials in Saigon and Washington gave up forever on the Hue Buddhists in this period. Since then, when they have acted constructively within the implicit rules of the political system, the United States has given Ky and the Saigon politicians full approval to repress the Hue Buddhists by military force and to change the rules against them. When the Hue Buddhists have been powerful within their region, U.S. officials have publicly criticized them; when the Hue Buddhists have tried to resist being double-crossed, U.S. officials have called for "unity" and for letting "the Vietnamese" decide the matter "by themselves."

At first all Buddhist leaders, not just the ones from Hue, frightened the Catholic groups. The Diem regime, it must be remembered, had not persecuted Buddhists for their religion. Buddhism did not have a hierarchy or a doctrinal unity transferable to political affairs which could have been persecuted even if Diem had so wished. Diem went so far as to dedicate all of South Vietnam to the Immaculate Heart of Mary in 1959, but neither religious persecution nor forcible conversion were attempted.

In politics, the Diem regime had simply favored Catholics and other Can Lao members and then imprisoned and tortured its opponents. These opponents differed in many respects, but by the process of elimination they were almost all Buddhists. In 1964, many Buddhists leaders tried to whip up an anti-Catholic sentiment as a means of strengthening their own position with the vast non-Catholic majority.

At the same time, all Buddhist leaders were agreed that only an ideology based on Buddhism could save Vietnam from Communism, that an empty anti-Communism led by Catholics could not win in the villages. Immediately after Diem's fall, the Buddhist leaders planned a national Buddhist organization parallel to the South Vietnamese government and reaching down into the villages, as exists in Thailand and Cambodia. Thich Tri Quang became the symbolic leader of the new organization, corresponding to the head of state. Thich Tam Chau, a milder refugee from the North who had led Buddhists against the Viet Minh in the autonomous Catholic Bishopric of Phat Diem, was made premier and placed over a

cabinet of ministers. At the same time, many Buddhist monks were made chaplains to ARVN units.

Naturally, Vietnamese Catholic leaders were opposed to the Buddhists riding to power on a wave of anti-Catholic feeling and then assuming exactly the same political role the Catholics had enjoyed first under the French and then under Diem. Since the native Southern Catholics were a disproportionately large portion of the urban middle class and since most of the Northern Catholic refugees remained in the Saigon area, Catholic leaders were also able to produce favorable demonstrations in Saigon.

At the same time, most Can Lao members were able to regain posts in the bureaucracy. Although they were removed from their provincial and district posts in late 1963, not enough others had the training and experience to compete with them, and after several months of confusion, most former Diem officials were simply assigned to different posts. Since the training of Buddhist monks concentrates entirely on scripture and omits both mandarin and foreign education, the Buddhist leaders could do no more than obtain a temporary preference for non-Can Lao officials. Though temporarily embarrassed and weakened, a Diemist recovery was inevitable after the fall of Diem himself.

Just as frightened of the Buddhists as the Catholics were the traditional urban politicians who had no organization, no mass following in the cities, and no tie to the countryside (except sometimes the dubious one of absentee landownership). Since they could not quickly make up for lost time, their only hope for power was for the military to eliminate the Buddhists as a national factor. Then civilian rule would mean rule by old men who had been jailed by Diem instead of by monks and students who had demonstrated against him.

Neutralization under Tri Quang?

A tragic element to the Buddhist defeat was their emphasis on being the only group who could gain a sufficient mass following in the villages to deal with the Viet Cong. Especially along the Coast, where people had never had an open alternative to the Communists and the mandarins, the appeal of a negotiated settlement, a coalition government, and neutralization of South Vietnam was very powerful. Although Thich Tam Chau was more cautious about the Viet Cong (as befitted a leader of Northern refugees, whatever the merits of the case), Thich Tri Quang cultivated an air of mystery, encouraging Vietnamese to feel that given sufficient power he could bring a stable settlement. Although this behavior is universal among politicians, the more Thich Tri Quang pursued this line with non-Catholic Vietnamese, the more Americans mistrusted him.

In Saigon, Vietnamese fearful of Tri Quang's domestic appeal quickly found that the best way to oppose him at the U.S. Mission was to exploit his claim to be able to bargain with the Viet Cong. Refugee leaders from the North used their Communist relatives and old friends as proof of a painful break, of an abiding feud with the Communists. The Northern ties of the Hue Buddhists, however, provided innuendos of Communist influence. (Of course the Americans given these innuendos never were told that Tri Quang's mother and elder brother died in a Communist prison camp in the North after partition.) Even Tri Quang's mass support from city people and from villagers who were trucked in for demonstrations was used as evidence of Viet Cong influence! It was permissible for the Viet Cong not to stop villagers from benefiting from U.S. medical teams, but when the Viet Cong did not stop villagers who wanted to demonstrate for Vietnam's first non-Communist charismatic leader, then Americans in Saigon and Washington became suspicious.

Not surprisingly, the Buddhists' most ambitious plans for separate organizations failed. Tam Chau, the Northerner who was supposed to head the hierarchy, lost interest. After he received no cabinet appointments and Tri Quang got three, Tam Chau tried to regain his power by allying with Northern Catholic leaders instead of working within the Buddhist coalition. Along the Coast, the Hue Buddhists tried to strengthen their organization with "People's Councils for National Salvation," but when their student leaders led demonstrations in the cities (which the Viet Cong had never been able to do), more experienced Viet Cong cadres took the crowds away from them and discredited the movement (a hostile action which was often regarded as roof of cooperation).

The I Corps coalition: Tri Quang and General Thi

By early 1966, the Hue Buddhists had turned their attention to another coalition, with ARVN officers and civilian officials in the I Corps, the military region comprising the five Coastal provinces around Hue. The ARVN commander was Lieutenant General Nguyen Chanh Thi. He was a native of Hue and the only important ARVN general born of a peasant family. He led the first coup attempt against Diem, in November 1960, with elite paratrooper units who were disgusted with Diem's inability to contend with the Viet Cong's first massive wave of terror. After Diem's fall, General Thi took command of the I Corps, his home area.

The I Corps coalition also included one of South Vietnam's two civilian province chiefs, an able, former exile civilian as Mayor of Danang, officials and professors at the University of Hue, and many civilian politicians who made up for the Buddhists' lack of administrative training. None of these men was a Communist. Some were suspicious of Americans conducting separate military operations and taking power more directly than the French had done in their area, and they became positively hostile when American policy gave Ky full support in trying to break up their coalition. The Honolulu Conference of February 1966 probably finished the Hue Buddhists under the Johnson Administration. Although its timing may have been planned to turn public attention away from the critical testimony of General Gavin and Ambassador Kennan, the Administration had prepared a series of demands on Ky. One demand, agreed to them and now practically forgotten, was "social revolution, including land reform," for which the Administration promised its "full support" (the U.S. had refused to help Diem pay for even his mild land reform). Also agreed upon was "a democratic constitution," "its ratification by secret ballot," and "elections rooted in that constitution." In his first announcement of the elections, Ky said that he would not himself be a candidate. President Johnson emerged from the Conference saying, "We talked of very specific things," and after the Conference Vice President Humphrey and the Secretaries of Agriculture and Health, Education and Welfare visited Vietnam.

Ky and U.S. Oppose Coalition

Ky's first "specific thing" after the Conference was to maneuver against General Thi in I Corps. In early March, the National Leadership Council unanimously deposed Thi, calling him a "war lord." The U.S. Mission in Saigon agreed immediately, calling the deposition of a popular general from his native area a "step toward political stability" and "a defeat for warlordism." It was perfectly clear that the U.S. would not continue to assist Thi, whose command corresponded to that of the U.S. Marines (also confined to I Corps), no matter how popular he was with his troops and the surrounding population.

Two days later the Hue Buddhists issued a demand for the return of Thi and the maintenance of all Corps commanders until the elections. When demonstrations began, General Thi appeared in person to ask them to stop, and they stopped. Fierce negotiations began in Saigon, with Ky, the Northerner Thich Tam Chau, and the Hue representative in Saigon meeting on March 12, 13, and 17. By the end of the month, father Quynh, leader of the Northern Catholics from Phat Diem and an impeccable anti-Communist, was also criticizing Ky.

In the first half of April, a compromise was developed and General Thieu signed a decree promising elections within five months, informally understood to be on August 15. The Buddhists asked for a definite agreement that the Constituent Assembly would replace the military government as soon as the new Constitution was ratified, and to everyone's surprise, a commission of politicians appointed by the generals to oppose the Buddhists agreed with them. On April 17, Tri Quang flew back to Hue and stopped demonstrations against Ky. This compromise definitely was influenced by the U.S. On April 5, Ambassador Lodge had personally ordered American aircraft to help fly to Danang ARVN troops loyal to Ky in a show of force; the troops were kept on the airbase and then later flown back to Saigon. On April 8, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, William P. Bundy, publicly criticized the Buddhists for refusing to compromise, ignoring the fact that the dispute began by disrupting a Buddhist compromise, the I Corps coalition.

Ky doublecrosses Tri Quang

Once he had Tri Quang satisfied, Ky betrayed him. On May 7 over a paper cup of Jim Beam bourbon he suddenly revealed to a group of American reporters that he would continue in office and that the Constituent Assembly would be disbanded when the Constitution was ratified. This news was censored in the Vietnamese press, and Ky surprised his enemies by sending ARVN troops and a third replacement for General Thi back to Danang, just as the current I Corps commander was about to start a solidarity party of Catholics and Buddhists to demonstrate to American officials and reporters their agreement. In Washington, Secretary Rusk and then a State Department spokesman disassociated themselves from Ky's alcoholic revelation and his second dispatch of troops to Danang, but an American helicopter was supplied to take the new I Corps commander from Danang to the hostile city of Hue. This man, Ky's final replacement for General Thi, was a notorious favorite of Diem (now head of an extremist Catholic ticket in the Senate). His appointment was a clear indication that the coalition which the Buddhists had developed with General Thi and which had survived his first two replacements was shattered. The Diemist appointment was also a calculated insult to the Hue Buddhists. As the American helicopter flew the new commander away after his speech, a young ARVN officer tried to shoot him down. The American gunner in the helicopter fired a burst of machine gun bullets into the crowd, killing the officer and wounding others.

United States ignores doublecross

In the next ten days, Tri Quang tried to gain a reversal of American policy. He stopped a demonstration after the helicopter incident and withheld the news that an American (rather than an ARVN) soldier had fired into the crowd. Three meetings with U.S. consular officials and a cable to President Johnson produced a "leave it to the Vietnamese themselves" style remark by Secretary Rusk and a non-committal reply from the President.

Ky made many conciliatory statements, but he did not explain how he expected to

be trusted. On May 26, the point of no return was reached in Hue: the helicopter gunner was identified as an American at the funeral procession for the dead ARVN officer, and Tri Quang's students led a crowd to burn the USIA library in Hue. ARVN troops were sent into Hue; the Buddhist leaders were cornered and then captured after a three-week seige.

American experts on the Viet Cong are rightly quick to point out that the Viet Cong does not attract the South Vietnamese elite and that even Tri Quang in his most anti-Saigon and anti-American moments did not threaten to seek Viet Cong support. When defeated, he still did not flee to the Viet Cong; instead he risked house arrest under a hostile government in circumstances similar to those that killed Diem and Nhu. If American experts emphasize this point, then they should also emphasize the desirability of reversing American policy and giving Tri Quang and General Thi (now in Washington, trying to learn English) a chance to reform their coalition.

Ky agreed to hold elections, and he has. The Hue Buddhists were excluded from the Constituent Assembly and from the Senate for the sin of "neutralism." Tri Quang's group would have had a very good chance in the Senate contest, because the multiplicity of candidates disproportionately favored a well-educated block vote. This advantage was reaped by Catholic groups, who may control over fifty percent of the Senate with less than ten percent of the population and whose most popular Senate ticket received less than fifteen percent of the Presidential vote.

THE SOUTHERN LOWLANDS: PRE-FRENCH TRADITION AND FRENCH RULE

The Southern Lowlands were completely changed by the French. In the 1860's, a small Vietnamese population lived in villages less than one hundred years old and cultivated about 500,000 acres of land, mostly between Saigon and My Tho. As the Vietnamese Emperor had ordered all his mandarins to leave the southern area first ceded to the French, the French had to rely upon themselves and the only inhabitants who knew any Western languages, the Vietnamese Catholics. Saigon became the base of French activities in Indochina and the Southern Catholics (unlike Northern and Coastal Catholics, mostly living in their own villages) became the basis for an urban middle class, working under French officials, businessmen, and customers.

Great canals were dug to drain the vast areas flooded annually by the Mekong and bi-monthly by salt water from unusually high tides. By 1880 the cultivated area had more than doubled to almost 1.3 million acres; by 1937 it had quadrupled again, reaching 5.5 million. In those 57 years the population almost tripled, from 1.7 million to 4.5 million.

The great expansion in rice fields produced two new Vietnamese social classes: the absentee landlord, with vast holdings supervised by managers, and what a colonial report of 1931 emphasized as a "very important rural proletariat" of tenants and migrant workers. Physically, there was plenty of land for all in the South, now almost four times as much per villager. But the expense of opening new areas, even when they had already been drained, and the competition for large plots completely disqualified most of the rural population from potential ownership. Along the Coast 65% of the households owned at least a small plot, and everyone could rent communal land.

But in the South only 28% owned any land at all, and the landless had no communal land to speak of (only 3% of the total rice area, as contrasted with 25% along the Coast). Coastal landholdings were generally worked by their owner or his sons and only 10% of the plots were worked entirely by tenants. In the South 35% of the plots were owned by absentees, and, assuming their plots were the largest, these men owned 85% of the rice land.

The new villages in the South were connected to Can Tho and Saigon by cheap, fast water transport. Most of their inhabitants immigrated; everyone depended on a good price for exporting rice all over Asia. Some fields (80% in Bac Lieu Province, from which the present An Xuyen Province was separated) were worked entirely by migrant workers who would follow transplantings and harvests up and down the Mekong. Some did not even live in villages—they simply lived on the bank of a canal without a government or community. In some areas, no effective government ruled at all; the landlord ruled without challenge from either established communities or from the French administration.

The result, of course, was a society in the South whose relations were monetary and impersonal and hence materialistic and individualistic by traditional Vietnamese standards, but the peasants were not Europeanized. The traditional responsibility of the landlord and creditor to be easy on the tenant and debtor after a bad harvest could not hold if the landlord lived in Saigon or Can Tho, depended solely on his rents and interest to live a gay urban life and conducted his business through a middleman. Even today, after a generation of warfare in the South, Vietnamese families are strong enough that orphans are taken in by relatives of the fourth and fifth degrees, rather than be left homeless. Pearl Buck's foundation for orphans and abandoned children of American soldiers recently found that even compared with Japan and Korea Vietnam has few deserted children.

Cao Dai and Hoa Hao

Instead of forming political parties and trade unions along Western lines, Southerners found escape, unity, and resistance to the French in two new Buddhist sects. The first, Cao Daism, founded by a group of Vietnamese in 1926, was not exclusively Buddhist, but a combination of the world's religions plus hero worship. (Winston Churchill and Victor Hugo, for example, are Cao Dai saints.) Its organization was consciously patterned on that of the Catholic Church, and it spread so rapidly among peasants as well as government officials that the French banned its advocacy from the Coast and in the North. The Cao Dai "Pope" had close ties with reformist political parties and with the Japanese. In fact, when the latter took over Indochina, the French deported the Cao Dai Pope to Madagascar. After World War II, the Cao Dai claimed a total of twelve sub-sects, totaling between one and four million members, a large proportion of the population in the South.

Hoa Haoism, the second sect, was started not by a committee, but by a charismatic leader, the twenty-year-old son of a minor notable. After developing a very attractive Protestant version of Buddhism (better to have a pure heart than a rich altar—and debts to pay for the altar), the Hoa Hao prophet predicted a Japanese attack on Indochina as soon as France fell to Germany. With more than one hundred thousand followers in less than a year of preaching, Huynh Phu So was soon a potent force. When the French exiled him to another part of the South, So converted the surrounding population. When the French committed him to a Saigon hospital, So converted his psychiatrist. A second exile became a place of pilgrimage; only Japanese intervention prevented a third exile, this one to be outside Vietnam.

