national cemetery system; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.J. Res. 910. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H. Con. Res. 542. Concurrent resolution extending congratulations to the Parliament of Finland on the 50th anniversary of Finland's independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. Con. Res. 543. Concurrent resolution extending congratulations to the Parliament of Finland on the 50th anniversary of Finland's independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. Con. Res. 544. Concurrent resolution extending congratulations to the Parliament of Finland on the 50th anniversary of Finland's independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H. Con. Res. 545. Concurrent resolution extending congratulations to the Parliament of Finland on the 50th anniversary of Finland's independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H. Con. Res. 546. Concurrent resolution extending congratulations to the Parliament of Finland on the 50th anniversary of Finland's independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CULVER:

H. Con. Res. 547. Concurrent resolution extending congratulations to the Parliament of Finland on the 50th anniversary of Finland's independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAMILTON:

H. Con. Res. 548. Concurrent resolution extending congratulations to the Parliament of Finland on the 50th anniversary of Finland's independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. Con. Res. 549. Concurrent resolution extending congratulations to the Parliament of Finland on the 50th anniversary of Finland's independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H. Con. Res. 550. Concurrent resolution extending congratulations to the Parliament of Finland on the 50th anniversary of Finland's independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. Con. Res. 551. Concurrent resolution extending congratulations to the Parliament of Finland on the 50th anniversary of Finland's independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TAFT:

H. Con. Res. 552. Concurrent resolution extending congratulations to the Parliament of Finland on the 50th anniversary of Finland's independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEITH:

H. Con. Res. 553. Concurrent resolution extending congratulations to the Parliament of Finland on the 50th anniversary of Finland's independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WYATT:

H. Con. Res. 554. Concurrent resolution extending congratulations to the Parliament of Finland on the 50th anniversary of Finland's independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H. Con. Res. 555. Concurrent resolution providing that it is the sense of the Congress that the President should submit a resolution to the United Nations for final and binding improvement of peace in Southeast Asia in accordance with the appropriate article of the United Nations Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TENZER (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. COHELAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. LEGGETT, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MULTER, Mr. ROYBAL, and Mr. SCHEUER):

H. Con. Res. 556. Concurrent resolution providing that it is the sense of the Congress that the President should submit a resolution to the United Nations for final and binding improvement of peace in Southeast Asia in accordance with the appropriate article of the United Nations Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Con. Res. 557. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of the Constitution of the United States as amended to February 10, 1967, together with the Declaration of Independence; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H. Con. Res. 558. Concurrent resolution concerning the development of the ocean floor through international cooperation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 13694. A bill for the relief of Gioacchino Plaia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 13695. A bill for the relief of Anna Maria Arcangeletti and daughter, Antonella Arcangeletti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 13696. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Cipolla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13697. A bill for the relief of Antonio Sammartino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 13698. A bill for the relief of Pasqua Spedicati; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KYROS:

H.R. 13699. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chandra Prabha Lal and her husband, Daya N. Lal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 13700. A bill for the relief of Fernando Antonio Porqueddu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 13701. A bill for the relief of Silvestre de Brito Caetano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

190. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the city of Thousand Oaks, Calif., relative to tax sharing to provide additional revenues to local government, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 25, 1967

The Senate met at 12 noon, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

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

God of all mercy, at this altar of Thy sustaining grace, Thou art the center and soul of every sphere, yet to each loving heart how near; nearer than the hands and feet that serve us, nearer than the problems that front us, nearer even than the comrades who walk beside us.

In and through the change and confusion of these bewildering times, we are made confident by Thy divine promise, "as thy day, so shall thy strength be." Thou knowest that our needs are many, but our greatest need is of Thee. Through the lips that speak in this forum of freedom, above all differences of judgment, may there be heard by a listening world the solemn summons to men of good will of all races to a new commonwealth in which power shall be held as a sacred trust dedicated to the common good.

In the dear Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, October 24, 1967, be dispensed with.

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

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS—ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

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

Under the order entered yesterday, the Senator from Montana is recognized.

VIETNAM RESOLUTION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and 37 other Senators, I submit a sense-of-the-Senate resolution seeking a U.S. initiative to assure United Nations Security Council consideration of the Vietnam conflict. I ask that the resolution be read, but not the names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 180), as follows:

S. RES. 180

Whereas the question of the Vietnamese conflict is a matter of which the Security Council of the United Nations is seized by action previously taken by the Council in connection with a letter of the Permanent Representative of the United States dated January 31, 1966, submitting a resolution seeking a settlement of the hostilities, and

Whereas more than 100 members of the United Nations through their Chiefs of State or Foreign Ministers or Permanent Representatives have expressed their deep concern with the continued hostilities and their de-

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

sire for a peaceful and honorable settlement of the Vietnamese conflict: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the President of the United States consider taking the appropriate initiative through his representative at the United Nations to assure that the United States resolution of January 31, 1966, or any other resolution of equivalent purpose be brought before the Security Council for consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at an appropriate place after my remarks certain memorandums which I have received, at my request, from the Library of Congress; a copy of a letter which I addressed to all Senators on the procedural questions having to do with the issue of Vietnam and the Security Council, dated October 9; a press release dated October 7; and an article published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch for Sunday, October 15, headlined "U.S. Bombing Halt Suggested Since September 21 By 50 in U.N."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the documents will be printed in the RECORD, as requested.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this is U.N. Week, and the General Assembly is talking a great deal about Vietnam while the Security Council is endeavoring to do something about the situation in the Middle East.

In this U.N. Week, celebrating the anniversary of the world's peacekeeping agency, the largest North Vietnamese airfield at Phuc Yen has been bombed. The military targets of any consequence left untouched in North Vietnam can now be counted on the fingers of two hands, possibly one. Just as the military targets are decreasing in number, so are the alternatives and options which could lead the way to negotiations and a possible honorable settlement of the conflict. There have been countless proposals advanced, many of which I have endorsed: proposals such as that of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] to confine the bombing to the 17th parallel and the so-called Ho Chi Minh trail in that region; General de Gaulle's proposal for a guaranteed neutralization of all of Southeast Asia; a return to the Geneva accords of 1954; the building of a barrier across the 17th parallel, and many others.

I am, today, submitting a Senate resolution which would seek to bring the question of Vietnam before the U.N. Security Council, for discussion and debate, and a possible recommendation. This proposal is not original with me, by any means. The initiator of Senate consideration of a U.N. approach is the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. He has been talking about it for several years and, as a matter of fact, for the past several months he has pressed a draft resolution which seeks to have the United Nations dispose of the matter. The draft resolution is now before the Foreign Relations Committee.

It is my view that while the United Nations Security Council has a significant role to play, it may not be able to resolve this issue, if for no other reason than that several of those critically involved in Vietnam are not members of the U.N. I do know, however, that a formal discussion of this issue can be brought about by the Security Council and that all those directly and indirectly concerned in the war, whether members or not, can be invited to appear before the Council. In that way, perhaps, it may be possible to begin to mark a path which could lead to an honorable settlement.

Initiation, not resolution, is the key word as far as the Security Council is concerned.

Some will say, as they invariably have since the President first directed an exploration of the matter many months ago, that this is not the time to propose a resolution of this sort. All I can say is that with our casualties in excess of 100,000 and increasing, and with no end in sight in the struggle in which we are engaged, any time is a good time, and now, most especially, during this anniversary week, when the very rationale of the U.N. is clouded by the conflict in Vietnam.

If the Ambassadors of the United States and the U.S.S.R. at the United Nations can introduce and push resolutions on the Middle East, what reason can there be for evading the question of Vietnam? Can it be said that Vietnam is not a threat to the peace of the world? Can it be said that Vietnam is not the foremost question of the hour insofar as this country and its people are concerned? Certainly, the least that can be expected is that the Ambassador of the United States at the United Nations shall undertake an initiative based on the resolution on Vietnam which he presented in January 1966 at the direct request of the President of the United States and that the roll be called on the members of the Council on the question of taking up this or some equivalent resolution.

Mr. President, it is high time that we find out and that the world finds out where the members of the Security Council stand on this question. What is the Security Council waiting for? What are we waiting for? The only way to find out is for a resolution to be brought to a vote, if necessary, and that the nations stand up and be counted. If there is to be an end of the conflict, there must be a beginning in the use of the machinery for peace. I think that the nations of the U.N. Security Council must face up to this matter at once.