The area between the Mekong and the Bassac (the southernmost branch of the Mekong) rivers was more fully developed by the French than the land farther to the southwest, the Transbassac. There drainage canals were still being dug when the Depression and World War II disrupted the French pattern of colonial development. The Transbassac contained the largest landholdings, with landlords whose word was law throughout their domains. Fiercely militant Cambodian villages, survivors of the original Cambodian occupants of the Mekong Delta driven south by the invading Vietnamese, were (and are) also found in the Transbassac.

To the north of the Saigon-Tay Minh line the lands were inhospitable all the way to the sandy and abandoned areas on the Coast mentioned above. The major river in this barren area, the Dong Nai, was overgrown with mangroves and the high ground beyond the river was cursed by malaria, a complete barrier to Vietnamese settlement. In the 1900's the French began developing the malarial high ground; its red and grey soils were good for rubber, whose rising price made cultivation very profitable. The rubber plantations soon became more valuable than the French rice holdings (most large riceland owners were Vietnamese) and the rubber plantations have become even more important to Americans today, because the undeveloped surrounding swamps and forest provide cover for guerrillas and because rubber trees are vulnerable (they must grow seven years before producing) and easily taxed.

As far as most peasants were concerned, the South was essentially a French creation. The Vietnamese and Cambodians had dug some canals, and, if the French had never taken over, large indigenous landowners and a rural proletariat might have arisen anyway. But everywhere Frenchmen held critical positions: officials granting land concessions and businessmen importing foreign manufactures in exchange for rice. While Coastal Vietnamese could hate the French from a position of self-confidence because of a memory of pre-French stability. Vietnamese in the South could hate the French only from a position of subjugation. For the United States today this legacy has meant that while the suspicious Coastal Vietnamese feel that "We don't need you—except to supplement our army," the suspicious Southerners say, "We don't want you running things on any terms, French or American." Therefore, no matter how terrible the Viet Cong may seem, it is very difficult for Americans to appear to offer a constructive alternative.

THE SOUTHERN LOWLANDS: VIET MINH ACTIVITIES

Unlike the North and the Coast, the South had several active indigenous organizations in addition to the Viet Minh working against the French. The French had permitted some urban political parties and had not suppressed the Cao Dai and Hoa Hao, so none of these groups were vulnerable to the Communists' mastery of exile politics. During World War II the Viet Minh controlled only a few villages and a forested enclave in the North; it started operations in the South too hastily at the end of the War to take over all anti-French activity.

Even before the War Southern Marxists were divided. A strong Trotskyite organization, led by the lower-class Ta Thu Thau, had badly defeated the predominately middle-class, orthodox Communists in the elections of 1938. In 1940 the orthodox Communists had tried to lead a peasant rebellion, but a security leak alerted the French, the rebellion was crushed, and the Communist organization was destroyed.

The Cao Dai and Hoa Hao had improved their positions during the War as the result of a less hostile administration. A new group, improperly called a "sect," had also formed: the Binh Xuyen, a coalition of robber bands around Saigon. Southwest of the Mekong Delta and in Vinh Binh Province the Cambodian minority, armed by the French, fought all Vietnamese. In Kien Hoa Province the Catholics organized a militia to defend themselves against the Viet Minh. At first the

various factions in the South fought as much among themselves as they did against the French and the Viet Minh. Only the consistent hostility of the Viet Minh and the eventual French recognition that these factions could be bargained with more easily than they could be "pacified" permitted a loose anti-Communist coalition. Among the factions two great surprises came during the war against the Viet Minh. The Hoa Hao, regarded as a loose, one-man organization, recovered after the assassination by the Viet Minh of their charismatic founder. And the larger Cao Dai failed to establish a secure rural power base; not even a small one could be set up around their Pope's residence in Tay Ninh.

The large number of indigenous factions make it even harder to estimate the extent of Viet Minh activities and control in the South than along the Coast. Village land records, for example, were destroyed throughout most of Vinh Binh Province. The French of course blamed the Viet Minh. The Viet Cong, claiming always to be their successors (but also careful since then to have a Cambodian representative on the National Liberation Front's Central Committee), have also given full credit to the Viet Minh. But it is impossible to verify today who destroyed which records, the Viet Minh rebels or the anti-Vietnamese Cambodians armed by the French. It is clear, however, that unlike in the North and on the Coast the Viet Minh were not the only organization fighting the French and terrorizing landlords.

The Communists fail in the south

The Communist party, moreover, revealed more factionalism in the South than in the North and along the Coast. The first Communist leader, Tran Van Giau, shortly after World War II tried to establish a tractable popular front in the South which would correspond to the Viet Minh. When, in 1946, it was clear that he had failed, he was repudiated in the South and assigned overseas. Then Nguyen Binh, an ex-member of the VNQDD (the Communists' mortal rival in the North), was appointed leader of the Viet Minh in the South. By 1949, according to Lucien Bodard, Nguyen Binh controlled almost all of the South except for the vital roads connecting Saigon and Quan Long: most of the Transbassac; the seaward tips of the Mekong Delta provinces; and, both sides of the "Duck's Bill"—from beyond Tay Ninh in the North to beyond Sa Dec, across the Mekong, to the south. In 1950 Nguyen Binh directed a conventional military campaign, similar to many of Giap's in the North, in an attempt to seize the large cities from the French, but apparently without having consolidated his control over many rural areas.

When this effort failed, Nguyen Binh was killed, not by simple execution, for he was too popular in the South. He was sent, without any rest, with a small party of troops loyal to Le Duan into the worst Cambodian jungle, supposedly to find a new infiltration route. When surprised by a unit of the Cambodian army, Binh's nominal subordinates killed him before fleeing into the jungle.

In 1951 after Nguyen Binh came Le Duan, the present First Secretary of the North Vietnamese Communist Party, and Le Duc Tho, present head of the party's Orgburo, as rival leaders in the South. While the origins and meaning of their rivalry are not clear, it certainly dates back to a dispute over the conduct of the war in the South, which had to be resolved by Ho Chi Minh himself.

In 1954 three short-term regroupment areas were established for the Viet Minh in the South: the tip of the Camau peninsula, an area somewhat larger than the present An Xuyen Province; the Plain of Reeds, somewhat larger than the present Kien Tuong Province; and, the Xuyen Moc-Ham Tan area, which then straddled the border between Cochin China and Annam and now overlaps Binh Tuy and Phouc Tuy Provinces. At that time the Viet Minh probably had two other base camps. First was the present "Zone C," around Tay Minh and easily connected to the Plain of Reeds regroupment area. Second was the present "Zone D," until recently corresponding to the Phuoc Thanh Province and now the area where four provinces meet northeast of Saigon and are easily connected to the Xuyen Moc-Ham regroupment area.

In the Southern Lowlands the Communist Party did not hold the monopoly on effective, tested political organization it enjoyed elsewhere in Vietnam. It could not claim, simply as director of the Viet Minh, as much respect as it could command farther north. When Vietnam was divided at the 17th parallel in 1954 to give the anti-Communists a second chance, the best opportunities for an indigenous anti-Communist coalition were in the Southern Lowlands.

THE SOUTHERN LOWLANDS: DIEM

Since Diem had delegated most of his power along the Coast to his brothers Can and Thuc, the Southern Lowlands tested his own abilities. His personality, like his political support, had two complementary elements: the traditional Vietnamese mandarin of Hue and the devout, medieval Catholic of the North and the Coast. He worked long into the night in the tradition of the self-sacrificing mandarin or prelate, but he had neither administrative skills nor charismatic powers. Though he was impressive in small meetings with Western diplomats and journalists, he came to rely on his brother Nhu to decide which Vietnamese leaders and official papers were to be sent to his office and to rely on the semi-secret Can Lao to control the population.

When Diem became premier in 1954, he was manifestly the representative of the American policy of a second chance south of the 17th parallel for the anti-Communist nationalists of Vietnam. The initial French policy after Dien Bien Phu was to preserve as many plantations and as much cultural influence as possible by sending an old friend of Ho Chi Minh's (Jean Sainteny) to Hanoi and by not trying to develop an anti-Communist coalition for the elections scheduled for 1956. The French still had close ties to the major opponents of the Viet Minh in the South: Emperor Bao Dai, the recently created army, the Binh Xuyen, the Cao Dai, and the Hoa Hao.

Diem's first cabinet was unimpressive; it was composed almost entirely of blood relatives and in-laws. But the end of 1954 saw a much broader cabinet, in which a majority (8 of 14) was held by the Cao Dai and the Hoa Hao. Both of these groups had long feared the Communists and had interests which no longer corresponded to those of the French. Diem secured his position by gaining control over the army—with substantial American help. The crucial subordinates of General Hinh, the army's commander were lured away on a visit to the much-admired President Magsaysay of the Philippines and General Hinh was told bluntly that no military aid would be given until the army was under complete civilian control (*i.e.*, Diem's). Though he later claimed he could have started a coup against Diem with a telephone call, General Hinh yielded and soon left for France, where has was given a military appointment.

Diem then began to fragment the sects represented within his cabinet, paying several Cao Dai and Hoa Hao leaders over $10 million from American military aid for "back pay." At the same time, in early 1954, Western representatives sympathetic to the sects (and hence their only hope of getting the U.S. to moderate Diem's hostility toward them) were withdrawn from South Vietnam. When they realized Diem's intention to destroy their groups, most Cao Dai and Hoa Hao leaders joined the Binh Xuyen leader on March 5, 1955 in demanding a greater role in the cabinet. Of course this was denied them.

Although the Cao Dai and Hoa Hao held political control over the Tay Ninh area northwest of Saigon and over many areas south of the Mekong River, they had no conventional force to match the 250,000-man army under Diem, and their local exactions could not compete with the $250 million annual American aid given Diem. Even their claims to conventional military forces never reached 50,000. The generally accepted total of 15,000 to 20,000 for the Cao Dai forces grossly exceeded the 4,916 regular troops actually subsidized by the French at the end of 1953. While the details of Diem's negotiations with the sects are still obscure, the Cao Dai and Hoa Hao leaders who had fought the French and the Viet Minh only when necessary could hardly have expected to defeat Diem's army in conventional warfare. Their resistance must have been a desperate last resort, and they were defeated within a few months. The only surviving units were four Hoa Hao battalions which fled up the Mekong beyond Long Xuyen and preserved themselves only by adopting guerrilla tactics and hiding amidst the loyal Hoa Hao population.

With the defeat of the Binh Xuyen and the sects, Diem had a chance to offer a non-Communist, non-sectarian alternative to rural areas of the Southern Lowlands, but he failed to make good on this opportunity. Large areas of land around Saigon (Binh Xuyen) and south of the Mekong River (Cao Dai and Hoa Hao), abandoned during the war against the French, were taken for the settlement of refugees from the North (most of whom were tightly-knit Catholic villagers) without the permission of local inhabitants. Improved security in rural areas, especially those formerly terrorized by the aggressive and intolerant Hoa Hao bands, led to some economic improvement. But the new rural security also permitted Saigon landlords who had not received rents for years to return to the countryside on the heels of the army and to make exactions in the form of "back rents," much as Diem had paid bribes in the form of "back pay." Even refugee Catholic villagers, a basis of Diem's support and able to publicize their complaints, were preyed upon by national and provincial officials until they were stopped by a national scandal and the dismissal by Diem of a cooperative cabinet minister.

Diem misrules the Hoa Hao

Hoa Hao areas associated with the surviving four battalions were repeatedly attacked by ARVN units, and the one peaceful Hoa Hao area for which information is available was badly treated. As late as 1960, a Michigan State University group found that Diem's government had taken over all Hoa Hao buildings without payment and had appointed all non-Hoa Hao officials in My Thuan, a former Hoa Hao headquarters in a part of Vinh Long Province where 85–90% of the population belonged to the Hoa Hao sect. The Americans then saw the suppression of a Hoa Hao ceremony on the Buddha's birthday, initially approved to honor Hoa Hao soldiers killed fighting the French and the Viet Minh. There were only 250 Catholics in the area, but they included crucial local officials, like the district chief, the district "information" officer, and the canton chief. Catholics were allowed to build a church instead of working on the local forced-labor construction projects (agroville) against the Viet Cong. Under prodding from a priest from Vinh Long, the seat of the area's Bishopric, the district "information" officer was reluctantly starting an organization to propagate Catholicism among the hostile local populace. Threatening letters to and assassinations of local officials were an increasing problem. Diem's officials blamed the Hoa Hao, and the latter blamed the Viet Cong, claiming that the local ARVN units

were infiltrated and useless. Since Americans made only a few short visits outside of Saigon between 1955 and 1962, it is impossible to say if My Thuan's plight was unusual. It should be emphasized, however, that the Americans reported no embarassment by Diem's officials at seeing their behavior observed and recorded.

Even the Binh Xuyen—the gangland alliance which had controlled the roads into Saigon, the city's rackets, and the French secret police—were not replaced by superior institutions. Brother Nhu ran most of these activities, not for personal profit, but to finance the Can Lao and his family's political activities independently of U.S. aid. Nhu controlled the opium trade and the lotteries, manipulated the foreign exchange market, and extorted Saigon businessmen. The only Binh Xuyen activities Nhu did not take over were those that were banned by his puritanical wife, the famous Mme. Nhu.

Mistakes by the U.S. Mission had a great influence on South Vietnam's increasing difficulties. United States military "advisers" made no effort to anticipate a resumption of Viet Minh guerrilla activities and converted the new Vietnamese army, originally created by the French for decentralized, small-unit, counter-insurgency operations, into a highly centralized conventional force, consciously imitating the South Korean army and preparing for a conventional invasion from the North. The refusal to finance Diem's plans for a para-military force has already been mentioned. In the Mekong Delta, the United States refused to continue the French-developed naval units used to patrol the hundreds of miles of rivers and canals (compared with only one major road south of Saigon). These military mistakes are being reversed today, but without the slightest hint that present improvements are more a return to French methods than American invention. United States Navy activities in the Mekong, for instance, are being publicized as having been inspired by the Monitor and the Merrimac, two American ships of a completely different war a century ago, rather than by methods successful in the same place against the Viet Minh within the past generation.

United States ignores assassinations

When evidence increased of a systematic insurgency as in reports of Hanoi-trained cadres in the Highlands and of assassinations and kidnappings concentrated in strategic provinces south of the Mekong where the Viet Minh had not been strong, the U.S. Mission maintained that the country was too prosperous for an insurgency to survive. United States aid was mostly in the form of consumer goods sold to merchants by the Saigon government, which then spent the proceeds instead of relying on local taxes. The merchants sold the consumer goods in the provinces and peasants bought them, without feeling the slightest gratitude to the United States for not being taxed harder. There was no way of knowing whether the peasantry had gained more from larger peacetime harvests and Diem's mild land reform and rent control laws than had to be paid in rents to absentee landlords. Since no prolonged American contact with rural areas existed until 1962, it was surely cavalier to ignore totally signs of trouble and bury them under claims of South Vietnamese rural "prosperity." The present Administration line, that the North began the insurgency because it was afraid of Diem's popularity, similarly lacks supporting evidence and is grossly deceptive.

The most grotesque American mistake was to conclude that there was "no alternative" to Diem and his family. The original reason for favoring Diem was a sound one: Diem was the best man to lead an anti-Communist coalition. Bao Dai had been discredited by years of association with the French and of high living in Vietnamese and European resorts. Diem had stayed clear of both the French and the Viet Minh, had good connections in the United States, and was a hard worker. In 1953, in a "neutralist" campaign that would be banned today in South Vietnam, brother Nhu organized a party that performed well in the election held by the French. Unfortunately, Diem did not try to lead a coalition. He established an inefficient dictatorship based on his family and the Can Lao, preventing legal opposition but not providing reforms and local competition against the Viet Cong.

In 1960, eighteen leading civilian politicians, including Suu and Huong, the best-known recent civilian Presidential candidates, signed a long manifesto against Diem. ARVN officers, disgusted by Diem's preoccupation with dividing the army rather than by fighting the Viet Cong, attempted coups in 1960 and 1962. Diem's jails were full of political prisoners, many of whom were brutally tortured; 46,000 survivors were released in 1963 and 1964.

Yet U.S. policy decided to reinforce Diem and the Can Lao instead of letting their domestic opponents replace them before Diem could fragment his opposition even further. But after visits by Vice President Johnson (May 1961) and General Taylor (October 1961) and a major speech (June 1962) by Senator Mansfield, one of Diem's original American supporters, calling for a reappraisal, the United States started an approach similar to the use of the Can Lao. Instead of trying to pressure Diem or to allow his enemies to combine him, American civilians and military officers were sent to crucial provinces to "advise" Vietnamese civil servants and ARVN officers, trying to persuade them to work against the system being buttressed by American aid in Saigon by taking precisely those local initiatives which would yield local popularity and which Diem's family would not reward if the individual's full loyalty was doubted in secret Can Lao reports. The hypocrisy and foolishness of such provincial activities in support of a hopeless central government may be symbolized by the American AID official in Quang Nam Province who unknowingly rented his house from a notorious (to Vietnamese neighbors) participant in local torture sessions.

THE SOUTHERN LOWLANDS: START OF THE INSURGENCY AND THE VIETCONG CADRE

The survival of at least one Hoa Hao unit and of elements of the Cao Dai and Binh Xuyen forces, coupled with the weak initial strength provided for the Viet Cong by the Viet Minh, make it impossible to be sure of the degree of North Vietnamese control of the insurgency in its early stages. The National Liberation Front (NLF) was not started until December 1960, but even so, according to a May 1966 memo issued by the U.S. Mission in Saigon, survivors of the sects "made up the bulk of the early NLF support, although the alliance was at all times an uneasy one." Yet the December 1961 State Department booklet meant to "inform" Americans and foreigners of "A Threat to the Peace: North Viet-Nam's Effort to Conquer South Viet-Nam" referred to the NLF as "Hanoi's creation" (p. 15) and did not even hint at the participation of non-Communists in their own groups, let alone at their ever having provided "the bulk of early NLF support." The return of Communist cadres to the Highlands in 1957 proves that North Vietnam was involved in the insurgency from its beginnings, but the original degree of Hanoi's control will remain in doubt until a wider range of evidence is publicly available.

The violent start of the insurgency was traced by Bernard Fall from contemporary newspaper reports of assassinations, ambushes, raids, and cells of dissidents. The campaign of violence began in the Mekong Delta, where the Communists were disproportionately weak. The first concentrations of violence (April 1957 to April 1958) were in the areas around Chau Phu and My Tho, presumably establishing a position on the Mekong River where the Cambodian border would provide a convenient sanctuary and preparing to cut off the only roads bringing rice from the Delta and Transbassac to Saigon.

The next pair of Viet Cong targets was immediately to the north and to the south of My Tho, further isolating Saigon from the Delta. In the period between April 1959 and April 1960 Long An Province had about one assassination per month, and there were other deaths in the adjacent parts of Hau Ngia and Kien Tuong Provinces.

South of My Tho, Kien Hoa Province was a crucial target, and captured documents indicated Viet Cong intention to make Kien Hoa its model province for the Delta. Kien Hoa is a cluster of three islands, and their inlets offer many good places for concealed depots, hospitals, and rest camps at the opposite end of the Mekong Delta from Chau Phu. At the same time, like the strip of rubber plantations circling Saigon to the north, Kien Hoa offers an easily taxed cash crop, coconuts. The Catholic militia of the Vinh Long Bishopric had cleared out most of the Viet Minh, but some agents survived and went north in 1954. In early 1958, in areas where the Saigon government had not gained control, some of these agents started returning to their native villages. There was as much violence in Kien Hoa as in Long An in 1959–60, about ten assassinations over twelve months. But when an honest military officer was sent by Diem to clean up Kien Hoa, he found far more (1,200) political prisoners in the provincial jail whom the former provincial governor had been trying to extort for their release. This military officer, a former chief of counter-intelligence on the Viet Minh in all of the Southern Lowlands, reopened the road to Saigon. This man's successor also did well until he was transferred in May 1963, but thereafter the situation deteriorated and proved difficult to retrieve after Diem's fall. Today much of Kien Hoa is controlled by the Viet Cong, and parts of it are being bombed.

THE SOUTHERN LOWLANDS: RECENT EVENTS AND U.S. POLICY

The Southern Lowlands have been divided since 1964 by the fact that major military operations have been concentrated north of the Mekong River. Few American ground troops, and even fewer North Vietnamese troops or cadres, have been operating south of the Mekong. Most North Vietnamese units have been fighting in the Highlands and along the Coast. Until they drew away American troops from the Saigon area this spring, American operations were concentrated on "search and destroy" missions in Viet Cong base areas in the sparsely populated Plain of Reeds (Kien Tuong Province) and rubber plantation area circling Saigon to the north (Tay Ninh to Phuoc Tuy Province).

Yet the only large secure rural area is south of the Mekong, the Hoa Hao stronghold of An Giang Province. After Diem's fall, the survivors of the four Hoa Hao battalions managed to negotiate with Saigon an agreement whose terms have not been publicized. It is clear, however, that Hoa Hao leaders remain in charge of their province, that the population quickly turns in Viet Cong agitators trying to establish a foothold, and that the province is receiving types of American aid which are possible only when full security is assured, such as electrification and a land survey. Unfortunately, the present An Giang Province (redefined on October 1, 1964, around the time of the agreement) is much smaller than the areas controlled by the Hoa Hao before their conventional defeat and steady harassment by Diem's forces.

In addition to the Hoa Hao, the Cambodian minority is a traditional enemy of the Viet Cong. Kien Giang Province, south of An Giang, has a substantial Cambodian minority and the most successful resettlement of Northern refugees in all of South Vietnam. Not surprisingly, Kien Giang is often mentioned as being more secure than most areas. Two other provinces with large Cambodian minorities are Ba Xuyen and Vinh Binh. Cao Dai and Catholic groups, who once maintained order around Quan Long and in most of the Delta (Vinh Long, Kien Hoa, and Vinh Binh), are no longer mentioned for their local control.

Most of the populous area south of the Mekong River appears to be involved in "live and let live" arrangements. Local holders of power, Viet Cong cadres controlling the villages (there being few local notables because of the predominance of absentees ownership) and ARVIN units stationed in the district town (there being few civilian district chiefs), do not challenge each other openly or with violence. The Viet Cong cadres do not expect to take over the district towns from the ARVN, especially when these towns are protected by artillery and airpower. At the same time, the local ARVN officers, whether in civilian or military posts, do not expect to challenge the Viet Cong seriously in the villages.

THE VIETCONG: THE CADRE, HIS SOCIAL ROLE AND HIS MISLEADING TACTICS

Since most violence and struggle movements occurred in the Southern Lowlands, eventually entirely under Viet Cong direction, it is vital to treat separately the basis of Viet Cong activity. This basis is a Communist political and social innovation, the local cadre, and subtle political tactics which make detection of his activity and a response by the legal government very difficult. The Viet Cong cadres are the only effective link between many Vietnamese villages and centralized commands, and they are the strongest such link in Vietnamese history.

The Viet Cong cadre is almost always an ambitious local person who has been trained to live with the people of his village, to seek out those with grievances against Saigon-appointed local officials and against local notables and to provide incidents which mobilize the peasantry against the government. Land reform, for instance, is not an abstract goal for the cadre and his followers—instead it provides patronage for political power. Landless tenants who join the cause are given plots of absentee landlords and owners of medium-sized plots still living in the village often join the Viet Cong to protect their holdings.

In each village, the Viet Cong cadre starts a series of front organizations which eventually should include every villager. There are Liberation Fronts for farmers, for their wives, for their children, and for old villagers. At first, only a nominal membership fee is requested, but enthusiastic members recruit their neighbors and eventually social pressure forces everyone to join and to participate actively. If a village is hesitant or hostile toward the Viet Cong, the cadre mobilizes greater hostility toward the Saigon government by calling in a Viet Cong military unit from another area and provoking air strikes or artillery fire from nearby ARVN or U.S. forces.

Even in contested villages, the Viet Cong cadre is the most knowledgeable about local affairs. He deputizes children to report on who enters and leaves the village and on what newspapers are read and what radio stations are listened to. As the cadre's control increases, he announces more rules, "requests contributions" (taxes), and recruits troops, and villagers are increasingly careful to obey him.

Thorough investigation of their training and internal messages, together with lengthy interviews with cadres who have come over as individuals through the Chieu Hoy amnesty program, have shown that the Viet Cong cadres assigned below the provincial or district level are not usually ideologically motivated. Just as many Vietnamese learned to speak French as a path to power, without necessarily liking Frenchmen, so many low-level cadres seem to have learned and applied new political methods to take over their native villages without necessarily liking the Communists who trained them. Cadres from middle class backgrounds, who are better educated and perform vital skilled functions, as in propaganda and medicine, may even become inwardly hostile to the Viet Cong command because it mechanically gives preferential promotions to their lower class rivals. The cadre's chief concern is with his new social and political role, as the promoter of non-family social ties and as a new bureaucratic link between the village and the outside world, interpreting commands from the center and communicating village grievances back to it.

Two tactics are crucial to a cadre-based insurgency. The first is the use of terror, which is directed not simply at eliminating enemies but more at manipulating the survivors. Before a man is assassinated or kidnapped, he usually receives a threatening letter listing grievances against him and warning him to change his ways. At the time of an assassination or kidnapping, a list of the offenses for which he is being punished is pinned to his clothing, or posted on a building, or read off to his frightened family and neighbors.

Until the last few years, the Viet Cong had a "Robin Hood" image, gained by killing and publicizing many obviously corrupt officials. As a result, assassinations on false charges of honest and able officials, the insurgency's worst enemies, were sometimes believed and did not provoke the local hostility toward the Viet Cong that an air-strike does against Saigon. Furthermore, not only are Viet Cong methods of violence inherently more selective than those of ARVN and U.S. forces, but the political intelligence of a Viet Cong cadre is much better than that of the typical Vietnamese or American local official on rapid rotation. Because of his better information, the Viet Cong cadre gets more political leverage from his carrots and sticks than our side does. Attacks on the most able men as well as on the most corrupt clearly indicates that Viet Cong cadres are seeking power in their villages and not simply reforms.

The second crucial tactic is that of the "coexistence" village, where the Viet Cong cadre, the village notables, the Saigon appointed district chief, and local ARVN officer "won't fight" and "live and let live," jockeying for political position without open resort to violence. Once a village's front organizations have started up a Viet Cong cadre is not supposed to provoke attacks for fear of being shown as unable to defend his people. By day, such villages are supposed to admit joint teams of American medical personnel and Saigon-trained propagandists. These villages all use Saigon government identity cards. In such villages, Viet Cong cadres would encourage participation in Saigon's elections in order to keep all identity cards in good standing, and the cadres would also oppose mutilating ballots which could be traced to their districts.

While this balance of local power is stable, neither the Viet Cong cadres nor the ARVN officers can formalize their tacit arrangement. Viet Cong cadres can get amnesty only as individuals through the Chieu Hoy program, and if a cadre were to bring over his small military force with him, it would be imprisoned for treason or placed under the district ARVN officer, outside of the control of the amnestied cadre and his village. "Coexistence" ARVN officers have enough trouble avoiding taunts that they "won't fight" without trying to suggest to Saigon that power be shared locally. In short, while the cadres and the officers can forestall disruption from their commands by reporting back that all is quiet (but not yet quiet enough to become a Viet Cong base camp or for landlords to return for their rents) and by avoiding violence which would attract attention to their area, they can do nothing constructive to promote their common interests and those of the populations they rule.

Unfortunately, the introduction of foreign troops or advisers disrupts the tacit peace and brings on violent incidents without being able to change the basic division of authority. North Vietnamese units can not capture district towns, and American forces, short of a full counter-insurgency operation, cannot capture the villages. Americans usually cannot provide a direct alternative to the Viet Cong, even if a village's cadre has become unpopular, because mistrust of a return to colonialism is stronger than dislike of the Viet Cong. Under Diem villagers south of Saigon openly referred to the government as the "My-Diem" regime the "American-Diem" regime. In one Mekong Delta village where the peasants disliked the Viet Cong a young ARVN officer began to make good impression last year and he was warned in time to leave each time the Viet Cong assassination squad visited the village. But when an American was assigned to advise him the villagers changed their minds decided that the Viet Cong were right in opposing even good officials from Saigon because they would bring American control and allowed the next assassination squad to kill the young ARVN officer.

LINOTRON—FASTEST TYPESETTING MACHINE IN THE WORLD

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, it is a pleasure for me to report on an important scientific development in the world of printing.

It is an electronic typesetting system which composes words on film at speeds of more than 1,000 characters per second. It is now in use at the Government Printing Office.

Called Linotron, it is the fastest typesetting machine in the world. It is the first ever to set an entire page of type at one time. All previous methods compose type one line at a time.

Linotron uses a highly advanced television technique where the functions of 256 television cameras are applied to set pages from computer programed tapes. At its average pace of 1,000 characters per second, the system completes a book-size page every 5 seconds with no time loss between pages. It could typeset the Bible in about 77 minutes, a job which took Johannes Gutenberg nearly 5 years in the 15th century.

The system is the result of more than 4 years of joint development effort by the CBS Laboratories of Stamford, Conn., and Mergenthaler Linotype Co., a division of ELTRA Corp.

At formal ceremonies on Monday, the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], chairman of the Congressional Joint Committee on Printing, described Linotron as the most significant development in typesetting since the invention of the Linotype machine in 1886. He said:

In the effort to cope with the information explosion, a major bottleneck has been eliminated. For the first time, man is able to compose typography at computer speeds—not a line at a time, but over an entire page in any sequence of characters desired. It is

an amazing machine and will save the government thousands of dollars.

Immediately following the ceremonies, the Linotron began work on a Defense Supply Agency stock catalog job of nearly 50,000 pages. Formerly reproduced from computer printout copy, the catalog, as typeset by Linotron, will save the Government an estimated $250,000 annually.

James L. Harrison, the head of the Government Printing Office, said that up to 40 percent of the bulk of large printing jobs can be saved with the use of one Linotron system. The GPO will receive a second system later this year. He added:

The use of two Linotron systems will repay the government's $2 million investment in less than two years.

An even more advanced version of Linotron, designed to reproduce pictures as well as type, is now being built by CBS Laboratories and Mergenthaler for the U.S. Air Force Logistics Command.

J. A. Keller, president of ELTRA Corp., said:

Linotron will have a profound effect on the future of printing and publishing. The systems now in existence and those presently being built are sophisticated and have great capacity, but development work is continuing.

Linotron is expanding into a whole family of systems involving computer typesetting, and can be tailored to individual needs in the fields of general printing, book publishing, newspapers and computer printout.

The development of the Linotron was led by Kenneth Moore, general manager of CBS Laboratories' Graphic Systems Department, according to Dr. Peter C. Goldmark, president and director of research of CBS Laboratories, who said:

The principles on which the Linotron developments are based lend themselves to fundamentally new methods of selectively retrieving and randomly recording extreme resolution alpha numeric symbols or picture material. An entirely new generation of full page character and picture typesetting systems will evolve from the first phase of our development work which resulted in the Linotron machine placed into operation today.

It is gratifying to CBS Laboratories that such diverse government projects as CBS Laboratories' Lunar Orbiter development and the Linotron shared in many of our fundamental technologies.

The heart of the radically new composing system is an electronic tube developed by CBS Laboratories, according to Mr. Moore. From a set of glass plate type character grids, letters, numerals and symbols are projected onto a light-sensitive surface of the tube.

Mr. Moore said:

The tube essentially performs the function of television cameras, each aimed at a different character.

On command from a coded computer tape, the tube releases the characters—in the form of electrons, which are amplified into video signals—and allows them to appear in any desired position and size on the screen of a unique cathode ray tube. The tube can display 180 times more detailed type and picture information than an ordinary television receiver. As the characters appear on the screen—faster than the human eye can detect—they are instantly recorded on film in front of the screen.

Although Linotron averages 1,000 characters per second for extreme high-quality reproduction, it can run as fast as 10,000 characters per second for print of typewriter quality. There are no moving parts except for advancing the film and changing the glass grids to different type styles. Each of these motions takes a fraction of a second.

Computer programing codes to operate Linotron were developed by Mergenthaler Linotype Co., prime contractor of the system. Basic copy to be printed is first punched on paper tape along with instructions for page makeup, indentation, type changes and other information. The paper tape is then converted to magnetic tape by the computer, which adds directions for spacing and hyphenating.

Mr. Harrison observed:

Almost 20 percent of the total $1 billion Federal printing program now involves photographic reproduction of information fed out directly from computers. This is somewhat like reproducing an endless telegram, with its accompanying poor quality, hard to read type and mammoth waste of paper.