Over 50 nations have discussed the bombing of North Vietnam and the great majority have advocated that there be a cessation. Over 100 nations have expressed their concern with the situation in Vietnam in one way or another in the U.N. General Assembly.

Words mean little or nothing if they are not followed by acts; and, in my opinion and in the opinion of those who have joined in sponsoring the resolution which has just been introduced, it is time for the U.N. to face up to its responsibility on the question of Vietnam. It is time for the member states of the Security Council to carry out the responsibilities which are imposed on them by the solemn treaty commitments of article I of the charter.

I repeat, Mr. President, just as the military targets of significance in North Vietnam are becoming fewer, so, too, are the options for peace becoming more difficult to find.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to support the position of the distinguished Senator from Montana, the majority leader, and I would like to add emphasis to what he has said by saying that the United States should insist that the United Nations face the issue of bringing the Vietnam war to an honorable conclusion.

It may be, as Secretary Rusk stated during his recent press conference, that Hanoi, Peiping, and Moscow are opposed to such a move.

I assume that he particularly refers to Russia which has already made it clear that it would attempt to block such a move in the Security Council.

Have we not kowtowed to Moscow long enough?

If Russia is opposed to ending the war, is it not time to let the world know it?

If any other members of the Security Council are opposed to ending the war, let them also admit it to the world.

The greater part of our losses in planes and flyers in Asia is caused by Russian weapons and presumably Russian ground personnel.

Is that any reason why we should be considerate of their feelings in the United Nations?

Secretary Rusk stated at his recent press conference that:

> The general attitude in the U.N. seems to be that since Hanoi and Peiping and Moscow are saying that this is not appropriate for the United Nations, that an effort by the United Nations to resolve this problem might get in the way of the use of other machinery, such as the Geneva machinery or quiet, bilateral, diplomatic exploration.

What "quiet, bilateral, diplomatic exploration" does he refer to?

I hope the Secretary is not naive enough to think that Russia would take our part in a war with China?

Or, as he implied, does he worry that any move on our part to get United Nations action would be jeopardizing the reconvening of the Geneva Conference?

If this is the reason he should recall that the Russians blocked all efforts to end the war by reconvening the Geneva Conference some time ago.

And what of the United Nations itself?

Has this organization become so wishy-washy and impotent that it no longer dares to strive for world peace for fear of offending "Hanoi and Peiping and Moscow"?

If this is the case, I see no reason for giving the U.N. our support except on the same pro rata basis as other members.

It seems that we may have been overly generous in the past.

As of now I see three parties responsible for blocking any effort to resolve the Vietnam situation through the United Nations:

First. The U.S. State Department which obviously does not intend to seek

an end to the war through the most logical agency for peace—the United Nations.

Second. The United Nations itself which cannot awaken its conscience enough to even consider the matter on its own initiative; and

Third. Russia—apparently happy that the United States is bogged down in a costly and deadly war 10,000 miles from home and also on the verge of a possible no-win war with China.

Again, I say the United States should force this situation into the open without delay.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I want to commend the distinguished Senator from Vermont and say to him, if I read his remarks correctly, that in the vernacular it is about time for the United Nations to "fish or cut bait."

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the distinguished majority leader upon the introduction of the resolution. I wish to endorse and support the resolution.

Surely this world organization of which we are a part has as its first obligation, its first goal, the maintenance of peaceful relations between nations. This is a function which it should perform and which we should beseech it to perform.

Therefore, I wish to fully support the resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the distinguished Senator.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, during the last month, the administration has stated a new policy to support our presence in Vietnam which, could extend the fighting in Vietnam in time and scope. The policy will, if adhered to, establish a new and extended role for the United States in Asia.

During the last month our bombing has increased, our forces have increased and ground fighting has been deadly. The attacks by the North Vietnamese and their use of heavier weapons, supplied by Russia and China have increased.

The issue of Vietnam steadily becomes deeper involved in party politics in the United States.

It is reassuring that in this atmosphere the majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] again speaks to the Senate, to the administration, and the country with the calm voice of reason asking that the issue of Vietnam be submitted to the United Nations.

It is no excuse for the Security Council or the General Assembly of the United Nations to argue that jurisdiction should not be assumed either because of a possible veto, or of possible inability to secure the approval of recommendations by the parties. If there has been any dispute, breach of the international peace, or war since the founding of the United Nations which ought to be submitted to it and upon which it should assume its responsiblity, it is the issue of Vietnam.

As I have said many times, I believe the United States has been more faithful in its obligations to the United Nations than perhaps any other nation. The submission of the issue by the United States to the U.N. would demonstrate our stand against aggression, our support of a settlement of disputes by international and peaceful means and a true leadership in the world.

I hope very much that this advice, this plea of the distinguished Senator from Montana, this voice of reason in the climate and enviroment which has grown about this war, will be heard by the administration.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall yield to the Senator from Wisconsin; but first I wish to say that the President has indicated personally on four occasions in the White House his intense personal interest in the United Nations giving consideration to the Vietnamese situation.

I hope that on the basis of this resolution, which imposes no restraints whatever on the President, this will be helpful to him.

In my opinion, we are now at a fork in the road. We have possibly five major military targets of significance which have not as yet been bombed: The Gia Lam Air Force Base 3 miles from Hanoi, which is both a military and commercial field, Haiphong, and Hanoi, and perhaps another installation or two. If and when all of those places are bombed, what are those who have said that bombing North Vietnam is the answer, and who say it is the way to a quick, easy, and decisive victory, going to say?

What will they say if the result which they have stated would be accomplished by bombing is not brought about?

I think at this fork in the road it would be better to get away from the idea of bombing within 24 seconds of China and recognize, frankly, that there are few military targets left. They should ask themselves, those who have urged this course, what the next step will be if and when these remaining targets are bombed.

There is another fork in the road which is being urged here today. It might just possibly lead to an honorable conclusion.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am very proud and happy to have been one of the cosponsors of the resolution of the distinguished majority leader.

I believe that the logic of his argument that the Vietnam dispute should go to the United Nations is unassailable. In the event that there should be a veto by the Soviet Union, we could press on to the General Assembly. We have done this before and we could do it again.

I would like to say to the distinguished Senator from Montana, and I am sure he would agree on the basis of what he said about the President's position, that this does not contradict or oppose the position that President Johnson has taken.

This would be perfectly logical and consistent with the position the President has expressed many times, that he wants to negotiate and that he wants to use the United Nations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I say once more, I am very happy that the majority leader, with his prestige and his following in the country, as well as in the Senate, has taken this forthright step.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, if ever there was a situation which constituted a threat to peace as envisaged by all of us at San Francisco more than 20 years ago, it is certainly the Vietnam situation. The fact that the participants are not members of the United Nations is immaterial. The United Nations can take cognizance of this problem, if it wishes, and take appropriate action, flushing out those governments which criticize us publicly while sometimes urging us privately on a different course.

This is a question of almost fish or cut bait; whether the United Nations wants to continue to sit on its hands, or take a positive approach to the problem.

Finally, it would seem to me, if we do send this problem up to the United Nations and are successful in its being seized by the United Nations, we should say in advance that we will abide by the vote of the United Nations, that we will abide by the collective verdict and collective judgment of the United Nations no matter what that verdict will be or how distasteful to us.

Part of the process of going to the United Nations requires the acceptance of its arbitration and its wishes in this matter.

I am very proud and very glad, indeed, to be one of the many Senators who are cosponsoring the resolution of the distinguished senior Senator from Montana.

If ever there was a Senator who knows more about the subject of Vietnam, and has added to his knowledge over a longer period of years, it is the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to commend the able majority leader for the incisive and cogent remarks he has just made.

I congratulate him on his previous statements on this same subject, and most of all I congratulate and salute him for the action he has taken today in this regard.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of the resolution, and I want to express my gratitude to the majority leader for extending the invitation to me to join as a cosponsor.

I hope that the Senate will act promptly to approve the resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from West Virginia for his comments.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I am very pleased, indeed, to be among those

cosponsoring the resolution of the Senator from Montana.