Mr. Harrison emphasized:

Because it uses magnetic tape, Linotron will free computers to do other jobs. A computer can put information on tape many times faster than it can print the same information on paper.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished acting majority leader, to fully confirm my understanding, that the Senate will convene at 9:30 tomorrow morning.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in response to the query from the distinguished minority leader, there will be no more votes tonight.

The Williams amendment will be made the pending amendment tonight before we adjourn. We will adjourn until 9:30 tomorrow morning under the previous agreement. There will be no more than 15 minutes for morning business, after which the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the Williams amendment and, under the previous agreement, up to 45 minutes will be allowed for the Williams amendment.

So it is anticipated that there will be a vote by 10:30 tomorrow morning on the Williams amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have one further inquiry. As I understand it, when action is completed on the pending bill, the next order of business will be the so-called transportation appropriation bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, that is also my understanding. There are four appropriation bills on the calendar, and it is my understanding, after talking with the distinguished majority leader, Mr. MANSFIELD, that the first of those appropriation bills to be considered by the Senate will be the transportation bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand also that after we complete the consideration of that bill, we will consider the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. That is correct. And then perhaps NASA and finally public works.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But not necessarily in that order.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Not necessarily in that order.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, do I correctly understand the Senator to say that the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill will follow the Transportation appropriation bill?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I referred to it as the second in a series, but I then stated that these would not necessarily follow in that order. The transportation appropriation bill will be first.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I hope that bill will not come up before next Tuesday. I hope that can be arranged satisfactorily.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The leadership will be glad to cooperate as far as possible, I am sure.

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. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 381

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, reads as follows:

On page 2, beginning with line 3, strike out everything through line 17 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "sum of $2,060,000,000 of which, subject to the provisions of section 616 of such Act, the amounts appropriated or made available by appropriation Act shall not exceed $295,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of part A of title I of such Act, $579,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out part B of title I, $1,022,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title II, $20,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out part A of title III, $27,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out part B of title III, $70,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title V, $16,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title VI, and $31,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title VIII, and".

On page 26, strike out lines 10 and 11, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 102. Parts B and D of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 are consolidated as a new part of such title and amended to read as follows:".

On page 37, in line 19, strike out "and part D of this title".

Beginning with line 17 on page 40, strike out everything through line 12 on page 45.

Beginning with line 8 on page 78, strike out everything through line 21 on page 86.

Redesignate sections 104 through 106 as sections 103 through 105, respectively, and redesignate sections 109 through 113 as sections 106 through 110, respectively.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 30 seconds so that I may yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask whether it is expected that there will be a final vote on the poverty program tomorrow.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am very sanguine that we can have third reading and passage of the bill reasonably early tomorrow. Of course, I would have to tell my friend the Senator from New Jersey that doubtful things are very uncertain. It is possible that the bill will go over. However, I am pretty confident that we can finish the bill tomorrow, and that there will be votes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I can now answer the question of a distinguished citizen of New Jersey who just called me, Elston Howard, who catches for the Boston Red Sox. He has offered me two tickets for the game. I will call him back and tell him I will have to be here.

Mr. CLARK. I am sorry. Perhaps the Senator can make it for the third game.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 minutes without taking time from the bill.

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

THE F-111 AIRCRAFT PROGRAM

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, during recent months, Congress and the American public have received much information regarding serious problems which continue to plague the F-111 aircraft program. There have been many news articles and broadcasts about the TFX, as it was originally called. They have been extremely interesting and quite enlightening to Members of Congress and to many millions of citizens who are concerned with our national defense capability. A number of these accounts have been printed in the RECORD at my request.

Another excellent article, entitled "The Critics Paint an Airplane Lemon," by Ralph K. Bennett, appeared in the October 2, 1967, issue of the National Observer. I wish to commend the author for having placed the troubles of this F-111 biservice aircraft in proper perspective for discerning and interested readers.

We recall that it was almost 5 years ago that research and development for this airplane was initiated. It is now conceded that the Navy version, the F-111B, is more than 2½ years behind schedule. We all know that the total costs of the original TFX aircraft, as estimated in 1962, have now more than doubled. The cost of approximately 1,300 of these planes which we now propose to buy has spiraled to more than double the estimated cost of the more than 1,700 we originally intended to procure. It also is well known that Pentagon officials have admitted in congressional hearings that both the Navy and Air Force versions of the plane are seriously deficient in specified combat mission performance.

In his article, Mr. Bennett indicates that a primary cause for the multiple problems of the F-111 is found in the insistence of the Secretary of Defense that the dubious goal of "commonality" between both versions take precedence over the vital objective of attaining weaponry effectiveness. When an airplane's costs escalate and when its performance is sacrificed to maintain an unrealistic concept like commonality, the heralded theory of "cost effectivness" produces, as it has in this instance, an aircraft which military officials in the Pentagon now privately refer to as a "clunker."

Mr. President, I am not implying that commonality cannot be a valid and economical concept. Money can certainly be saved by ordering the procurement of a common weapon when the requirements of the individual services are identical. There is no way, however, to build with identical parts an effective single weapons system which will carry out separate and widely diverse military missions. Mr. Bennett's article points out that the TFX program was an attempt to combine the drastically different design and performance characteristics of a Navy plane weighing 50,000 pounds and an Air Force plane weighing 90,000 pounds. The result is an 80,000-pound hybrid craft that cannot capably perform to the requirements of either service.

The original insistence upon commonality, by amateurs in the Pentagon, despite the warnings of expert engineers and technicians that in this case the concept was neither valid nor feasible, is one of the glaring and most critical mistakes made in the F-111 program. The stubborn refusal of top Pentagon officials to admit the basic error of applying the commonality concept to this program has compounded and intensified the F-111's fundamental problems in almost 5 years of research and development and caused the costs to soar while the weaponry effectiveness has alarmingly sagged. It is now crystal clear that a complete redesign of the airplane in both its versions would be necessary to produce two individual weapons systems that would meet the separate needs of the services and the initial operational requirements specified by the Navy and the Air Force.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Bennett's article in the National Observer be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

[From the National Observer, Oct. 2, 1967]

AFTERBURN FOR MR. MCNAMARA: THE CRITICS PAINT AN AIRPLANE LEMON

(By Ralph K. Bennett)

". . . If the military really must fly, why can't it buy one machine and take turns using it?"—President CALVIN COOLIDGE.

F-111 born TFX out of Robert Strange McNamara. On paper it is the most sophisticated, flexible, yet economic air-weapons system yet devised—a single airplane capable of performing the divergent missions of both Navy and Air Force. In reality it may be the most costly bungle in the not-too-tidy history of American military procurement—a multibillion-dollar farrago, which may not only place an imposition on the taxpayer but may also compromise national defense.

What to do about it? Men of good will are torn by indecision. On the one hand they listen as starchy U.S. Sen. John McClellan, Arkansas Democrat, says the plans ought to be scrapped now, while there's time. On the other hand, they listen to Mr. McNamara's continuing insistence that the plane can meet all the requirements for which it was built, and maybe more.

The F-111 is the most controversial weapons system ever built, and last week the controversy showed no signs of slackening off. The Defense Department says the sleek, "swing wing" jet represents a bundle of technological firsts. Critics argue that it has established some other "firsts."

They believe the F-111 represents the first instance of a multibillion-dollar defense project being undertaken *entirely on the basis of rough figures,* never set down for accounting, but merely stashed away "in his head" by the Secretary of Defense.

They believe the F-111 is the first major air-weapons system, *already scheduled for complete integration into national defense,* that has reached its fifth year of development without meeting the standards originally set for it, and without operating with complete reliability.

They believe the F-111 represents the first time that a highly qualified military selection board has been overruled on its selection of an aircraft by the Secretary of Defense. In this particular instance, the board was given no opportunity to explain why it preferred an alternate design to the F-111 through four reviews of the project.

They believe the F-111 is the first major U.S. military aircraft to have doubled and perhaps tripled in cost before ever becoming operational. Expected to average about $3,000,000 per plane at the outset of the program, the F-111 now bears a price tag of about $6,000,000 for the Air Force version, $8,000,000 for the Navy version.

THE SWINGING WING

General Dynamics, of Fort Worth, which won out over the Boeing Co. for the contract to build the F-111, is now working feverishly to make the plane a semblance of what it was originally intended to be. Theoretically, the secret of the F-111's "success" is its variable sweep wing. With the wing extended at right angles to the fuselage, the plane should have the capability of taking off and landing at very low speeds over a very short distance. If it sweeps its wing back 60 degrees, the F-111 should be able to fly at Mach 2.5 (about 1,650 m.p.h.) at very high altitudes. With wings swept entirely back, the plane takes on the appearance of a delta-wing jet, and should be able to streak along at supersonic speeds at tree-top level, thus avoiding enemy radar.

This amazing versatility, envisioned back in 1962, was to be the one-plane answer to the differing needs of the Air Force and the Navy. At that time, the Air Force wanted a heavy (between 80,000 and 90,000 pounds), slim, sleek, and strong fighter-bomber able to defend itself and able to make sustained supersonic "dashes" beneath enemy radar. The Air Force was already undertaking preliminary study of such a plane.

The Navy, meanwhile, was seeking a successor to its highly successful McDonnell F-4 fighter. The Navy wanted a plane with the capability of protecting the fleet from aerial attack at a great distance from the fleet itself. It had to be light (no more than

50,000 pounds) and short (for aircraft carrier stowage); and stubby, (to permit pilot and copilot to sit side-by-side). The plane must of course be capable of short take-off and landing, must have a long range, and must be able to "loiter" for great lengths of time, watching for approaching enemy aircraft. It would defend the fleet by firing sophisticated Phoenix missiles, computerized to select and destroy the most dangerous of incoming targets.

Both services were playing with the idea of a swing-wing aircraft for their needs when President John F. Kennedy came into office and Mr. McNamara went to the Pentagon. Mr. McNamara's zeal in cutting out unnecessary duplication between the services is already legend. When he saw that the Air Force and the Navy were planning to develop two swing-wing planes, he reasoned that if they both were to build and buy the same swing-wing aircraft there would be a tremendous saving in research and development and production costs.

This new plane, in short, would be the synthesis of Mr. McNamara's gospel of "commonality." It is in many ways a sound gospel, preaching as it does that the various military services can save a lot of money by using the same basic items wherever possible, from belt buckles, to boots, to butcher's smocks. But now commonality was to be carried into the realm of a sophisticated weapons system. There the trouble began. Mr. McNamara saw little difference in the mission requirements of the Navy and the Air Force. He ordered joint development "of a single aircraft of genuine tactical utility to both services" in a now famous memorandum of Sept. 1, 1961. The Navy and the Air Force grumbled, but a joint Source Selection Board was formed to establish criteria and select the best design offered by contractors.

TOO MUCH COMPROMISING

The problem of commonality pervaded work on the plane, then designated TFX for Tactical Fighter Experimental. Neither the Navy nor the Air Force felt a truly superior weapons system was possible. There was simply too much compromising. ". . . The incompatability of requirements led the Navy to say that the things that made the Air Force plane better, made the Navy airplane worse," said George Spangenberg, evaluation director of the Bureau of Naval Weapons. He and other officials said commonality would present great difficulty for any manufacturer.

The two services finally did achieve compromises on performance, weight, and various aircraft characteristics. The two companies offering the best designs to meet the joint service terms were General Dynamics and the Boeing Co. Both offered swing-wing planes of very similar configuration, although the Boeing design had large air scoops above and behind the cockpit, which made it easily recognizable. Neither designer could meet the requirements of the services. Four times they reworked their designs and presented them to the Source Selection Board. *Through all four go-rounds the members of the board preferred the Boeing design.* It had longer range, greater fire power, could carry a greater selection of weapons, used thrust reversers instead of air brakes, and it was about 2,000 pounds lighter. The high-mounted air scoops meant there was less chance of damage to jet engines from foreign objects sucked in from *the ground.* They also minimized the possibility of exhaust from a fired missile blasting into the engine, cutting off its air supply, and thereby conking it out. They felt that Boeing management expertise, and the fact that the Boeing plane was lighter, would make its plane more economical.

The Source Selection Board made its recommendation to the Air Force Council, consisting of nine generals and (because of the joint effort) three admirals. On Nov. 8, 1962, the Air Force Council met. Its chairman, Air Force Gen. William F. McKee, recalled that "because of the clear operational superiority of the Boeing aircraft and other factors, the Air Force Council, with Navy members, voted unanimously to recommend Boeing as a source . . ." for the new aircraft. The council said the Boeing design advantage over General Dynamics was "clear and substantial."

Secretary McNamara turned down the decision and chose General Dynamics. In a memorandum of Nov. 21, 1962, he criticized the "execssive optimism" of Boeing reflected in its design, and ordered acceptance of General Dynamics' proposal "on the basis that it proposes the greater degree of commonness, contemplates the use of conventional materials [Boeing had urged use of titanium], provides the higher confidence in structural design, and offers the better possibility of obtaining *the aircraft desired on schedule and within the dollars programed.*"

The Source Selection Board and the Air Force Council were never called for consultation, given an opportunity to explain, or to hear explanations. They were merely informed of the decision. Albert W. Blackburn, an aerospace consultant in the Pentagon at the time, later observed that "it is difficult to imagine that several hundred top technical experts . . . would again with such seriousness of purpose and over such a long period of time . . . so enthusiastically seek to accomplish the choice of the superior weapon-system proposal in another such competition when the total effort expended by them is from their point of view completely negated by an executive decision."

M'NAMARA STANDS FIRM

This executive decision by Mr. McNamara is the pivot point of the entire F-111 controversy. If it negated all that went before, it also places full responsibility for what comes after upon Mr. McNamara's shoulders. The Secretary of Defense has gladly accepted this burden, and has stood by it unflinchingly to this day, through a storm of criticism and a continuing investigation by the Senate Permanent Investigating Subcommittee, headed by Senator McClellan.

Mr. McNamara's reputation as the great steel-trap brain of the Pentagon, the decision maker who brought economy and efficiency to the Defense Department, was put on the line with the F-111 decision. Was it a bankrupt decision? A costly mistake? The people who will answer "yes" to those questions are legion. But remembering the animosity that has developed between the civilian element in the Pentagon, represented by Mr. McNamara, and the military, most of the brickbats thrown the Secretary's way must be examined judiciously, taken sparingly. However, there are undeniable facts arising from the inception of the TFX program, and the subsequent development of the F-111, which today place Mr. McNamara's decision in dubious light.

First, the cost. Since 1962, Mr. McNamara and his aides have trumpeted the "fact" that building of the joint-service airplane would save the taxpayers $1 billion. A year later, the Senate investigators discovered that the $1 billion figure was computed by a consultant in the Pentagon on a hypothetical airplane with "no relationship to General Dynamics or Boeing, or any of the other four earlier contractors." But the $1 billion figure has become an amusing antigue anyway, because of the ballooning cost of the F-111 program.

ESTIMATES GO UP

Back in 1963, the Air Force looked forward to spending $711,000,000 on research and development of the F-111, with this included in a total cost of just under $6 billion for purchase of 1,700 of the planes. Now the Air Force has revised its estimates. Misgivings about the plane have caused the total purchase to be reduced to 1,300 planes. However, research and development costs are now topping out at $2 billion, with at least $10 billion to be spent on actual plane purchases.

How could there be so much miscalculation on this revolutionary move to bring economy to military procurement? Of course the original figures upon which costs were calculated would be of great help in providing an answer. But there aren't any. Secretary McNamara rejected Air Force cost estimates on the TFX program as "unreliable" back in 1962. However, as the then comptroller general of the United States, Joseph Campbell, testified in 1963, Mr. McNamara had no "independent or additional cost estimates" of his own upon which to base the feasibility of the TFX program. When representatives from Mr. Campbell's office personally asked the Secretary of Defense for such figures, "he (the Secretary) stated that he had the figures in his head, indicating to us that he did not have them on paper."

Mr. McNamara's remarkable candor at this juncture must certainly be applauded, but Mr. Campbell was appalled by the implications of what the Secretary of Defense had said. "I would expect the fullest kind of documentation in this case for two reasons," the comptroller general told the Senate investigators. "One is the enormous expenditure involved, and second, which may not seem important, but it is to me, in case I were not around to explain something, the supporting documents would be available."

The second element detracting from Mr. McNamara's decision is the evidence of the F-111 itself. The Air Force version of the plane can reach scarcely over 25,000 feet when fully loaded with bombs and fuel. This is far below the projected—and secret—ceiling for the aircraft. Its ferry range is 600 miles short of requirements, and its crucial tree-top "dash" range (the Air Force's prime requirement) is about 25 to 50 miles compared to the 200 miles needed. The speed brake—a hinged device that projects from the fuselage to increase wind resistance and slow the plane—continues to give trouble. (The Boeing design called for thrust reversers in the engines, such as are used on jet liners, to substitute for a speed brake).

Because of the effort towards "commonality," the Navy version—designated F-111B—suffers all these same ills, plus more. The most important is weight. In compromising with the Air Force, the Navy accepted a projected 55,000-pound weight for its plane. Now the Navy version weighs about 75,000 pounds when armed and fueled. This is dangerously excessive for carrier operations and leaves little leeway for the fact that military planes grow in weight by as much as 25 per cent over the years, as new armament and electronic systems are added. The Navy will have to restructure most of its carrier elevators to accommodate all this weight. Usually, when a plane is brought up to the deck of the carrier, it rises on the elevator with a tractor already attached to drag it to the catapult. Not so with the F-111B. The Navy will need extra tractors since the plane will not fit on an elevator with its tractor. So there will have to be tractors below decks and tractors above decks.

A LOT OF WIND

One of the most crucial of the Navy's military requirements has sadly eroded too. The Navy wanted a plane that could take off from a carrier at anchor with no wind. The F-111B will need a wind of 29 knots (allowing for the Navy's 10-knot safety margin) to take off. This means that the F-111B will only be able to take off when the carrier is moving, and moving into the wind. If there is a wind of, say, 20 knots the carrier will have to be moving at least at 9 knots

in order for the F-111B to take off. If there is little wind the carrier will have to be moving at top speed to permit take-off of F-111Bs. And the carrier will be moving in a predictable direction, since it must move into the wind. An enemy could therefore know by wind direction which way the carrier is moving. Original requirements, if satisfied, would have provided an almost instant response capability, which the Navy will not have with the F-111B—a plane ironically designated for defense of the fleet.

ONE VERSION PROCEEDS

Other problems plaguing both planes are myriad. They have caused production and development delays that have put the Navy version of the plane behind schedule by as much as two years. It is still considered "unacceptable for service use" by the Navy. But the Pentagon has steamed ahead, letting a $1.8 billion contract for the Air Force version (for an initial 493 planes) to General Dynamics. The Pentagon insists that while the Navy plan has had its troubles, the Air Force version is getting along fine. Senator McClellan observes, however, that "in view of the persistence for commonality, most of the defects in the Navy plane are also present in the Air Force plane. If these defects cannot be corrected, there is reason to consider abandonment of the project."

Far from abandoning the project, Mr. McNamara has announced more tasks will be assigned to the F-111. He plans to phase out 345 B-52s and 80 B-58s of the Strategic Air Command (SAC) and replace them with an F-111 modification called the FB-111. SAC and other military officials have pointed out that, judging from the present standards of the F-111 series, such a plane would be sadly deficient in almost every service requirement as a long-range bomber.

Such moves by Mr. McNamara have shaken his critics somewhat. How can he be wrong if he keeps banking on the F-111 so much? "Gad, what a poker player he'd be," remarked a member of the House of Representatives, intimating that the Secretary may be bluffing his way through an incredible error. Other Congressmen believe the Secretary is just too "vain and egotistical" (as Senator McClellan put it in a speech) to back down and admit an error. This has put Mr. McClellan in an uncomfortable position. He wants the Armed Services to have the best possible airplane for their needs; but he does not want a program costing so much money to slip through if it is not feasible. He has sought to withhold major funding of the F-111 program, but all the while he has been beset by the nagging thought that Mr. McNamara may have put the United States so far out on the limb with F-111 that its defense may be compromised unless this plane, good or bad, is used. Since the F-111 controversy began there have been no major new military-aircraft programs begun to fulfill similar defense needs.

"We may find ourselves out on the edge somewhere about 1970 with a lousy airplane and nothing to replace it," said a Navy officer in the Pentagon last week.

THE COST OF COMMONALITY

Secretary McNamara insists the F-111 is not a "lousy" airplane. He is staking everything on it, and on the concept of commonality. This is rather ironic, since the whole reason for commonality is economy. The F-111 gives every evidence of being an airplane in which money, lots of it, is being paid out to achieve commonality. General Dynamics and the Defense Department maintain that the "commonality factor" of the F-111 is about 80 per cent. This means that 80 per cent of the parts in the Air Force and Navy versions are identical. Aircraft designers and consultants interviewed by The National Observer refuse to believe this is so. Some venture to believe the factor has dropped to 60 per cent, and will go much lower before the F-111 is completely operational.

It is possible to achieve commonality and come up with something acceptable. But is acceptable good enough, where national defense is at stake? "The Defense Department has been able to say this plane is acceptable," notes Senator McClellan. "Well, acceptable is something far less than was expected in the F-111. These planes are not what either service asked for. The cost is more. The quality is less."

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. PERCY in the chair). Who yields time?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time on the pending amendment not start running until tomorrow morning.

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

IMPACT SCHOOL AID

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the conferees on H.R. 10196, the appropriations bill for the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, have reached a decision on the impacted school aid problem which will cause great difficulties in many localities across the Nation.

The conference committee agreed to take the House figure on this item—$439,137,000. The Senate had voted for $33,800,000 more for this purpose, or a total of $472,937,000. I am convinced the Senate's decision for the larger figure was completely justified, and that Congress will have to consider supplemental nourishment for these federally-affected areas.

I know that this has been a matter of great concern to the members of the conference committee, and that their decision was not arrived at without much attention. However, we must recognize the connection that this item has to our national defense posture. Schools within military-affected areas are under severe strain due to the extraordinary activity resulting from the war in Vietnam. Thus, important reductions made by the House figure will affect adversely the school programs of these already overcrowded schools.

JEWISH NEW YEAR

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, at 7 p.m. on this day, Wednesday, October 4, Jews throughout the world will usher in their New Year, of 5728. I rejoice with them in the observance that they will tender to this new milestone of their life.

In the main, their 5,728 years have been filled with adversities and difficulties. They were robbed by the kings and mobbed by the people, stopped from working at their professions by the guilds, and prohibited from worshiping in accordance with their faith by rulers intolerant of other people's religions. Without a common language, without a land to which they could go and rest their weary heads, but devotedly adhering to their Torah they struggled through life.

In the year 1492, when Columbus discovered America, the King of Spain discovered the Jews. He robbed them of their possesisons. Under penalty of torture and frequently death, an abandonment of their religion was demanded. To their great tribute, they suffered tortures and confiscation of their property, and forfeiture of life, rather than abandon their faith.

They were driven out of their ancient land of Jerusalem, driven out of Spain, and caused to move to various places of the world, but never have they given up their faith in their Torah.

Six million of them suffered death under the cruelty and terrorism of Hitler. Their only uniting force was the Torah, carried with them wherever they sought refuge.

How these people were able to survive has been a mystery and, in fact, a miracle in the history of the people of the world.

Mr. President, Rabbi David L. Genuth, of Cleveland, Ohio, a distinguished Jewish Rabbi, has issued a message in connection with this significant beginning of the 5,728th year of Jewish life. His message is so replete with tender and appropriate thoughts that I feel it is highly worthy of becoming a part of the RECORD of the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the message of Rabbi David L. Genuth be printed in the RECORD.

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

On Wednesday, October 4th at 7 P.M., Jews throughout the world will usher in the year 5728.

One of the inspiring prayers reads as follows:

"Now, Lord our God, put thy awe upon all whom thou hast made, thy dread upon all whom thou hast created; let thy works revere thee, let all thy creatures worship thee; may thy all blend into one brotherhood to do thy will with a perfect heart. For we know, Lord our God, that there is dominion, power and might; thou are revered above all that thou hast created."

This year more than ever we are going to offer special prayers for the Fatherhood of God and for the Brotherhood of Man.

According to our belief the first man was created on our Religious New Year. He was created in the image of God and he was endowed with an immortal soul.

When we refer to man, we include all of God's children, regardless of race, creed or color.

I believe it will be very appropriate for Jews all over the world to pray for peace in general and for peace in Viet Nam in particular.

We, as Americans of Jewish faith had a great share in the making of this nation. In the mine and in the mill, at the lathe and at the loom, in counting room and council chamber, the Jews has been at work for 3 centuries and a half for his America. He has sentried his nation's camp; he has been in the mast's look-out on his nations ship; he has gone out to battle, and he was among them that fell at the firing line . . . The future will place new solemn obligations upon us for the country's sake and as Judaism's consecration; we shall not shirk our duties.

We will continue to defend our Americanism with all our hearts and souls.

On the New Year's we read Biblical portions pertaining to the day and one of the portions we recall the stirring challenge in the Bible, "I call heaven and earth to witness against you this day."

"Choose life" has been spoken throughout history to men and nations at the point when a life-or-death decision has to be made. The challenge is more urgent and more momentous today than ever before, because man has acquired skills and studied techniques which can easily eliminate him from our planet. His amazing conquests in the realm of nature may only speed his own annihilation unless he is more successful in conquering human nature. The tragedy of our age is that man learned to split the atom before he achieved a united humanity.

The High Holy Days present man with the greatest gift of God, that man was created in the image of God, and he was endowed with a Divine and Immortal Soul.

In the last 30 or 40 years we presented him with a concept which is not true, and therefore we corrupted him. We presented man as an automation of reflexes, as a mind-machine, as a bundle of instincts, and environment. We feel the nihilism to which modern man is, in any case, prone. This is the reason why on the Day of Atonement we read the story of Jonah, the Prophet. He was the Prophet who tried to run away from his Divinely-given duty but could never escape. He was also the Prophet who had to learn the lesson of the High Holy Days—that human life is a gift from God, and all men are God's children.

Rosh Hashanah also reminds us how important it is for each and every one of us to listen to God in the soft, still voice of our conscience. The Bible depicts the situation most picturesquely. The great Prophet Alijah was weary of life and prayed to die. He then received a Divine Command to go to Mt. Sinai. The trip took him 40 days; when he stood on top of the Mountain, great upheavals took place. There was a whirlwind that broke the rocks in pieces, there was an earthquake, and there was fire. The Holy Scriptures report that God was not in the whirlwind or in the earthquake, nor in the fire. Then came a soft, still voice. Alijah was suddenly aware of the presence of God. He received the Divine message and returned to his people. How important this message is for modern man!

Earthquakes in the shape of major or minor wars will not create the Kingdom of God. Riots and violence, burning and destroying will not assure us of a world of brotherhood and peace. Only by listening to the soft-still voice of God who keeps on repeating every moment of the day, "Choose life—choose peace—choose brotherhood," only then will our civilization be saved and mankind will enjoy peace and tranquillity in all eternity.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERCY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, before making a motion to adjourn, I ask that the clerk state the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] proposes an amendment to S. 2388, as follows:

On page 2, beginning with line 3, strike out everything through line 17 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "sum of $2,060,000,000 of which, subject to the provisions of section 616 of such Act, the amounts appropriated or made available by appropriation Act shall not exceed $295,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of part A of title I of such Act, $579,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out part B of title I, $1,022,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title II, $20,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out part A of title III, $27,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out part B of title III, $70,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title V, $16,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title VI, and $31,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title VIII, and".

On page 26, strike out lines 10 and 11, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 102. Parts B and D of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 are consolidated as a new part of such title and amended to read as follows:".

On page 37, in line 19, strike out "and part D of this title".

Beginning with line 17 on page 40, strike out everything through line 12 on page 45.

Beginning with line 8 on page 78, strike out everything through line 21 on page 86.

Redesignate sections 104 through 106 as sections 103 through 105, respectively, and redesignate sections 109 through 113 as sections 106 through 110, respectively.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, I wish to recapitulate the information I gave to the Senate earlier today in response to the question propounded by the distinguished and able minority leader.

In the morning, in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement offered by the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the morning business will be confined to no more than 15 minutes, following which, the consideration of the Williams amendment will take place, and 45 minutes is allotted to the consideration of that amendment. There will then be a vote on the Williams amendment.

Following the vote on the Williams amendment there may be other amendments and there may be other votes; but it is hoped that the third reading of the bill would follow not too long thereafter and that the Senate might then reach a final vote on the poverty bill.

Following the disposition of the poverty bill it is intended that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Transportation Department appropriation bill. When the consideration of that bill has been concluded, any one or more of three appropriation bills will be brought up during the rest of the week for consideration. Those three bills are the NASA appropriation bill, the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill, and the public works appropriation bill. The bills will not necessarily be considered in that order.

Mr. President, again, we expect to have some votes on tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 5, 1967, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 4 (legislative day of October 2), 1967:

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers, when retired, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233:

Vice Adm. Charles B. Martell, U.S. Navy.
Vice Adm. Charles E. Weakley, U.S. Navy.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3284 and 3298:

To be first lieutenants

Aasen, Robert B., OF100369.
Adair, William H., OF101302.
Adams, James L., OF101303.
Adams, Robert G., OF100372.
Adams, Stanley L., OF100373.
Adams, Thomas L., OF100374.
Adams, William D., OF103166.
Adkins, Hubert R., OF101872.
Alitz, Douglas A., OF101304.
Alldredge, Donald H., OF100378.
Allen, John M., OF100380.
Allison, David B., OF102305.
Allman, Gary W., OF100382.
Amedick, Paul F., OF100741.
Ames, Robert A., OF101305.
Amrine, Robert M., OF101306.
Anderson, Darwin J., OF100383.
Anderson, Norman L., OF101307.
Anderson, Raymond W., OF101308.
Andre, James C., OF100366.
Andrews, Andrew E., OF101309.
Andrews, Roger L., OF103808.
Ankrom, Charles B., OF101873.
Annan, William M., OF101310.
Anthony, Thomas E., OF101311.
Armstrong, David B., OF102400.
Arnold, Joseph C., OF101312.
Arrington, John W., OF101313.
Asbury, David L., O095425.
Ashbrook, Lonnie R., OF100392.
Austin, Lavern M., OF100393.
Avery, Ronald L., OF100742.
Bachman, Howard F., OF101314.
Badger, Thomas A., OF101315.
Bailey, Harvey J., OF101876.
Bain, Seavy A., Jr., OF101316.
Baker, Joel S., OF100398.
Balderson, Robert A., OF101317.
Baldwin, Roger L., OF101318.
Ball, Francisco, Jr., OF100402.
Ballagh, Robert S., OF101319.
Ballou, Roger W., OF100988.
Banovic, Daniel M., OF101320.
Baratto, David J., OF101321.
Barber, Victor C., OO99128.
Barnett, Phillip G., OF100405.
Barnett, Ronald V., OO96821.
Baron, Thomas S., OF100406.
Barovetto, John L., OO97752.
Barr, Douglas H., OF101322.
Barrett, Robert W., OF100407.
Barrow, Joseph M., OF102307.