It seems to me that the greatest threat to world peace since World War II and the Korean struggle should avail itself of the very best of the limited machinery we have to maintain and secure that world peace. There are those who say—as the majority leader has noted—that this is not the right time, that this is a political expedient in the international field to force some of those nations who are indifferent to take a position at this time.

Well, if this is not the time, there never will be such a time.

I think it does no good to our cause and to the goals we seek, if we do not give the United Nations every opportunity and every encouragement to utilize its very best offices to seek a peaceful solution of this serious problem, as I have stated, the greatest threat to peace since World War II and Korea.

I commend the majority leader. I hope his efforts will be fruitful. If not, they are still serving a very great cause. I salute him for introducing the resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the distinguished Senator from Kansas. I agree wholeheartedly with what he says, except as it applies to me personally.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I am very happy to be a cosponsor of the resolution of the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the majority leader.

He has long been a student and good authority of foreign matters, particularly those relating to the Asiatic area.

I usually find myself in complete accord with his views. I am, in this instance.

It seems to me that if the United Nations is to serve the world and justify its existence, it should at least attempt to try and resolve the Vietnam situation.

The United Nations may be—and probably is—the only alternative we will have, except to continue the battle as it is presently being waged.

The solution, so far as military operations are concerned, are not too promising. At least, we are not making much progress.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, the dangers involved in today's world demand that every possible avenue be explored which will lead to peace, not only in Vietnam but everywhere in the world as well.

We know that various possible roads leading toward a solution of the Vietnam conflict have been blocked. There seems little hope of removing many of the obstacles. Yet we must proceed on the basis that peace will come someday and can be hastened by an active and imaginative search on our part.

It is with the hope that the United Nations will live up to its early promise as a force for peace in the world that I support the resolution introduced by the distinguished majority leader.

This effort may or may not be successful. But some effort, someday, will be successful, and we cannot afford to allow any opportunity for peace to remain unexplored.

In addition, Mr. President, it seems to me that the United States, in asking the Security Council to take an active role in bringing the Vietnam conflict to an honorable end, is showing itself to be ready to stake its reputation and motives in debate before the world.

This in itself would serve to underscore the fact that we are in Vietnam for honorable purposes and seek to leave that country under honorable circumstances.

EXHIBIT 1

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington, D.C., October 20, 1967.

To: Hon. MICHAEL J. MANSFIELD.
From: Foreign Affairs Division.
Subject: United Nations Members Expressing Concern Over Vietnam.

Representatives of the following members of the United Nations, numbering 104, expressed their concern over the situation in Vietnam in the general debate or opening statements at the 22nd Session of the General Assembly which began September 19, 1967:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian S.S.R., Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Kinshasa), Costa Rica.

Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan.

Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland.

Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somali Republic, South Africa, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Tanzania, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian S.S.R., U.S.S.R., United Arab Republic, United Kingdom, United States, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, and Zambia.

(SOURCE.—Verbatim Records of the General Assembly, September 19–October 13, 1967.)

U.S. SENATE,
OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,
Washington, D.C., October 9, 1967.

To All Senators.

DEAR ———: In the past few months, some thirty Senators have expressed the view that the United Nations might play some role in finding peace in Viet Nam. I have been among the thirty. It has been and still is my hope that the Security Council might serve to spur negotiations (whether under its own aegis or in a reconvened Geneva Conference or some other appropriate forum) which might lead to an honorable settlement.

In my judgment, much might be gained and nothing is to be lost in a sustained attempt to get the U.N. Security Council to consider Viet Nam. At worst, an open defeat of specific moves in this direction can hardly be more opprobrious than rumors and allegations that the United States is preventing negotiations. Even if we cannot muster the votes or are estopped by a permanent member's veto, I believe we have a responsibility to pursue whatever means may be proper and open to us in the Security Council, if for no other reason than to make clear our willingness to lay our position on Viet Nam formally on the line.

The appropriateness of a U.S. initiative in the United Nations in connection with Viet Nam is underscored by Article I of the Charter. The fact is that U.N. members have bound themselves by Treaty commitment:

". . . To take effective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace . . . and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes. . . ."

Obviously, this responsibility falls with particular weight upon the Permanent Members, including the United States.

At one time, this nation did make a start towards raising the Vietnamese question in the Security Council. In a letter to the President of that body on January 31, 1966, on instructions from the President, Ambassador Goldberg requested the calling of an urgent meeting of the Council to consider the situation in Viet Nam. In a supplementary letter, he submitted a draft resolution on Viet Nam.

A meeting of the Security Council was called for the next day, and two items were listed on the Provisional Agenda for the meeting. The first was the adoption of the provisional agenda (which is invariably the first item to be considered at a Council meeting). The second was the letter from the United States representative.

The vote on the adoption of the provisional agenda was taken on February 2, 1966. The results were 9 in favor, 2 opposed, and 4 abstentions. Although one of the negative votes was that of the Soviet Union, the agenda, nevertheless, was formally adopted. That is because the adoption of the agenda is a procedural question on which decisions in the Council are made by a vote of any nine of the fifteen members. The Soviet negative vote, therefore, did not act as a veto.

However, instead of next calling up the draft resolution of the United States (that is, the second item of the agenda or the U.S. letter on the question of Viet Nam) the Council adjourned indefinitely for informal consultations. These consultations proved ineffective; some of the Council members even refused to participate in them. Since that time, the Security Council has not explored, in formal debate and under public scrutiny, the issues of Viet Nam.

Insofar as the Council is concerned, then, the status of the Vietnamese problem has long been that of one item in an extensive list of "Matters of which the Security Council is Seized" under the title, "Letter dated 31 January 1966 from the Permanent Representative of the United States of America addressed to the President of the Security Council." In analogy with Senate procedure, the item is on the Calendar, waiting to be called up.

The text of the proposed U.S. resolution which lies in this situation is as follows:

"*The Security Council,*

"*Deeply concerned* at the continuation of hostilities in Viet-Nam,

"*Mindful* of its responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace and security,

"*Noting* that the provisions of the Geneva Accords of 1954 and 1962 have not been implemented,

"*Desirous* of contributing to a peaceful and honourable settlement of the Conflict in Viet-Nam,

"*Recognizing* the right of all peoples, including those in Viet-Nam to self-determination,

"1. *Calls* for immediate discussions without pre-conditions at _____ on _____ date, among the appropriate interested Govern-

ments to arrange a conference looking towards the application of the Geneva Accords of 1954 and 1962 and the establishment of a durable peace in South-East Asia;

"2. *Recommends* that the first order of business of such a conference be arrangements for a cessation of hostilities under effective supervision;

"3. *Offers* to assist in achieving the purposes of this resolution by all appropriate means, including the provision of arbitrators or mediators;

"4. *Calls on* all concerned to co-operate fully in the implementation of this resolution;

"5. *Requests* the Secretary-General to assist as appropriate in the implementation of this resolution."

It is this U.S. introduced resolution which was permitted to go dormant after having been motioned up almost two years ago and which we have since made no formal effort to revive. Initially, the principal reason for leaving it in limbo, as I understand it, was to avoid jeopardizing the efforts of the Secretary-General who, in his diplomatic capacity, was quietly trying to bring about negotiations through other channels. This effort and other secret approaches at the time were believed to hold more promise for peaceful settlement than formal consideration of the problem by the Council.

However, it is now almost two years later. In the interim, a range of alternative approaches to peaceful settlement has been pursued with great vigor but with singular lack of results. All the while the war in Viet Nam has intensified and the options for opening negotiations for peaceful settlement have grown fewer. In these circumstances, it seems to me that the United States has an obligation to itself and, under the Charter—commitments to the people of the world, to resume the formal effort (which we began almost two years ago and then dropped almost as soon as we began) to get the question of Viet Nam before the U.N. Security Council.

In my judgment, the United States resolution which was submitted in January 1966 is still valid as a vehicle for this purpose. However, an alternative draft resolution could be offered by the United States, or by another country, for the purpose of opening consideration of the problem of restoring peace in Viet Nam.