Barry, Anthony, OF100408.
Baseheart, George M., OF101323.
Basile, Domenic F., OF100410.
Bast, Christopher O., OF101324.
Batchelder, Michael., OF100411.
Batrow, Peter P., Jr., OF100413.
Battey, Robert E., OF100414.
Battilega, John A., OO99130.
Baukert, Frank P., OF100415.
Baumann, Charles H., OF100416
Beale, Richard E., Jr., OF101879
Beardslee, Harold M., OF100419
Beasley, Clifford M., OF101325
Beaumont, Richard A., OF100420
Bechtold, Earl E., OF100421
Beck, William R., OF101326
Bedford, Ralph F., OF100422
Beierschmitt, James, OF101328
Bell, David G., OF100423
Bell, Terence M., OF102309
Bennett, David W., OF100920
Bennett, Douglas P., OF101329
Bennett, James R., OF101880.
Bennett, Jay F., OF101330.
Bergen, John D., Jr., OF101331.
Bergeron, Daniel M., OF106497.
Bergman, David M., OF101332.
Bertelli, Paul F., OF101333.
Best, Billy B., OF105618.
Bettner, Steven M., OF101334.
Biank, Samuel A., OF101335.
Bigelow, James E., II, OF101336.
Binney, David G., OF101337.
Bischoff, Eric L., OF101338.
Bjork, Gary F., OF100438.
Black, Bruce R., OF100439.
Black, William L., Jr., OF100440.
Black, William R., OF101339.
Blair, Joseph M., III, OF100442.
Blalock, Harry H., OF101082.
Blankenship, Dumont, OF100444.
Bloomfield, Kenneth, OF101340.
Bogensberger, Paul, OF100448.
Boland, Edward J., OF100449.
Bolen, William R., OF101341.
Boling, Joseph E., OF100453.
Bonine, Larry S., OF101881.
Boone, Howard E., OF101342.
Booth, Teddy J., OF100454.
Boroff, Michael A., OF100456.
Bosworth, Weldon S., OF100458.
Bouchard, Frederick, OF100459.
Bourne, Robert R., OF106063.
Bowers, Michael J., OF101343.
Bowman, Thomas E., OF100461.
Boyd, Hugh F., III, OF101344.
Boyles, Calvin E., OF100463.
Bradham, R. A., OF102690.
Bramlett, David A., OF101345.
Bramlette, Larry J., OF101346.
Branch, David D., Jr., OF101882.
Brandon, James C., OF102313.
Bransford, Ann H., LO00834.
Brennan, Mark F., Jr., OF101347.
Brennan, Robert F., OF100079.
Bresley, Kenneth V., OF96825.
Brewer, Larry K., OF101348.
Brinkman, Edward P., OF101349.
Brinton, Robert H., OF100470.
Brockliss, John A., OF100471.
Brogdon, James M., II, OF100472.
Brokaw, Milton J., OF101350.
Brophy, Daniel M., OF100473.
Brotzman, Ellis R., OF100475.
Brown, Albert S., Jr., OF100476.
Brown, Charles T., Jr., OF101352.
Brown, Gerald C., OF101353.
Brown, James H., OF100477.
Brown, Martin G., OF100478.
Brown, Richard J., OF100480.
Brown, Robert B., OF100481.
Brown, Victor A., OF100483.
Brucker, Willis H., OF101354.
Bruggeman, Bradley, OF100485.
Brunner, William H., OF101887.
Burton, Robert W., OF100486.
Bryon, Larry A., OF101355.
Brye, Paul E., OF100487.
Buckles, Richard L., OF100024.
Buckley, Michael J., OF101356.
Buckner, Roy C., OF101357.
Buehler, Christian, OF100962.
Bujalski, David A., OF101358.
Bullard, Charles N., OF100489.
Burch, Harold E., OF101889.
Burke, John C., III, OF100491.
Burkett, Lawrence A., OF100493.
Burney, Samuel M., Jr., OF101359.
Burns, Edward C., OF101171.
Burton, Emmette Y., OF103091.
Butlak, Jan M., OF100495.
Butler, Thomas W., OF101360.
Byrd, Wayne W., OF100497.
Cahill, Gregory, OF100498.
Campbell, Donald L., OF101890.
Campbell, James L., OF100518.
Campbell, Ralph J., OF101361.
Cappellino, Anthony, OF100502.
Cardwell, Stephen G., OF100506.
Carey, John P., OF100507.
Carlisle, Richard D., OF105642.
Carlson, Robert H., OF101362.
Carmichael, John H., OF100509.
Carnes, Robert D., OF100605.
Carr, Jeremiah T., OF100510.
Carr, Richard L., Jr., OF101363.
Carson, James M., Jr., OF101364.
Carter, Ian B., OF101365.
Carter, Virgil R., II, OF100721.
Carver, George A., Jr., OF101366.
Cary, John R., OF101367.
Case, Harry M., OF100088.
Case, Melvin E., OF1011368.
Casey, Bernard J., OF100251.
Casey, Michael T., OF100513.
Cate, Paul E., Jr., OF101369.
Cates, William N., Jr., OF100516.
Caudill, Watson G., OF101370.
Cavanaugh, Roger J., OF100517.
Cecchine, Gary A., OF101371.
Cella, James J., OF102698.
Cesarski, William V., OF101372.
Chaffers, James A., OF100519.
Chaffin, Sherrill T., OF100520.
Chapin, Edward D., OF101892.
Chapman, James H., OF104392.
Chapman, Thomas W., OF101373.
Charlton, Darrel T., OF100524.
Charpentier, Lino G., OF102317.
Charron, Leo D., Jr., OF101374.
Cherrie, Stanley F., OF100525.
Chescavage, William, OF101375.
Chilcoat, Richard A., OF101376.
Childress, Richard, OF100526.
Ching, Wendell T. P., OF100527.
Chiota, Robert J., OF100528.
Chirico, Carl F., Jr., O096832.
Chmielak, Jerome A., OF101377.
Christensen, Alan N., OF101378.
Christoffersen, Jon, OF100529.
Chun, Kenneth W., OF102699.
Churchill, Floyd V., OF100530.
Ciancaglini, Joseph, OF100531.
Clark, John R., OF101379.
Clearwaters, Boyd L., OF101893.
Cleavenger, Carl M., OF103261.
Cleek, Don E., OF101894.
Clelland, David H., OF100532.
Clingham, James H., OF100534.
Cobbs, James S., OF101380.
Colburn, Neville, OF101381.
Colclasure, Wyett H., OF102318.
Cole, Coye M., OF100536.
Cole, Edward G., II, OF100094.
Coleman, Fredrick W., OF101382.
Collins, Arthur L., OF100538.
Collins, Bernhard B., OF103093.
Collins, David, OF100539.
Collins, Francis J., OF101383.
Collins, Ronald S., OF100540.
Condon, Thomas B., OF100542.
Confer, Kenneth T., OF100543.
Conn, Samuel H., Jr., O096835.
Conner, John T., OF100545.
Connolly, Patrick C., OF100546.
Connor, William M., OF101384.
Conrad, Joseph C., OF100547.
Conway, Michael J., OF101385.
Cook, Michael R., OF101386.
Cook, Robert E., OF100548.
Cook, William H., OF106552.
Cooper, Norman G., OF100071.
Cope, John A., Jr., OF101387.
Coppin, Thomas D., O099550.
Corbett, David A., OF101388.
Corcoran, Edward J., OF100549.
Corey, George C., OF100550.
Corey, Joseph J., Jr., OF101389.
Corley, Bruce R., OF101390.
Cornell, James E., OF101391.
Counts, Clyde G., OF103096.
Covalucci, Robert J., OF100553.
Covington, Terrell, OF101393.
Cox, Walter T., III, OF101896.
Craighill, Robert R., OF101394.
Crissman, Kearney W., OF101395.
Crites, Richard J., OF100556.
Cromartie, George D., OF101396.
Cross, Ronald M., OF101397.
Crossman, John S., OF100558.
Crowder, Lewis H., OF102706.
Culp, Dennis K., Jr., OF101398.
Cunningham, Clyde R., O096838.
Cunningham Richard, OF100560.
Cunningham Thomas, OF101399.
Cupp, James L., OF100562.
Curran, Thomas M., OF101400.
Cusick, John J., OF100563.
Dabrowski, Peter F., OF103100.
Dahl, Matthew G., OF101698.
Daily, Robert R., Jr., OF102036.
Dalessandro, Peter, OF101401.
Daly, James M., Jr., OF101402.
Danielski, Loren R., OF101900.
Danylchuk, Peter R., OF101403.
Darrow, John H., OF101404.
Dash, Michael E., OF100570.
Daub, Russe, OF100571.
Davis, Charlton E., OF100573.
Davis, Charles T., O095475.
Davis, Curtis A., OF101405.
Davis, Glendel C., OF100574.
Davis, Richard W., Jr., OF101406.
Davis, Stewart P., OF102038.
Davis, Walter W., Jr., OF101407.
Davison, Michael S., OF101408.
Davy, Douglas C., OF100575.
Day, James R., OF101902.
De Gon, Kenneth M., OF101409.
De Vito, Kenneth J., OF101903.
Dean, Richard V., OF100576.
Deasy, Kevin B., OF100577.
Decoteau, Glynn T., OF100578.
Dee, Raymond C., OF100579.
Deloatch, Voneree, OF100581.
Derrah, Donald W., OF100582.
Desjardins, George, OF101410.
Deter, Daniel E., OF101411.
Devanney, Thomas M., OF100583.
Dexter, Craig M., OF101904.
Dexter, Paul D., OF100584.
Dexter, Richard P., OF101412.
Di Nens, William T., OF101413.
Dick, Donald E., OF100587.
Dickey, James L., OF101905.
Dickson, John R., OF103101.
Diesing, Richard C., OF100589.
Dietze, Jeffrey C., OF100590.
Dixon, Daniel D., OF100591.
Dixon, Peter J., OF100592.
Doerfler, Donald W., OF106572.
Dole, William E., Jr., OF101906.
Dollar, William M., OF102039.
Dollhausen, Hans C., O096365.
Domas, George J., Jr., OF101414.
Donnelly, Joseph J., OF100594.
Doolittle, Robert J., OF101416.
Dovas, Christos A., OF100597.
Dowdy, Edward C., III, OF100598.
Downey, James P., OF101417.
Downs, Michael C., OF100600.
Draper, Stephen E., OF101418.
Dresser, Paul A., Jr., OF100601.
Drillock, Serge, OF100602.
Due, William F., Jr., OF101419.
Duffy, John P., OF101420.
Duke, Wayne, OF102041.
Dundy, Michael W., OF101910.
Dunlap, David W., OF101911.
Dunn, Emet C., Jr., OF100606.
Dunn, Thomas D., Jr., OF106582.
Dunning, Raymond M., OF100607.
Durand, Pedro J., OF101912.

Durfee, Thomas J., OF101422.
Durgin, Harry W., OF101913.
Dye, Carl E., OF101423.
Dykes, Andrew A., OF101424.
East, Jared, OF102321.
Ebert, Marlin J., OF104414.
Ebitz, Curtis V., OF102322.
Edwards, Dennis L., O099832.
Edwards, Jerry W., OF100614.
Efird, Crayon C., Jr., OF101425.
Eggers, Howard C., OF100619.
Egner, George F., OF101426.
Ehrlich, Martin L., OF101915.
Eklund, Kenneth R., OF101427.
Elliott, Charles B., OF100624.
Elliott, Don A., OF102862.
Ellis, Harold J., OF102323.
Ellison, John S., OF100625.
Elson, Peter M., OF101428.
Ely, Douglas C., OF100626.
Ely, Thomas L., OF100627.
Endress, George W., OF100629.
Engelking, Roger F., OF100630.
Erdmans, Thomas J., OF101429.
Eschenwald, Aldolfo, OF101916.
Ethington, William, OF100632.
Evans, Daniel M., Jr., OF101430.
Faddis, Roy J., OF101431.
Falconer, Thomas J., OF102711.
Falise, Ferdinand R., OF100634.
Farnsworth, John A., OF101432.
Faulds, Thomas G., OF101433.
Fechner, Robert F., OF100637.
Felton, William D., OF100639.
Ferry, Bernard A., Jr., OF101434.
Ferry, John V., OF100643.
Filaseta, Michael A., OF100645.
Fillingame, Billy W., OF100646.
Fincher, Betty H., L000644.
Finno, Roy S., OF101435.
Fischer, Paul H., OF102324.
Fischer, Ronald E., OF100648.
Fishback, David M., OF101436.
Fisher, George A., Jr., OF101437.
Fitzgerald, Daniel, OF100650.
Fitzgibbon, Daniel, OF101438.
Flanagan, James A., OF100651.
Flick, Michael B., OF100654.
Flint, Charles K., OF101439.
Flowers, James P., OF102713.
Fly, Francis L., Jr., OF101440.
Fontaine, Roland G., OF109047.
Fortunato, Edward T., OF100660.
Foster, Richard A., OF100670.
Foster, Robert B., OF101441.
Fostervold, Harald, OF100662.
Fowler, James A., OF103110.
Fox, David W., OF100663.
Fracker, Stanley S., OF101442.
Francis, Joseph J., O099842.
Francis, Marion E., OF102328.
Francisco, John R., OF100667.
Fraser, George D., OF100671.
Freeman, Eldon V., OF106112.
Freeman, Waldo D., Jr., OF101444.
Freestone, William, OF100672.
Friedman, Jay A., OF102327.
Friedrich, Robert L., OF100676.
Fritchie, John W., OF100679.
Fulco, Albert P., Jr., OF101445.
Gadarowski, James J., OF100371.
Gaetje, Frank C., OF100684.
Gaither, John B., OF100685.
Galton, Mark C., OF101447.
Gantsoudes, James G., OF101448.
Garber, William B., OF100687.
Gares, William M., Jr., OF100691.
Gasdek, Barry D., OF101921.
Gaston, Hardie M., OF100165.
Gauger, George H., OF100692.
Gawronski, Kenneth, OF100693.
Gaylor, Arnold H., OF101449.
Genther, William E., OF100695.
George, James D., OF100696.
Gesner, Robert W., OF101450.
Gibson, Clyde K., OF101922.
Gibson, William D., OF102330.
Gilbert, Ralph W., Jr., O096856.
Gill, Norman W., Jr., OF101451.
Gillem, Dennis J., OF101452.
Gilson, Dennis, R., OF101453.
Gimbert, Robert A., OF102050.
Giordano, Frank, R., OF100985.
Givens, John W., OF100701.
Gledhill, Carl W., OF101923.
Gleszer, Peter E., OF101454.
Golas, Robert J., OF100707.
Gonzalez, John A., OF100709.
Gooch, Gerald L., OF100710.
Gordon, Charles L., O096587.
Gordon, Donald J., OF101924.
Goriup, Franklin J., OF105681.
Goularte, Richard W., OF101926.
Gragg, Robe, O099549.
Graham, John M., OF101456.
Gralla, Lawrence J., OF102052.
Grammel, Ronald G., OF100716.
Grant, Ernest R., OF102053.
Grasfeder, Lee R., OF101457.
Graves, Patrick H., OF101458.
Graw, Leroy H., OF101459.
Gray, Frederick C., OF101460.
Gray, Richard L., OF101461.
Gray, Roy V., OF100717.
Green, Jerry, OF100718.
Green, Martin L., Jr., OF101462.
Gregson, Robert M., OF101463.
Greiner, Bruce I., OF101464.
Griffin, Sanford W., OF100703.
Griffith, Michael W., OF101465.
Grimes, Everett D., OF101466.
Grippe, Jerome P., OF100720.
Grisham, James W., OF101467.
Grisham, Jerret R., OF102333.
Grote, Dennis A., OF101930.
Grotheer, Allan J., OF100722.
Grubbs, John H., OF101468.
Grunstad, Norman L., OF101469.
Guimond, Paul R., OF100726.
Gulstrand, Rudolph, O098556.
Guthrie, William E., OF101470.
Gventer, Elliott J., OF102054.
Haas, Charles W., II, OF100728.
Haessig, Arthur G., OF100731.
Halberg, Richard C., OF100733.
Hall, Donald A., OF101471.
Hall, Philip L., OF100734.
Hall, Roger P., OF102056.
Hampton, John J., OF101933.
Hanko, Thomas M., OF106640.
Haraszko, Dennis A., OF100757.
Harding, James R., OF101472.
Hardy, Leonard D., Jr., OF101473.
Harnisch, John M., OF101474.
Harris, James S. W., OF102338.
Harris, Philip, R., OF100740.
Harris, Randolph L., OF101475.
Hartle, Anthony E., OF101476.
Hartley, George M., OF101477.
Hartman, Clarence B., OF101478.
Hartman, Thomas E., OF103841.
Harvey, James F., OF101479.
Hatfield, Harold M., OF101480.
Hayashida, Myron K., OF100745.
Haydash, Edward J., OF101481.
Haydon, David E., OF100746.
Hayward, Gregory J., OF101482.
Heard, George L., Jr., OF102067.
Heger, Richard G., OF100750.
Hegg, George H., OF100751.
Hegglund, James W. OF101483.
Heine, Charles E., OF101936.
Heisterman, Robert, OF103120.
Hellmuth, Robert W., O094072.
Henderson, Robert S., OF100753.
Heneman, Helmuth J., OF101484.
Henry, William A., OF101485.
Herdegen, Lawrence, OF101486.
Herold, Thomas J., OF102058.
Herron, Reese P., Jr. OF102340.
Hess, Michel E., OF100754.
Heydt, Richard H., OF101467.
Hickson, Robert D., OF101488.
Higbee, Roger C., OF101489.
Hillard, David F., OF100757.
Hillard, George O., OF101490.
Hilliard, Robert W., OF106138.
Hillyer, Robert A., OF101491.
Hinshaw, Frederick, OF101492.
Hodor, Robe, OF100761.
Hoefer, Rufus S., OF104352.
Holdsworth, David R., OF101493.
Holeman, J. B., Jr., OF101494.
Hollingsworth, Rona, OF100766.
Holmes, Jack J., OF100767.
Holms, Richard L., Jr., OF102059.
Holt, Wayland T., OF100769.
Holway, William K., OF10639.
Hoover, William O., OF101495.
Hornbarger, Daniel, OF101496.
Horstman, Michael L., OF101497.
Hospodar, William G., OF100772.
Hottell, John A. III, OF101498.
Houck, Merle L., OF100773.
Houston, William R., OF102061.
Hovey, Roy, A., OF102724.
Howard, Bruce L., OF101499.
Howard, John D., OF101500.
Huber, Walter D., OF100776.
Hudak, Daniel X., OF101940.
Hudgins, Seth F., Jr., OF101501.
Hudson, Kelly S., OF100777.
Hughes, Justin R., OF101502.
Hughey, Philip J., OF101503.
Hunt, Leon T., OF100778.
Igel, Peter A., OF100782.
Induni, Stephen J., OF101505.
Isaac, Alfred G., OF100785.
Israel, James L., OF102063.
Jackman, William L., OF101506.
Jackson, Charles L., OF101507.
Jackson, Dixie J., OF102343.
Jackson, Richard E., OF100786.
Jackson, Robert L., OF101942.
Jacoby, Thomas G., OF101943.
Jucunski, George G., OF101508.
Janairo, Antonio R., OF101509.
Jappen, John W., OF102062.
Jenkins, Charles A., O099763.
Jerge, Louis A., OF101510.
Jinks, James R., OF101511.
Johnson, Allan W., OF102064.
Johnson, Bobby D., OF102065.
Johnson, Charles L., OF100792.
Johnson, Curtis S., OF101944.
Johnson, Gary R., OF101512.
Johnson, Max W., OF101513.
Johnson, Robert L., OF101514.
Johnson, Robert B., OF101945.
Johnston, J. Ford, Jr., OF102066.
Jones, Allen F., OF101515.
Jones, Buddington B., OF100793.
Jones, Herman H., OF100795.
Jones, Philip A., OF100797.
Jones, Raymond M., OF101516.
Jones, Roy, Jr., OF101517.
Jorgensen, Michael, OF100801.
Jorgensen, Robert B., OF103857.
Judge, Robert M., OF106152.
Juergens, William A., O096876.
Jullian, Robert A., OF100802.
Jump, Robert K., OF102067.
Kacsmar, Francis N., OF101949.
Kamicka, Gerald W., OF105446.
Kane, Mark A., OF100805.
Katsuyoshi, Charles, O096854.
Kaufman, Harold J., OF101518.
Kawamoto, Spencer K., OF100807.
Keenan, Robert L., OF100801
Kelley, Kevin C., OF101519.
Kelley, Randall R., OF100512.
Kelly, Arthur M., Jr., OF101520.
Kelly, James A., Jr., OF100814.
Kelly, Richard J., OF100813.
Kelly, Robert J., OF100816.
Kelton, Earl R., OF101521.
Kempinski, Chester, OF101522.
Kendall, Arnold E., OF100818.
Kendall, Glen R., OF100819.
Kenison, Charles B., OF102069.
Kernahan, Gregory P., OF100823.
Kernen, George G., OF100824.
Kerns, Thomas C., OF101523.
Kerrigan, Robert J., OF100825.
Kesler, Robert W., OF100826.
Kevitz, Eric A., OF100827.
Keyes, Joseph E., OF100828.
Kiely, William L., OF100830.
Kierstead, Arthur E., OF101524.
Kievenaar, Henry A., OF100831.
Kiley, Michael J., OF101525.
Kim, Dennis S. Q., OF101951.
Kindergan, John F., OF100832.