If we choose to resume the initiative, the United States representative has only to ask for a meeting on the resolution on Viet Nam of 1966 and the item would be taken from the list of matters of which the "Security Council is seized" and included on an appropriate provisional agenda. The question of the adoption of the provisional agenda would then arise at a meeting of the Security Council, and it would be determined without vote if no objection were raised. In the event of objection, adoption would require the vote of *any* nine members. In short, if there are any nine members of the Council willing to have the Security Council face up to Viet Nam, the Council can begin the attempt to open the door to peaceful solution.

Of late, there have been rumors and innuendoes to the effect that "we do not have the votes" and so, therefore, we have not moved on the matter. It seems to me, however, that if there are not nine members of the Council prepared, at this late date, to acknowledge in concert this most serious threat to the world's well-being, it is high time for this nation to clarify by a recorded vote—win or lose—who is willing and who is not willing to bring the U.N. into the effort to restore peace in Viet Nam.

If the Security Council elects to do so, moreover, it can invite parties to the Vietnamese conflict, even though they are not members of the United Nations, to participate in discussions of the question. Again, the precedents clearly indicate that an invitation of this kind involves a procedural decision and, hence, requires *any* nine votes for adoption. Indeed, there are several cases in which invitations to participate in Security Council proceedings have been extended to non-U.N. members notwithstanding a negative vote of a permanent member. The precedents include the extension of two invitations to Communist China in 1950 (one of which was opposed by both the United States and the Republic of China and the other by the Republic of China) during the Korean Conflict. Precedents include even an invitation to an individual to appear and to speak in the Security Council after his diplomatic credentials had been thrown into doubt. (Dr. Jan Papanek, the Permanent Representative of Czechoslovakia to the United Nations at the time of the coup was invited, despite the negative vote of the Soviet Union.)

In short, the Charter and procedural practices of the U.N. clearly make possible a formal initiative on Viet Nam in the Security Council. While there have been of late, apparently, corridor-explorations by the United States of the possibilities of resuming the approach of almost two years ago, as yet, no specific procedural steps have been taken.

Needless to say, an initiative along these lines by the United States appears to me to be most desirable. May I say that I would not expect consideration of Viet Nam by the Security Council to be a substitute for direct negotiations by the parties involved or for the Geneva Conference or, for that matter, the personal diplomacy of the U.N. Secretary-General and other third parties. Nor am I sanguine in the expectation that this approach will necessarily be more fruitful than the others which have already been tried without avail. We cannot know what the results will be until the attempt is made. In my judgment, it would have been a worthwhile effort even if consideration by the Security Council served only to clarify the various positions of those directly and indirectly involved in this conflict by bringing them together in face-to-face and open discussions.

In closing, let me emphasize that I write to you not to seek an endorsement of any particular approach to the problem of Viet Nam. Each of us has his own views even as we share, I know, a deep concern and a deep desire for the prompt restoration of peace. I write you only to elaborate, as of possible interest, certain procedural and other ramifications which would be deeply involved in the event of a resumption of a U.S. initiative on Viet Nam in the Security Council.

With best personal wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

P.S.—I am sending along a copy of a statement made on Sunday which also bears upon the matter.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD, DEMOCRAT, MONTANA

The current session of the General Assembly has brought an outpouring of foreign office statements which urge the United States to call a halt to the bombing of North Viet Nam. Led by the Soviet Union, twenty or more nations have publicly pressed this advice in recent weeks. There are probably additional nations which feel the same way even if they have not yet expressed themselves.

In my judgment, this nation should not make light of this international advice. In some cases, it comes from nations with which we have had a long and intimate association and whose well-being is linked closely with our own. In any event, it is not necessarily either gratuitous or misdirected but arises, I am sure, from a deep and worldwide concern with the prolongation and expansion of the war in Viet Nam. This government has a responsibility, as do all governments, to pay a decent respect to the concerns as well as the opinions of other nations.

Well-intentioned or not, however, international advice is not likely to prove very helpful in this instance unless there is a willingness to couple it with a measure of international responsibility in seeking the termination of the Vietnamese conflict. That willingness, I regret to say, is still conspicuously lacking. A willingness to attempt a concrete contribution to a solution of the Vietnamese problem is not present among the Geneva Conferees and it is not present in the Security Council.

The Soviet Union, which is a member of both, has been in the forefront of the nations which insist that a discontinuance of the bombing is an essential in the restoration of peace in Viet Nam. Indeed, we are advised—almost assured—that the cessation will lead to negotiations with North Viet Nam. If the Soviet Union is convinced that this is the course to peace, it would seem to me to be appropriate for that nation to put its conviction into a formal resolution and present it for consideration to the Security Council. Until that is done, eloquent pleas and statements calling for an end of the bombing, particularly as they come from members of the Security Council can hardly be regarded a contribution to peace or even as a fulfillment of elementary responsibilities under the Charter.

I would hope, therefore, that the Soviet Union or any other member of the Security Council for that matter, which is persuaded that an end to the bombing is the way to peace, would frame its conviction as a draft resolution and present it to the Council. In that way, the regular procedures of the Charter will be engaged. In that way, perhaps, a path to peace may yet be uncovered either inside the U.N. Security Council or through its initiatives, in some other forum.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Oct. 15, 1967]

U.S. BOMBING HALT SUGGESTED SINCE SEPTEMBER 21 BY 50 IN U.N.

(By Donald Grant)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., October 14.—Since Sept. 21, a total of 50 nations has suggested in the General Assembly that the United States should stop bombing North Vietnam, a tabulation of the general debate just concluded shows.

Last year, the suggestion was made by 28 nations in the general debate in the assembly.

Discussion of the war in Vietnam induced more nations than ever before to participate in the general debate this year. Out of a total UN membership of 122, 109 nations took part.

The United States was supported in its Vietnam policies without qualification by six nations. A dozen other nations gave the United States qualified support.

BIGGEST IN AFRICA

The greatest increase in the number of nations criticizing American policy in Vietnam was among the Africans. Last year, nine African nations criticized American policy in Vietnam; this year 20 nations from Africa offered such criticism, coupled with appeals to stop the bombing.

Two years ago, the representatives of 24 nations spoke in the general debate without mentioning Vietnam. Last year, the representatives of 16 nations spoke on other issues but were silent on Vietnam. This year, all but

half a dozen or so mentioned Vietnam in one way or another.

Seven Western Hemisphere nations that supported the United States policy in Vietnam last year no longer give such support, the general debate showed. Two Western Hemisphere nations—Canada and Jamaica—are among those calling for an end to the bombing.

The relatively ardent supporters of American policy as shown by the general debate are Australia, New Zealand, Nationalist China, The Philippines, Thailand and Argentina.

QUALIFIED SUPPORT

Qualified support came from Iceland, Dominican Republic, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Luxembourg, Britain, Belgium, Greece, Israel, Japan, Laos and Bolivia.

Nations asking for an end to the bombing, in the order that they spoke, were Denmark, Sweden, the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Upper Volta, Senegal, Canada, Somalia, Kenya, France, Burundi, Indonesia, Albania, Egypt, Bulgaria, The Netherlands, Finland, Poland, Hungary, Norway, Ethiopia, Yugoslavia, Mongolia, Mauritania, India, Nepal, Kuwait, Tanzania, Chad, Jamaica, Romania, the Sudan, Cyprus, Mali, Morocco, Gabon, Algeria, Nigeria, Iraq, Cambodia, Yemen, Congo (Brazzaville), Ceylon, Camaroon, Togo, Syria, Rwanda and Cuba. The Ukraine and Byelorussia, Soviet republics, also were on the list.

Last year, Arthur J. Goldberg, the chief American delegate, attempted to answer the accumulated criticisms of American policy in the general debate with a statement of his own before the assembly. This year he did not do so.

SOME AMBIGUITY

Among nations giving nominal support to United States policy in Vietnam, there was often a degree of ambiguity in the debate. Latin American speakers tended to praise the efforts of Secretary General U Thant in seeking to bring the war in Vietnam to a halt—without stating directly that Thant's efforts had included a repeated call for a halt in the bombing.

Among the large powers, only Britain gave any support at all. Such praise for American policies as was offered by British Foreign Secretary George Brown later was repudiated by the British Labor party convention in Britain.

Cambodia was the most severe critic of United States policy in Vietnam.

WARMEST SUPPORTERS

The warmest defenses of United States policy were given by Australia and New Zealand.