King, Carli, OF102346.
King, Henry, OF100833.
King, Jay P., OF100834.
Kirkpatrick, David, OF101527.
Kite-Powell, Christopher R., OF101528.
Kleb, Geoffrey H., OF101529.
Klein, George C., OF100837.
Klein, Robert J., OF101530.
Kluess, Calvin R., OF101531.
Klunk, Daniel S., OF101532.
Knell, Raymond E., Jr., OF101533.
Knickerbocker, Raymond J., OF105721.
Knight, Richard G., OF101534.
Knowles, Richard W., OF106159.
Knox, Rhona M., N003159.
Knudsen, Jerald G., OF102348.
Knutzen, John A., OF101535.
Kobayashi, Ted M., OF101536.
Koeplin, Wayne M., OF101952.
Kofalt, James A., OF101537.
Kolanowski, Stanley, OF100933.
Kollarik, Donald M., OF102071.
Korponai, David A., OF100842.
Koster, James L., OF101538.
Kotch, Stephen, Jr., OF102072.
Koterwas, Donald J., OF101539.
Kotrc, James C., OF101540.
Kowalchik, Michael, OF101541.
Kramer, William J., OF100843.
Kratz, Paul J., OF106161.
Kraus, Robert G., OF101953.
Kresefski, Leonard, OF101542.
Kruger, Lawrence J., OF100846.
Krutulis, Joseph W., OF102073.
Kubicek, Charles K., OF100848.
Kufeke, Ralph P., OF101543.
Kullman, Thomas M., OF101544.
Kvam, Kenneth C., OF101545.
Labutti, Ronald J., OF100850.
Ladd, Richard B., O096880.
Laier, James E., OF101955.
Lake, Joseph R., OF101547.
Lamar, Lawson L., OF102349.
Lamarine, Paul A., OF100851.
Lamback, Samuel P., OF101548.
Lambert, Franklin P., OF101549.
Lamkin, Fletcher M., OF101550
Lamoureux, Michael, OF100852
Landers, Willard O., OF101956.
Landgraf, William H., OF101551.
Landowski, Robert R., OF010853.
Lang, John W., III, OF101552.
Lange, David L., OF100856.
Lanier, Tharan J., OF100857.
Lanning, James W., OF100858.
Larkin, Andrew M., Jr., OF100859.
Larson, Jeffrey A., OF101553.
Latimer, David M., Jr., OF101554.
Lavoy, Gary R., OF101546.
Lazenby, Gerald A., OF101958.
Leaptrott, William, OF101959.
Lee, Dwaye G., OF101555.
Lee, Frederick O., OF102352.
Legan, Thomas L., OF101556.
Lehman, Nelson S., Jr., O097642.
Lehner, Jon O., OF100867.
Lehowicz, Larry G., OF100868.
Leishner, Stanley L., OF100159.
Lent, Morris J., OF101557.
Leonard, Michael, OF101558.
Levin, Daniel, OF101559.
Lew, James W., OF101560.
Lewis, David P., Jr., OF101961.
Lewis, James M., OF100871.
Leyendecker, John S., OF100872.
Leyerzaph, John W., OF101561.
Libbey, Glidden N., OF102722.
Lincoln, Daniel B., OF100873.
Lind, Ronald W., OF101562.
Lindou, James R., OF101563.
Lindstrom, Lawrence, OF100876.
Little, Robert D., OF103455.
Littnan, Charles L., O099771.
Lohmiller, William E., OF109388.
Lorenz, John F., OF100883.
Losey, Myron D., OF100884.
Lott, Thomas W., OF101963.
Lough, Maurice T., OF101564.
Louis, Geoffrey R., OF101565.
Lovelace, Frederick, OF100886.
Lowe, Richard A., OF100887.
Lowe, Richard V., OF102076.
Loyd, Gerald E., OF100888.
Lozeau, Arthur G., OF101566.
Luckie, William J., OF101567.
Lucyk, Edward J., OF101568.
Lufkins, Daniel F., OF102077.
Lum, Franklin Y. S., OF100889.
Lundquist, Loren G., OF100891.
Lundy, Robert J., Jr., OF100892.
Lyon, Kenneth S., OF105745.
MacDonald, Clifford, OF100894.
MacDonald, Donald, OF106301.
MacDonald, Terence, OF100895.
Macchiaroli, Charles R., OF101570.
Macia, James H., III, OF101571.
Mack, Arthur R., OF101572.
Mackey, Edward E., OF101573.
Maddocks, Carmen F., N3280.
Madsen, Per I., OF101574.
Magnell, Carl O., OF101575.
Magruder, Robert B., OF101576.
Mahar, Harold W., OF101966.
Mahley, Donald A., II, OF102741.
Mahn, Michael J., OF100896.
Major, William J., Jr., OF101577.
Makieve, Mi, OF100897.
Mallberg, Dale D., OF101967.
Mallory, Reginald, OF100898.
Manhart, Michael H., OF100899.
Manske, Tad P., OF100902.
Manton, Terry D., OF101578.
Marinelli, Libero, OF102079.
Marino, Benedict T., OF101579.
Markowski, Eugene P., OF101580.
Martin, Edward G., OF100906.
Martin, Jim I., OF100907.
Martin, Ronald S., OF100150.
Marxen, Edward L., OF101969.
Mashburn, Frank C., OF101581.
Mastriani, Joseph A., OF101582.
Matrosic, Charles A., OF100915.
Matsumoto, Robert K., OF101583.
Maulella, Vincent M., OF100917.
Mayhew, William J., OF101584.
Mazik, Peter D., OF100918.
McAdams, Richard C., OF101585.
McAteer, Peter J., OF101586.
McCaffrey, Barry R., OF101587.
McCanham, Frank A., OF101972.
McCarley, Kenneth, OF101973.
McCloskey, John S., OF100921.
McClure, James R., OF101568.
McClure, John A., OF100922.
McConnell, Jeffrey, OF100924.
McCormack, Harold, OF101589.
McCormack, James R., OF101590.
McCoy, Bob F., OF101591.
McCoy, Frederick W., OF100926.
McCranie, Von S., OF106706.
McCutchan, James B., OF101592.
McFarlin, Robert P., OF100928.
McGrath, Dennis J., OF100929.
McGrath, Francis C., OF100930.
McInnis, William L., OF102080.
McKay, Donald M., Jr., O096914.
McKinley, Bruce A., OF101593.
McKinley, Michael, OF101594.
McKittrick, James, OF101595.
McLaughlin, Stanley, OF101596.
McLemore, Eugene M., OF101597.
McMakin, William H., OF101598.
McNamara, James C., OF105947.
McNeill, David, Jr., OF100935.
McNulty, James F., OF101599.
McTernan, Bernard, O092990.
McWatters, Jack W., OF101600.
Melchiori, Remo, Jr., OF101601.
Mellett, Richard E., OF100940.
Melton, Jackson D., OF100941.
Menzel, Sewall H., OF100944.
Merritt, Robert G., OF101602.
Messinger, Boyd R., OF100945.
Metz, Richard H., OF100946.
Metzger, William H., OF100847.
Meyer, Peter J., OF101605.
Micek, Jerome J., OF100948.
Michela, Robert J., OF101604.
Michlik, Martin J., OF101605.
Miles, Rich, OF101978.
Miller, Brink P., OF101607.
Miller, Charles S., OF101608.
Miller, Jack T., OF101609.
Miller, Leonard D., OF101979.
Miller, Michael D., OF101610.
Miller, Warren F., Jr., OF101611.
Miller, William J., OF101612.
Mingo, Fred, OF100955.
Mirus, John E., OF100956.
Mitchell, Michael A., OF101980.
Moakley, Geoffrey S., OF101614.
Monson, Robert E., OF101615.
Moomaw, Robert C., OF101616.
Moran, Michael J., OF101617.
Morgan, Ted G., OF101618.
Morig, Robert D., OF100967.
Morris, Alton D., OF106192.
Morris, John C., OF102356.
Morse, Jan R., OF100970.
Mortimer, S., OF100971.
Morton, Frederic W., OF100972.
Morton, Hugh P., OF101619.
Moser, John T., OF100973.
Moss, Jesse, Jr., OF101983.
Moss, Robert V., OF101620.
Mozden, James P., OF101621.
Muir, James I., III, OF101622.
Mullen, James F., OF100975.
Muratti, Jose A., OF101623.
Murdy, William F., II, OF101624.
Murimoto, Warren S., OF100960.
Murphy, Alfred W., OF102358.
Murphy, Kevin R., OF101625.
Murray, John F., OF101626.
Murray, Kenneth L., OF100980.
Mutal, Morris F., OF103142.
Myers, William D., OF102084.
Nagy, Edward L., OF100983.
Nahas, Nicholas M., OF101627.
Nanstad, Randy K., OF101628.
Nawrosky, Michael R., OF101629.
Neale, Justice W., OF101630.
Nelsen, James W., OF100986.
Nelson, Larry L., OF100987.
Newman, Ray D., OF106755.
Newman, Thomas K., OF102085.
Nichols, Harwood S., OF101631.
Nielsen, Alan R., OF100989.
Nieman, Dowell T., OF100990.
Niford, Chester R., OF101984.
Nisbet, Gerald D., OF100991.
Nischwitz, John A., OF101632.
Normyle, James W., OF101633.
Nowak, Richard A., OF101635.
Nunn, Jack H., OF101636.
O'Brien, Joseph J., Jr., OF101637.
O'Bryan, James M., OF100998.
O'Connor, Dennis J., OF101638.
Odea, David P., OF100999.
Odom, Ronald G., OF101641.
O'Donnell, James E., OF101639.
O'Donnell, Robert M., OF101000.
Odum, Michael R. R., OF101001.
Oehrlein, Richard V., OF101642.
Oesterling, Richard, OF100172.
O'Neal, Douglas P., OF101640.
O'Neal, Jerry L., OF101002.
O'Neill, Joseph T., OF101985.
Onweller, Arthur E., OF101004.
Orndorff, Christopher M., OF101643.
Orr, Robert H., OF101644.
Osterlin, Howard P., OF101006.
O'Sullivan, Kevin E., OF101008.
Otjen, John P., OF101645.
Overton, Stephen M., OF101646.
Pachler, Francis T., OF101647.
Page, Gary O., OF101648.
Pagliaro, Salvatore, O095653.
Paconis, William G., OF101010.
Palma, Gerard V., OF101650.
Palmer, Allyn J., OF101651.
Palumbo, Guy B., OF101011.
Parker, Arthur E., OF101652.
Parrott, Preston A., OF102361.
Paton, Thomas D., OF101014.
Patterson, Alexander, OF100460.
Pauley, Richard E., O097724.
Payne, David P., OF103144.
Payne, William B., OF101653.
Peake, Charles A., OF101016.
Pedersen, James H., OF101654.
Pedersen, William N., OF101019.
Pells, Russell K., OF101655.