Goldberg, speaking on the opening day of the debate, urged "the active participation of the United Nations in the quest for peace in Vietnam." Similar suggestions have been made in Congress.

After wide consultations, however, Goldberg concluded that the time was not ripe for seeking support in formal United Nations meetings, either of the General Assembly or the Security Council, in order to get resolutions adopted that would be favorable to American policy.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the United Nations resolution (S. Res. 180) be kept at the desk until 5 o'clock for further signatures, and that, in the meantime, the names of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SPONG] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] be added as cosponsors, which I think brings the total number to 40 or 41.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of 18 more Senators may be included as cosponsors of the U.N. resolution now at the desk, bringing the total number to 54.

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

REPORT ON TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 177)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit the 11th annual report on the trade agreements program. This report is required by section 402(a) of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, covering calendar year 1966.

Nineteen hundred and sixty-six was another remarkable year for international trade. World trade during the year rose by 9.5 percent, bringing great benefits to all the nations of the free world. The United States shared fully in this growth. Our foreign trade set new records, adding to the strength of our economy and to the income and welfare of our people.

The United States played a major role during 1966 in efforts to improve conditions of world commerce and to stimulate the growth of trade. The drive to conclude the Kennedy round—the most ambitious multilateral attempt to reduce trade barriers ever undertaken—was the most important of these efforts. This negotiation was successfully concluded on June 30, 1967, and will pay dividends for every American and the entire free world.

We have had two decades of unprecedented growth in world trade which contributed greatly to the economic progress of this country and of our trading partners. We must maintain this momentum.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 25, 1967.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 13606) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 13606) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

PETITION

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Township Committee of the Township of Randolph, County of Morris, State of New Jersey, praying for the enactment of legislation in connection with the selection and retirement of members of the Supreme Court, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

H.R. 2275. An act for the relief of Dr. Ricardo Vallejo Samala (Rept. No. 682).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

H.R. 8580. An act to convey certain land to the Squaxim Island Tribe of Indians (Rept. No. 683).

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

S. 1752. A bill to amend the act prohibiting fishing in the territorial waters of the United States and in certain other areas by vessels other than vessels of the United States and by persons in charge of such vessels (Rept. No. 684);

S. 1798. A bill to amend section 4 of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, as amended (Rept. No. 685); and

S. 2047. A bill to exempt certain vessels engaged in the fishing industry from the requirements of certain laws (Rept. No. 686).

By Mr. BARTLETT, from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments:

S. 1260. A bill to amend the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Act of 1950 (Public Law 845-81) (Rept. No. 687); and

S.J. Res. 103. A joint resolution to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a survey of the coastal and fresh-water commercial fishery resources of the United States, its territories, and possessions (Rept. No. 688).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce:

Howard J. Samuels, of New York, to be Under Secretary of Commerce.

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Claude F. Clayton, of Mississippi, to be U.S. circuit judge for the fifth circuit.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

S. 2582. A bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act for 1967 to defer policemen and firemen from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By Mr. HOLLINGS:

S. 2583. A bill for the relief of John W. Harte, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 2584. A bill for the relief of Ludger J. Cossette; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 2585. A bill for the relief of Kim Kap Rai; and

S. 2586. A bill for the relief of Kim Young Nam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 2587. A bill for the relief of Dr. Roberto Garcia-Rivera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 2588. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alberto Caburian DeVera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

OBSERVATION OF 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE REPUBLIC OF FINLAND

Mr. MONDALE (for himself and Mr. HART) submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 49) to observe the 50th anniversary of the Republic of Finland, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

RESOLUTION

SENSE OF SENATE RESOLUTION SEEKING U.S. INITIATIVE TO ASSURE UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL CONSIDERATION OF VIETNAM CONFLICT

Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. BROOKE, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. PELL, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. METCALF, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. HART, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. BAYH, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. NELSON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MORTON, Mr. CASE, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. SPONG, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. MOSS, Mr. TOWER, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. ANDERSON) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 180)—a sense-of-the-Senate resolution seeking U.S. initiative to assure United Nations Security Council consideration of Vietnam conflict, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

TOWARD MORE EFFECTIVE LAW ENFORCEMENT

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, nothing is more important to our security—to our total defense system—than adequate protection against crime and fire.

Without such protection; our rights as citizens can soon become rather meaningless.

Policemen and firemen are our first line of defense. They are essential to the maintenance of law and order. We depend upon them not only for personal safety, but for the very survival of our society.

But today, Mr. President, domestic security is gravely threatened.

The civil disorders which ravaged some of the Nation's urban centers this summer have underscored a desperate need for more adequate police and fire protection.

In addition, the riots focused attention upon the increasing danger to which local police and firefighters are subjected.

Metropolitan police forces must contend not only with the serious acceleration of crime, but with outbursts of collective violence as well.

The Nation's response to the problem must be two-pronged. In the first instance, we should endeavor to cure the social and economic ills which breed frustration and disaffection. Second, we must insure that law enforcement agencies and fire departments are adequately staffed and trained to defend society.

In order to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of these vital public services, Mr. President, I am today introducing, for appropriate reference, a bill to defer policemen and firemen from the military draft.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2582) to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 to defer policemen and firemen from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States, introduced by Mr. GRIFFIN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, as I shall point out, such a step can be of great assistance in the effort to strengthen local law enforcement.

According to the Task Force Report on the Police, issued by the President's Crime Commission, approximately 420,000 persons are employed in the criminal justice field in the United States. In 1965, there existed a ratio of 1.7 police officers to every 1,000 citizens, as reported by the Federal Bureau of Investigation in its "Uniform Crime Reports, 1965."

As the crime rate increases, particularly in urban areas, the role of the police and their responsibilities multiply and grow more complex.

Due to expanding population and attrition in present ranks, 50,000 new police officers will be needed in 1967 alone—"Task Force Report: The Police," President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, page 133. Yet police departments are notoriously unsuccessful in their attempts to recruit qualified candidates. Today it is commonplace to find departments well below authorized strength. The Municipal Yearbook for 1967 states as follows:

> Continuous recruitment of police candidates by a formal recruitment program prevails only in cities over 500,000.[1]

[1] The Municipal Yearbook, 1967, page 443.

Resignations are a major drain on staff. This is indicated by table I, which I shall place in the RECORD following my remarks, along with other data compiled in the Municipal Yearbook of 1967.

The shortage of eligible manpower has become a chronic handicap to effective law enforcement. The problem is not so much the lack of applications as it is the lack of qualified aspirants. In 1961, a survey of 368 police departments showed that only 22.3 percent of all applicants were hired. The acceptance rate dropped from 29.9 percent recorded in 1956.

The Commission's Task Force Report on the Police sets forth several practical recommendations to make police work, as a career, more attractive to able young men.

But the immediate problem remains. The manpower deficiency is acute.

Other tables show more clearly than words what we are up against. By population group, city type, and geographic region, the cities reporting in table II indicate a cumulative lag in actual personnel. Table II illustrates that the widest gap between authorized strength and existing manpower is in the central city areas. Of 176 metropolitan police departments reporting, as against independent cities and suburbia, 3,879 personnel are claimed to be needed to meet specified enrollment. And it is precisely the urban metropolis where crime and violence are most prevalent.

The urban rate for robbery, for instance, was 88.6 per 100,000 inhabitants, as compared to a rate of 9.9 in rural communities. The urban rate of aggravated assault was more than double the rural rate. These figures are drawn from "Uniform Crime Reports, 1965," published by the FBI.

In the cities, the incidence of petty and serious crime is much greater than in outlying or nonurban areas. And one cannot, of course, omit from this alarming equation the occurrence and possible reoccurrence of mass rioting and looting, which thrust extra burdens upon undermanned local and State police forces.

The third table carries information on duty hours, salary, recruitment practices, expenditures, and other statistics of police departments in major U.S. cities. Particularly revealing is the column on authorized strength and needed personnel. Of 54 cities reporting with populations from 250,000 to over 1 million, only three departments were at authorized strength.

According to the 1967 Municipal Yearbook, Detroit, in my own State of Michigan, lacked 459 police officers. Apparently, the shortage varies only modestly from month to month. As of August 1, the Detroit Police Department needed 451 additional men. The impact of such a continuing deficiency can hardly be overstated.

The low acceptance rate compounds Detroit's problem of maintaining its force at or near authorized capacity, which is 4,855 men. Between the period January 1, 1967, and September 1, 1967, only 228 candidates were accepted out of 2,369 applications received.

Detroit Police Commissioner Ray

Girardin, testifying before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures on March 8 on this year, explained the issue in these terms:

> Detroit and other major cities are facing a crisis in recruiting and retaining qualified officers.
>
> The situation will become critical in the 1970's when the many officers who were hired in the abundant postwar labor market of the late 1940's become eligible for retirement.[2]

Of 92 cities with populations from 100,000 to 250,000, table III records that only five of them were adequately staffed. In Michigan, this includes Dearborn, Grand Rapids, Lansing, and Warren, all of which were below full strength.

I have used these facts to elaborate the dilemma police departments are experiencing in maintaining and enrolling sufficient personnel. Right here in the Nation's Capital, vacancies on the police force rose to 369 in September, as against 350 recorded for August.

Undoubtedly, the danger and harassment to which firefighters are also increasingly subjected act as a deterrent to recruitment. Recent rioting starkly underlines the often unpredictable hazards of firefighting. Last year, the International Association of Firefighters issued a survey which showed that, out of 507 cities reporting across the Nation, there were 55 line-of-duty deaths per 100,000 firemen in 1965. This study revealed that the fatality rate for firemen was approximately 2½ times greater than the prevailing rate for policemen. The firemen's rate compares very unfavorably to the 7.2 on-the-job deaths registered per 100,000 civilian Federal employees—"International Fire Fighter," October–November 1966, pages 4 to 7.

The IAFF Department of Education and Research also reported that out of 24 national occupations, injuries per 1 million man-hours of exposure in the firefighting service were exceeded only by marine cargo handling in 1965. In cities with populations above 300,000, firefighters averaged 74.5 injuries. Nationally, the police injury frequency rate was also comparatively high at 33.7.

In 1965 alone, 2,400,000 fires killed 12,000 men, women, and children. Economic loss was valued at $1.5 billion.

On August 30 of this year, Albert E. Albertoni, secretary-treasurer of the International Association of Firefighters, testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee that 418 firemen had been injured and four killed during the riots inflaming eight cities this summer. During the violence firemen were often confronted by sniper fire and open hostility on the part of the local populations and rioters.

In view of these alarming trends, and the critical nature of police work and fire control, every possible effort must be exerted to spur recruitment and retention of competent men in these two hazardous fields.

We cannot afford to be remiss in this vital public service, which most directly affects the health and safety of our citizens.

Much depends upon the initiative of local and State authorities in applying the many recommendations of the President's Crime Commission and other studies. But the Federal Government, within its limited jurisdiction, can play a role in helping State and local governments to solve its manpower problem.

Accordingly, I advocate that policemen and firemen, employed full-time or otherwise pursuing requisite training, be deferred by statute from the military draft.

At the present time, policemen and firemen are drafted or deferred on a "hit and miss" basis, depending upon the attitude of local draft boards.

Neither of these occupations is recommended for deferment in the current list of "Essential Activities and Critical Occupations," which is dispatched by the Federal Government to every local draft board for guidance. This list includes such civilian specialties as chemist, astronomer, foreman, patternmaker, and tool-and-die maker. It is not mandatory for draft boards to defer automatically those in the categories enumerated. However, spokesmen at the Nation's headquarters of the Selective Service System indicate they are reasonably certain that local boards generally apply the list routinely.

Nonetheless, there are no figures available to substantiate the extent to which the list is actually applied. It appears that there is no feedback of data, from local and State boards, which would indicate in detail to what extent local authorities are implementing the list, and precisely what kinds of occupational deferments are being granted, and how many.

Presently, the Inter-Agency Advisory Committee on Essential Activities and Critical Occupations is reviewing the list, under the auspices of the National Security Council. The existing list, it should be noted, has not been altered significantly since 1962, although one amendment was issued in March 1965. The committee has nevertheless held regular monthly meetings since 1962, subjecting the deferred occupations to reexamination.

It is apparently true that local boards generally respond affirmatively to written representations from local police departments when it is claimed that a certain officer is indispensable. However, there are no national figures to indicate how many seasoned policemen and firemen have been drafted. Furthermore, it is clear that the draft system seriously restricts the ability of police agencies in their efforts to recruit potentially qualified men.

Most police departments do not hire anyone under 21 years of age. This puts the police at a disadvantage. Those persons not attending college generally determine employment or career direction before they reach 21. And under present pay standards, university graduates simply do not embark upon careers with the police.

Under the Military Selective Service Act of 1967, the Government is to begin drafting the youngest eligibles first. It seems to me that such a policy will further inhibit police recruitment, at a time when forces across the country are already dangerously understaffed.

Since 1962, draft boards have been deferring essentially the same occupational categories, if the recommended list is taken as evidence. The list, in effect was compiled on the basis of crucial national need in relation to available—or unavailable—skills. Inasmuch as the list has not undergone alteration since 1962, except for one addition—programer, engineering, and scientific—and one change—substituting scientific linguist for structural linguist—one can easily, though perhaps erroneously, infer that our needs and our lack of manpower to meet those needs have remained constant.

Despite the fact that police vacancies constitute an ominous and universal deficiency, police work is not classified as critical. And despite the increasing threat to personal safety and property, the enormous rise in crime and violence, police and fire protection are not classified as essential. Such blatant anomalies in administrative practice cry out for statutory correction.

I understand that Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System, has recommended that the Inter-Agency Advisory Committee consider the inclusion of firemen and policemen on the forthcoming revised list of Essential Activities and Critical Occupations. But even if the committee determines to add firemen and policemen to the list, there is no guarantee that such inclusion will form a sufficient inducement to higher enrollment, or that the inclusion will be enforced uniformly.

The Selective Service System continues to argue against rigid exemptions which, it is claimed, remove the flexibility now exercised by local draft boards. But I insist, to the contrary, that the absence of nationally applicable standards has riddled the system with contradictions and inconsistencies which, manifestly, have helped to produce widespread controversy about our military draft policy.

It has also been suggested that mandatory deferment of firemen and policemen would create an artificial and undesirable surplus of personnel. Logically, this is impossible. For under a mandatory exemption, police and fire departments reaching full strength will not recruit beyond normal turnover demands.

Nor can it be inferred, as some have done, that a statutory exemption will interfere with police qualification standards, which are justifiably high. The fear that police departments might become havens for draft dodgers is baseless.

The only relevant question is this: Should police and firefighters be placed in a privileged draft exempt status not accorded to other essential employment, public or private?

The answer is that nothing is more important to our internal security than adequate protection against crime and fire. We cannot afford to bargain with the physical safety and well-being of our citizens.

To be secure in one's person is essential to the functioning of a free society. Yet today, the threat to life and prop-

[2] "Controlling Crime Through More Effective Law Enforcement." Hearings before the Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, Senate Judiciary Committee, 1967.

erty, particularly in urban areas, is already critical. The confidence of the people in the capacity of their government to provide basic protection is eroding at a fast clip.

Crime statistics reveal the true dimension of the problem. Since 1960, crime has risen by 62 percent compared to a population increase of only 9 percent. In the first 6 months of this year, crime went up by 17 percent nationally over the rate recorded for 1966.

Law enforcement is our first line of defense. It is indispensable to the full enjoyment of citizens' rights. But with each passing month, there is fresh evidence of our inability, as a society, to provide law-abiding Americans with the basic defense against crime to which they are entitled.

The frightening acceleration of lawlessness and violence will persist unless we are willing to heed the warning signals and equip responsible authorities with the means to cope with the problem.

I seriously doubt whether the mere inclusion of the police and firefighting professions on the list of essential activities and critical occupations will have much impact at this point. The list has been revised only once since its first appearance in 1962, which suggests that the skilled trades recommended for deferment on the list did not automatically encourage greater career pursuit.

Moreover, other than information supplied by public employment offices, the precise effect of the list, in helping to meet the demand for certain critical skills, is impossible to calculate.