Pembrook, Stephen B., OF101656.
Perkins, Jacob H., O092792.
Perrill, Robert D., OF101022.
Perryman, Steven, OF101657.
Peters, Roosevelt, OF102363.
Petersen, Bradley H., OF101986.
Peterson, Jay R., OF101024.
Pezzillo, Frank M., OF101987.
Pfeiff, William P., OF101026.
Pheeney, Walter T., OF101027.
Pickett, George E., OF101028.
Piekarski, Richard, OF101658.
Pietsch, Kent L., OF101659.
Pike, Nolan A., III, OF101031.
Pittman, James T., OF101660.
Plaut, Peter K., OF101035.
Poe, Gerald D., OF101036.
Pokras, Richard M., OF106357.
Polliard, John C., OF101037.
Polonitza, Edmund H., OF101039.
Ponko, Marshall D., OF104516.
Ponzoli, Gary P., OF101661.
Pope, Frederick M., OF101662.
Popp, James L., OF101663.
Popp, Ronald S., OF102090.
Powers, James C., OF101664.
Powers, James W., OF101665.
Prather, Dan E., OF105801.
Prawdzik, David A., OF101990.
Price, John S., OF101666.
Priest, James H., OF102091.
Prothero, Michael B., OF101667.
Puckett, John D., OF101050.
Pulsts, Peteris, OF101053.
Quann, Brendan T., OF101668.
Quidgley, Ernesto, OF101993.
Quist, Frederick F., OF101669.
Rafanelli, Gene H., OF101057.
Raley, Thomas S., O096909.
Rasor, Sam J., Jr., OF102092.
Rath, Frank H., Jr., OF101995.
Rayman, John R., OF101058.
Redmond, James P., OF101062.
Reed, Podge M., Jr., OF101670.
Reese, Thomas R., OF101671.
Reeves, Robert L., OF101672.
Reh, Donald C., OF101673.
Reich, Robert M., OF101674.
Reilly, Philip H., OF101066.
Reilly, Terry H., OF102093.
Reineck, Theodore C., OF101067.
Renfro, Don L., OF101675.
Rennie, Paul T., OF101676.
Reth, Thomas B., OF101068.
Revie, Charles D., OF101677.
Reynolds, Harvey J., OF106213.
Reynolds, William J., OF101678.
Rezek, Ronald E., OF101679.
Rhoades, Gordon T., OF101680.
Richard, Michael W., OF101681.
Richards, John L., OF101682.
Richards, Robert E., OF101997.
Richardson, Lloyd M., OF102365.
Rintamaki, John M., OF101998.
Riscavage, George A., OF101074.
Rivera, Alfredo, OF101999.
Robb, Nathaniel H., OF102001.
Robbins, John E., OF102095.
Roberts, Norman L., OF101683.
Roberts, Thomas C., OF101684.
Roberts, Thurman M., OF101685.
Robertson, William, OF101686.
Robinson, Karl W., OF101687.
Robinson, Robert R., OF101079.
Robinson, Winston T., OF101080.
Roby, Edward F., OF101688.
Roemer, Harold E., Jr., OF101083.
Roesler, David E., OF101689.
Rogers, Arthur N., OF101084.
Roller, Barry J., OF101690.
Roller, John F., Jr., OF101691.
Romero, Robert T., OF102003.
Rose, Joseph S., Jr., OF102096.
Rosson, Allen K., OF103488.
Rowland, Michael Y., OF101091.
Rubel, Ronald G., OF102367.
Rucker, James S., OF105336.
Rundquist, James W., OF101094.
Rusnak, Terrence J., OF101692.
Russell, W. Arthur, OF101693.
Russo, Alan M., OF101694.
Ryan, James P., OF101695.
Ryan, Martin F., OF101696.
Ryan, Michael L., OF101096.
Sadler, Larry D., OF101098.
Salgado, Eduardo A., OF102004.
Sam, John R. E., OF101697.
Sanders, Joe M., Jr., O099055.
Sanderson, Michael, OF101698.
Sandman, Robert B., OF101699.
Sanford, Teddy H., Jr., OF101100.
Sarantakes, John E., OF101989.
Sargent, Martin W., OF101101.
Schantz, Vincent L., OF101106.
Schaufelberger, John E., OF102098.
Schillo, Edward C., OF101700.
Schlenker, Patrick, OF101109.
Schmeelk, Peter F., OF101701.
Schmidt, Richard A., OF105821.
Schoeller, Herbert, OF101112.
Schoening, Klaus D., OF102006.
Schoonover, James F., OF101702.
Schou, Dirck T., OF101703.
Schroeder, James M., OF104330.
Schwartz, Ronald J., OF101113.
Schwartz, Thomas M., OF101114.
Scotnicki, John P., OF101704.
Scott, Edward A., OF103148.
Scott, Richard P., Jr., OF101705.
Scully, John J., OF102370.
Seale, James E., OF102371.
Seeber, Joseph G., OF101706.
Seelig, Lou, OF101115.
Seely, William H., OF101707.
Seiler, Dennis L., OF101708.
Sells, Harold E., OF102007.
Serio, Robert F., OF101709.
Setikas, Algimantas, OF102008.
Shannon, Kenneth M., OF101121.
Sharpe, Gerald W., OF106226.
Sharratt, Thomas B., OF101122.
Shaughnessey, Peter, OF101710.
Sheak, Jack C., OF101123.
Sherman, Roger G., OF102372.
Shive, Donald W., Jr., OF101711.
Shoemaker, Philip H., OF101712.
Shoemaker, Raymond, OF101713.
Shore, Christian M., OF101714.
Showalter, James V., OF103733.
Shrader, Charles R., OF102270.
Shurtleff, Charles, OF102099.
Simmons, Bobby J., OF103150.
Simmons, Douglas M., OF101127.
Simonis, Joseph W., OF101715.
Sims, Eddie R., OF101716.
Simus, John O., OF101128.
Sinclair, Robert B., OF101717.
Skaggs, Gary C., OF103151.
Skerker, Alan L., OF102010.
Skrzypek, George J., O096916.
Slabaugh, Bryce L., OF101129.
Slama, Richard A., OF101130.
Sleet, Phillip M., Jr., OF101718.
Slominski, Michael, O096917.
Smay, Donald R., OF101132.
Smith, Charlie W., OF101134.
Smith, David H., OF102012.
Smith, David M., OF101719.
Smith, David N., OF102101.
Smith, Douglas M., OF102102.
Smith, Edward C., OF106232.
Smith, George F., OF101720.
Smith, Harold W., OF101721.
Smith, Jimmy T., O096918.
Smith, Norman S., Jr., OF101722.
Smith, Robert L., OF106233.
Smith, Walton N., OF101137.
Smith, Wiley R., OF101723.
Smothers, Curtis R., OF102087.
Snow, Joseph T., OF101139.
Solomon, Steven P., OF101724.
Sommerkamp, Robert, OF101142.
Sorensen, Kenneth C., OF101143.
Sornson, Roger L., OF101725.
Spannaus, Owen L., OF101726.
Spear, Albert C., OF102103.
Speedy, John C., OF101727.
Spells, John D., OF101144.
Speranza, Nicholas, OF101145.
Spinosa, Ray D., OF101728.
Sprague, Kenneth E., OF101729.
Staas, Donald F., OF102014.
Stack, John J., OF101147.
Stair, Gary I., OF102015.
Spanko, John R., OF101730.
Staples, Arthur W., OF101151.
Stapleton, James B., OF101731.
Starnes, John L., OF101153.
Starzynski, James R., OF101154.
Steiner, Joseph C., OF102375.
Stepek, David F., OF101732.
Stephenson, Francis, OF101733.
Sternberg, Ben, Jr., OF101734.
Stewart, William T., OF101163.
Stickler, Tom E., OF101164.
Stisitis, Robert P., OF101165.
Stocker, Ralph F., OF101167.
Stockmoe, Lyle D., OF106027.
Stone, Edmund C., III, OF101736.
Stone, Haskel P., Jr., OF101168.
Straub, William J., OF101737.
Stumpf, James C., OF102105.
Styer, Norman W., Jr., OF102017.
Sullivan, Eugene R., OF101738.
Sullivan, Timothy J., OF101175.
Swanson, Roland I., OF101179.
Sylvester, Ernest, OF106241.
Szekely, Akos D., OF101739.
Tanner, William P., OF101740.
Tapscott, James W., OF102377.
Tate, John H., II, OF101741.
Taylor, Erle A., Jr., OF102107.
Taylor, Frederick C., OF101742.
Tedesco, Vincent J., OF101185.
Tellis, Andrew J., OF101186.
Temple, Albert W., Jr., OF101743.
Terry, John F., OF102109.
Tetu, Robert G., Jr., OF101744.
Textor, William M., OF101189.
Thackston, Bruce L., OF101190.
Therrell, Brock M., OF101192.
Thie, Harry J., OF101193.
Thies, Bob L., OF101194.
Thomas, Charles L., O096518.
Thomas, John S., OF102110.
Thomas, Thomas N., OF101746.
Thompson, Fred B., OF105840.
Thompson, Robert A., OF102111.
Tingle, Gordon W., OF101200.
Tivol, Edwin A., OF101201.
Togashi, Theodore T., OF101748.
Tomlan, Jolene K., M010206.
Toney, Elijah, OF101202.
Torres, Walter, Jr., OF101204.
Townsend, Elester C., OF101205.
Tratensek, Milivoj, OF101749.
Traylor, John A., OF101750.
Treado, Alvin D., OF101751.
Treese, Edwin J., OF102022.
Treinen, Michael D., OF102378.
Treweek, Gordon P., OF101752.
Trifiletti, Anthony, OF101753.
Trussell, James B., OF105853.
Tschanz, Arnold T., OF101209.
Tucker, Edwin H., OF100200.
Tucker, Jeffrey, OF102023.
Turner, Thomas M., OF102380.
Turner, William E., OF101212.
Tuttle, Herbert M., OF101213.
Twining, David T., OF102024.
Ullmann, Donald F., OF101755.
Underwood, Alan K., OF101214.
Upchurch, Robert H., OF102381.
Usher, David J., OF102112.
Utley, Melvin A., OF102382.
Vaillancourt, Kenneth, OF102113.
Van Horn, John B., OF101218.
Van Matre, Donald G., OF101219.
Van Stone, Donald L., OF101220.
Vaughan, Herbert G., OF101756.
Velkey, Robert J., OF101221.
Venckus, Edward W., OF102383.
Vennard, Gerald A., OF101222.
Verdel, Thomas H., OF102026.
Verdier, Douglas L., OF101223.
Vice, John B. W., OF101225.
Vigue, Ronald L., OF101226.
Villiere, George J., OF101227.
Vineyard, William R., OF101757.
Von Freymann, Ronald, OF101758.
Vonderahe, Thomas A., OF100221.
Vondruska, George B., OF101759.
Vooys, Daniel F., OF102115.

Wade, David C. III, OF101760.
Wagner, Frank J., Jr., OF101229.
Wagner, Terry L., OF102385.
Wahl, William E., OF101230.
Wakefield, William, OF105574.
Walbeck, Daryl G., OF101231.
Walden, Robert D., OF102027.
Waldrop, Kenneth M., OF101761.
Walk, Gary J., OF101762.
Walker, Charles L., OF101232.
Walker, Lawrence A., OF102386.
Walker, Lyman J., II, OF106867.
Walker, Patrick E., OF101234.
Walker, Thomas M., OF101235.
Wallace, Thomas L., OF105923.
Walters, Robert J., OF101763.
Ward, Dennis, OF102119.
Ward, Emmett J., OF101236.
Ward, John H., OF101764.
Warner, Jeffrey K., OF101765.
Warner, Lance C., OF102782.
Wass, De Czege Huba, OF101766.
Watson, Gordon E., OF101238.
Watts, Olen C., OF101239.
Weathers, Robert L., OF101767.
Webb, Alfred N., Jr., OF101768.
Weber, John P., OF101769.
Weeden, Donald C., OF101243.
Weichel, Frederick, OF101244.
Weisel, Stephen L., OF101770.
Weiss, Arthur D., OF101771.
Weiss, Robert M., OF102389.
Wells, Geoffrey F., OF101246.
Wells, George W., Jr., OF102786.
Welte, Ronald F., OF106883.
Werner, Gerald C., OF101772.
West, Arthur L., III, OF101773.
Westfall, Grover D., OF104052.
Wettack, John T., III, OF101248.
Wetzel, David C., OF101249.
Wetzel, Lawrence R., OF101250.
Wheeler, Wayne R., OF101774.
White, David A., Jr., OF101775.
White, Howard W., Jr., OF102030.
Whitehead, Charlie, O095288.
Whitehorne, Joseph, OF101254.
Whitney, Roger B., OF101257.
Whitten, Wilburn L., OF101258.
Wickens, Donaldson, OF101259.
Wickman, Lance B., OF102122.
Wikan, Michael E., OF101776.
Wilcox, Charles K., OF101777.
Wilderman, Glenn R., OF101778.
Williams, Albert C., OF101779.
Williams, Arthur, OF102790.
Williams, Gerald P., OF104164.
Williams, William R., OF102792.
Williamson, Ronald, OF101780.
Willis, Edward J., Jr., OF102031.
Wilson, Gary R., OF100228.
Wilson, Howard W., OF101781.
Wilson, James L., OF101270.
Wilson, Julian A., Jr., OF102032.
Wilson, Robert D., Jr., OF101271.
Winiecki, Stephen D., OF101273.
Winkler, John K., Jr., OF101782.
Winslow, Wendelin W., OF101275.
Winter, Carl J., Jr., OF101783.
Winters, David R., OF101784.
Winton, Harold R., OF101785.
Wisdom, Jesse A., OF101276.
Wiser, James W., OF101277.
Wissinger, Thomas R., OF102033.
Womack, Robert L., OF101280.
Womble, Carl C., Jr., OF102124.
Wong, Frederick G., OF102392.
Wood, Marion D., Jr., OF101281.
Wood, Norman M., Jr., OF101282.
Wood, William R., Jr., OF101284.
Woodbury, Kenneth M., OF101285.
Woodle, Clyde E., Jr., OF101786.
Woods, Patricia M., N3181.
Wooley, Bo, OF102125.
Woolsey, George T., OF101787.
Worcester, Theodore, OF100368.
Wright, Michael L., OF102126.
Wright, Robert E., OF101788.
Wright, Thomas L., OF101789.
Wrona, Richard M., OF102393.
Wynn, Robert E., OF101790.
Yamada, Earl M., OF101289.
Yankoupe, Roger F., OF101791.
Young, John F., OF105887.
Young, Philip W., OF101290.
Young, Robert F., Jr., OF101792.
Yourtee, Leon R., III, OF101793.
Zachels, David W., OF101293.
Zengerle, Joseph C., OF101794.
Ziegler, William A., OF101795.
Zimmerman, Henry H., OF101796.
Zitz, John E., OF101298.
Zolkiwsky, Donald J., OF101299.
Zschoche, Robert C., OF102127.
Zugmier, George A., OF101300.
Zweig, Richard N., OF101301.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

H.R. 6418, the Partnership for Health Amendments, Will Strengthen Health Care in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, last year, when the Comprehensive Health Planning and Public Health Services Amendments of 1967 were enacted, I felt that we had made a major move toward better health for all the people in this Nation. When the President recommended the extension of the Partnership for Health program, I supported his position enthusiastically. Now I want to emphasize to my colleagues in the House my conviction that we have taken a giant step when we passed H.R. 6418 on Sept. 20.

There are many innovations in this legislation. It provides for States and communities to use Federal grants in programs that they know to be important to the health of their people. Before, they could receive Federal money only for certain specified programs that perhaps were not the most urgent to meet their needs. It allows programs to be redesigned around the total health needs of people, where before they were designed around diseases or categories of need. It provides for the establishment and support of comprehensive planning for health, where before health planning was done piecemeal without any way of avoiding duplication or overlap of programs. And in the planning process, it gives a major voice to the consumers of health service, all too often unheard in the past.

As an example of what the President means by creative federalism, this legis- in our country and that the States and local programs, it recognizes the variety in our country and that the States and communities have and can fulfill the responsibility for fully assessing their own health situations and deciding how best to go about improving them.

This is a very good piece of legislation, and I am grateful that we acted upon it with wisdom.

Social Security: 30th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1967

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday, September 29, the Gary, Ind., Social Security Office celebrated the 30th anniversary of its opening on September 30, 1937.

Howard Jennings, Director of the Social Security Administration at Gary, is to be commended for his efficient work in successfully administering the operations of one of the largest social security branch offices in the Middle West.

Orland C. Zajicek, assistant regional representative, in the Chicago Social Security Office, was present for the occasion along with other officials, businessmen, and citizens of the Calumet region.

In 1937, when this great program of the Federal Government was initiated, the industrial Calumet region of Indiana was just recovering from the greatest depression in our Nation's history. Steel mills, factories, and businesses of all kinds that survived that depression were just beginning to successfully operate again. Thousands of our citizens were gradually being reemployed and the dark depression days of the early 1930's were becoming a memory. The enactment of the nationwide social security program under Franklin D. Roosevelt and a Democratic Congress in the middle 1930's was the greatest sparkplug to start our Nation back on the road to the economy enjoyed in later years.

Excerpts from my remarks made on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the opening of the Gary Social Security Office in 1937 follow:

In 1937 when the Gary office opened, it serviced both Lake and Porter Counties and there was but a small staff on hand to carry on the work for the people of this area. At that time the duties principally consisted of issuing account number cards to workers in commerce and industry, the only ones then covered by Social Security. Workers then could look forward to monthly benefits for themselves when they reached the age of 65. Two years later, in 1939, the law was expanded to provide benefits for dependents and survivors. Later, Social Security coverage over the years has been extended to farm workers, domestic workers and self-employed people. Over 90% of our population now has Social Security protection.

Originally, the program was intended for the benefit of older people, but now it includes benefits for young dependents of disabled or deceased workers and disability benefits for younger workers. At the present time, Lake, Porter and Newton County area receive monthly Social Security checks totalling over 55 million dollars a year.

Starting last year, Congress added the Medicare Program to our cash benefit program, and in 1966, over 92% of our Senior