The unpredictability of the foregoing proposal leaves us with only one alternative. The Nation cannot meet the needs of domestic security by relying on suppositions and half-measures which carry no real assurance of closing the manpower gap. Right now the adequacy of police protection is in question, in part because police departments are woefully undermanned.

Congress can take action to upgrade the status of police and fire personnel and provide an incentive for the recruitment of qualified applicants.

The bill I am sponsoring will help attain this objective.

I am convinced that the crucial responsibilities borne by such personnel, and the crisis we face in reducing the manpower shortage, impels such action.

The President's Crime Commission and other studies have pointed to additional steps which should be undertaken to attract young men to police work as a career. By itself, statutory deferment will not solve the continuing predicament of understaffed police forces. But it is an essential part of our national effort to mount a meaningful attack on crime.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill which I introduce be printed in the RECORD.

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

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2582

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (f) of section 6 of the Military Selective Service Act, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. 456(f), is amended by striking out "The Vice President" at the beginning of such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof "(1) The Vice President"; and by adding at the end thereof two new paragraphs as follows:

"(2) Police officers of the States, territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia, and of the subdivisions of the States, shall, while employed in such positions on a regular full-time basis, or while pursuing an authorized and official course of training or education in law enforcement, be deferred from training and service under this title in the Armed Forces of the United States.

"(3) Firemen of the States, territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia, and of the subdivisions of the States, shall, while employed in such positions on a regular full-time basis or while pursuing an authorized and official course of training or education in firefighting, be deferred from training and service under this title in the Armed Forces of the United States."

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, also, I ask unanimous consent that certain tables referred to during my remarks, drawn from the Municipal Yearbook of 1967, be printed in the RECORD.

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

POLICE DEPARTMENT STATISTICS

TABLE 1.—REASONS FOR LOSS OF POLICE PERSONNEL

Population group	Number of cities reporting	Total loss	Death		Retirement		Disability		Resignation	
			Number of men	Percent of total	Number of men	Percent of total	Number of men	Percent of total	Number of men	Percent of total
Over 500,000	19	1,914	133	7	594	31	195	10	992	52
250,000 to 500,000	23	731	36	5	185	25	52	7	458	63
100,000 to 250,000	67	1,044	46	4	164	16	28	3	806	77
50,000 to 100,000	146	1,137	34	3	177	16	56	5	870	76
25,000 to 50,000	206	989	26	3	127	13	30	3	806	81
10,000 to 25,000	375	1,205	28	2	107	9	28	2	1,042	87
Total	836	7,020	303	4	1,354	19	389	6	4,974	71

TABLE 2.—POLICE PERSONNEL NEEDED TO REACH AUTHORIZED STRENGTH

	Number of cities reporting	Personnel needed to reach authorized strength	Patrol		Traffic		Detective		Juvenile		Identification and records		Other [3]	
			Number [1]	Percent [2]	Number [1]	Percent [2]	Number [1]	Percent [2]	Number [1]	Percent [2]	Number [1]	Percent [2]	Number [1]	Percent [2]
Population group:														
Over 500,000	17	1,632	1,206	74	109	7	128	8	49	3	19	2	121	7
250,000 to 500,000	24	696	532	76	74	11	43	6	14	2	11	2	22	3
100,000 to 250,000	80	1,239	907	73	156	13	105	8	26	2	17	1	28	3
50,000 to 100,000	128	908	683	75	87	10	58	6	15	2	13	1	52	6
25,000 to 50,000	155	744	559	75	86	12	42	6	28	4	9	1	20	2
10,000 to 25,000	211	631	470	74	51	8	48	8	14	2	18	3	30	4
Total	615	5,850	4,357	74	563	10	424	7	146	2	87	1	273	5
City type:														
Central city	176	3,879	2,911	75	354	9	289	7	86	2	47	1	192	5
Independent city	208	827	611	74	94	11	57	7	28	3	16	2	21	2
Suburb	231	1,144	835	73	115	10	78	7	32	3	24	2	60	5
Total	615	5,850	4,357	74	563	10	424	7	146	2	87	1	273	5
Geographic regions:														
Northeast	122	1,269	1,033	81	61	5	56	4	33	3	25	2	61	5
North-central	215	1,635	1,235	76	159	10	102	6	30	2	21	1	88	5
South	157	2,072	1,436	69	276	13	189	9	47	2	24	1	100	5
West	121	874	653	75	67	8	77	9	36	4	17	2	24	3
Total	615	5,850	4,357	74	563	10	424	7	146	2	87	1	273	5

[1] Number of men needed to reach authorized strength for each function.

[2] Percentage of total personnel needed to reach authorized strength; percentages may not total 100 due to rounding.

[3] Includes training, communications, marine, community relations, maintenance, and general Administration.

TABLE 3.—POLICE DEPARTMENT DATA FOR CITIES OVER 10,000

FIREARMS CONTROL

[Data in this section concern only firearms defined as "any pistol, revolver, sawed-off shotgun, or other firearm of a size which may be concealed upon a person"]

Legal Authority

None—City has no legal authority to control the sale and possession of firearms.
Y—City has legal authority to control the sale and possession of firearms.

Source of Legal Authority

1—State law.
2—City law.
3—Both State and city law

Permits

Y—Yes.
N—No.

Registration

Y—Yes.
N—No.

Police-Community Relations Program

[Data in this section concern police-department-initiated program designed to offer an opportunity for police and other public and private agencies and individuals in the community to discover their common problems, ambitions, and responsibilities and to work together toward the solution of community problems. Major emphasis is that police are part of and not apart from the community]

None—City does not have such a program.
Y—City does have a police-community relations program.

Citizen complaints

Special board

Y—City has special board which handles citizen complaints against police officers.

N—City does not have a special board.

Investigative powers

Y—Special board has investigative powers.
N—Special board does not have investigative powers.

City	Employees: Total	Employees: Civilian	Duty hours per week	Salary of patrolmen—Entrance, maximum	Below authorized strength, number of men needed	Recruitment practices: Frequency, area covered	Recruitment practices: Methods	Recruitment practices: Residence policy	Firearms control—Legal authority, source permits to purchase, registration	Citizen complaints—Special board, investigative powers	Police community relations program, year created	Police department expenditures, 1966 (in thousands): Salaries and wages	Police department expenditures, 1966 (in thousands): Total for department
Over 1,000,000:													
Chicago, Ill	12,378	1,478	40	$6,792–$8,316	N	1–2	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11	3	Y-2-Y-N	Y-	Y-65	$95,192	$103,396
Detroit, Mich	4,827	520	40	7,424– 8,335	Y-459	1–3	1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12	2	Y-1-Y-Y	Y-Y	Y-56	37,104	38,682
Houston, Tex	1,605	260	40	6,097– 6,695	Y-767	1–4	1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11	N	Y-1-N-N	N	None	9,248	10,613
Los Angeles, Calif	6,620	1,445	42	7,692– 9,060	Y-167	1–5	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11	N	Y-1-Y-N	Y-Y	Y-50	57,957	61,644
New York City, N.Y	27,749	1,900	40	7,032– 8,483	Y-479	1–4	1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12	N	Y-3-Y-Y	Y-Y	Y-66	269,348	281,605
Philadelphia, Pa	7,268	597	42	6,395– 6,879	Y-298	1–1	1, 3, 8, 10, 11, 12	1	Y-3-N-Y	Y-N	Y-55	50,350	52,700
500,000 to 1,000,000:													
Atlanta, Ga	858	123	44	4,836– 5,967	Y-50	1–5	1,4,5,8,11	N	Y-3-N-N	N	None	5,365	6,431
Baltimore, Md	3,185	288	44	5,604– 6,780	Y-391	1–4	1,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12	N	Y-1-Y-N	Y-N	Y-58	22,223	24,306
Boston, Mass	2,674	196	40	5,803– 7,306	Y-70	–1	12	N	Y-1-Y-N	Y-Y	Y-66	20,050	21,383
Buffalo, N.Y	1,514	202	40	5,200– 6,500	Y-17	6–2	----------	N	None	Y-Y	Y-62	10,055	10,678
Cleveland, Ohio	2,375	342	40	6,078– 7,482	Y-740	1–2	1,3,4,7,8,10,11,12	N	Y-2-Y-N	N	None	16,057	---------
Columbus, Ohio	829	138	40	5,967– 7,436	Y-76	–5	1,3,4,5,7,8,10,11,12	N	Y-2-Y-N	N	--------	6,122	---------
Dallas, Tex	1,381	205	40	5,904– 6,516	Y-110	1–3	1,3,4,5,6,8,10,11,12	N	None	Y-Y	None	10,511	---------
Denver, Colo	974	153	40	5,700– 7,056	N	3–5	1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11	1	Y-3-N-N	Y-N	Y-65	6,614	8,376
Indianapolis, Ind	1,056	148	42	5,825– 6,325	Y-40	1–2	1, 3, 4, 8, 10, 11	N	Y-1-N-N	N	Y-66	6,504	7,226
Kansas City, Mo	1,171	256	40	5,520– 7,044	Y-10	1–4	1, 3, 4, 8, 10, 11	2	Y-1-N-N	Y-N	Y-56	7,453	8,550
Memphis, Tenn	1,031	197	40	5,325– 6,420	Y-110	1–2	1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11	N	Y-3-Y-N	Y-Y	None	6,219	6,912
Milwaukee, Wis	2,055	232	40	6,363– 7,620	Y-90	1–3	1, 4, 5, 8, 11, 12	2	None	N	--------	16,165	17,519
New Orleans, La	1,163	129	40	6,267– 7,120	Y-319	1–5	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12	N	Y-2-Y	--------	Y-66	7,899	9,009
Phoenix, Ariz	800	129	40	6,024– 7,392	Y-33	1–5	1,3,4 ,5 ,6 ,3 ,11	3	None	N	Y-66	5,463	6,777
Pittsburgh, Pa	1,619	31	40	5,963– 6,900	Y-30	1	1	1	None	N	None	11,912	12,516
St. Louis, Mo	2,626	591	40	6,110– 7,670	Y-197	1–4	1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12	N	Y-3-N-Y	N	Y-55	17,608	20,795
San Antonio, Tex	810	115	40	4,485– 5,820	Y-90	6–3	1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11	4	None	Y-Y	None	4,603	5,529
San Diego, Calif	884	145	40	7,578– 8,988	Y-37	1–4	1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11	N	Y-1-N-N	N	Y-63	7,395	8,169
San Francisco, Calif	2,031	254	40	8,220– 8,820	Y-23	1–3	1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 11	N	Y-3-Y-N	Y-Y	Y	17,589	18,389
Seattle, Wash	1,170	148	40	7,470– 8,040	Y-25	1–3	1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11	N	None	N	Y-65	8,100	9,592
Washington, D.C	3,102	282	42	6,700– 8,400	Y-280	1–5	1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12	N	Y-2-Y-N	Y-N	Y-64	27,729	29,627
520,000 to 500,000:													
Akron, Ohio	310	20	42	6,552–7,488	Y-12	6–2	1,3,4,5,8,10,11	1	Y-2-N-N	N	None	2,276	2,467
Birmingham, Ala	541	57	40	5,340– 6,468	Y-13	6–2	1,3	1	Y-3-Y-N	N	None	3,377	3,845
Cincinnati, Ohio	967	101	40	6,965– 7,921	Y-45	4–2	1,3,4,5,8,10,11	3	None	N	Y-66	7,041	7,667
Dayton, Ohio	446	57	40	6,864– 7,977	Y-22	1–2	1,3,4,5,6,8,10,11,12	N	None	N	None	3,573	3,949
El Paso, Tex	434	73	40	4,824– 5,964	Y-21	6–4	1,3,4,7,8,10,11	4	None	Y-Y	None	--------	2,505
Fort Worth, Tex	578	70	40	6,120– 6,120	Y-51	1–2	1,2,4,5,7,8,11,12	N	None	Y-Y	Y-45	--------	4,459
Honolulu, Hawaii	1,008	125	40	6,048– 7,716	Y-20	6–3	1,3,4,5,7,8,10,11,12	N	Y-1-Y-Y	N	Y-48	--------	--------
Jersey City, N.J	915	88	40	7,012– 7,512	N	6–1	1,4,5,11	1	Y-1-Y-N	N	None	--------	--------
Long Beach, Calif	724	111	40	7,458– 8,976	Y-31	–2	1,4,6,8,11	3	Y-1-N-N	N	None	6,202	6,856
Louisville, Ky	648	109	40	5,380– 6,179	Y-7	1–2	1,3,5,10,11	N	Y- – –N	N	None	3,853	4,412
Miami, Fla	854	235	40	6,000– 6,888	Y-50	6–5	1,3,4,5,7,10,11	N	Y-3-Y-N	Y-Y	None	5,252	6,222
Minneapolis, Minn	775	69	40	6,768– 7,524	Y-36	6–3	1,3,4,5,9,10,11	2	None	N	None	5,877	6,519
Nashville, Tenn	631	110	40	4,680– 5,832	Y-16	6–1	1,5,11	1	Y-3-Y-Y	N	None	4,005	4,770
Newark, N.J	1,668	274	40	6,551– 7,602	Y-37	3–1	1,6,8,10,11	1	Y- –Y-N	N	Y-66	11,896	13,962
Norfolk, Va	484	45	40	5,112– 6,420	Y-8	2–2	1,4,5,8,11	4	Y-3-Y-N	Y-Y	None	3,718	3,859
Oakland, Calif	860	205	40	8,232– 8,772	Y-34	1–5	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12	N	Y-1-N-N	N	Y-64	7,222	8,161
Oklahoma City, Okla	458	49	44	5,250– 5,700	Y-67	1–4	1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 11	4	Y-3-Y-N	N	Y-65	2,338	2,600
Omaha, Nebr	472	55	40	5,640– 6,900	Y-49	6–1	1, 8	1	Y-2-Y-Y	N	Y-66	3,056	3,392
Portland, Oreg	835	139	40	6,968– 7,696	Y-14	1–4	1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11	N	Y-3-N-N	N	Y-47	5,277	6,635
Rochester, N.Y	597	76	40	6,123– 7,319	Y-34	6–2	1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 12	N	Y-1-N-Y	Y-Y	Y-66	4,491	4,794
Sacramento, Calif	490	81	40	7,740– 9,420	Y-4	6–5	1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11	3	Y-1-Y-N	N	Y-65	3,649	4,058
St. Paul, Minn	460	60	40	6,486– 7,626	------	–4	1, 3, 4, 5, 11	N	----------	Y-Y	None	3,554	3,823
San Jose, Calif	380	31	40	7,848– 9,312	Y-8	–3	1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11	N	Y-1-N-N	N	Y-66	3,461	3,901
Tampa, Fla	622	146	40	5,136– 5,952	Y-50	1–5	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,10,11,12	N	None	N	None	3,283	3,830
Toledo, Ohio	622	40	40	6,660– 7,740	Y-21	–2	1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 11	1	Y- –N–	N	Y–	4,236	4,689
Tulsa, Okla	366	57	40	4,296– 5,808	Y-30	4–3	1, 6, 11	N	N–	N	None	1,790	2,080
Wichita, Kans	398	83	40	5,502– 6,540	Y-34	1–4	1,3,4,5,6,10,11	3	N– – –N	Y-Y	Y–	2,367	2,803
100,000 to 250,000													
Abilene, Tex	132	21	40	4,800– 5,280	Y-2	6–3	1,3,10,11	1	N	N	None	660	814
Albuquerque, N. Mex	328	42	40	5,408– 6,490	Y-44	1–4	1,3,4,5,6,8,10,11	----	N	N	None	2,093	2,355
Alexandria, Va	172	27	40	5,900– 7,535	Y-15	1–4	1,4,5,11	N	Y-2-Y-N	Y-Y	None	1,559	1,745
Allentown, Pa	178	26	44	5,150– 6,150	Y-1	6–2	1,10,11	2	Y-1-N-Y	N	Y-63	907	1,057
Amarillo, Tex	214	39	40	5,040– 5,280	Y-8	6–4	1,3,4,5,8,10,11	4	Y-1-N	N	None	963	1,222
Anaheim, Calif	263	48	40	7,356– 8,940	Y-2	5–2	1,8,11	N	N	N	Y-64	2,658	3,060
Arlington, Va	227	28	40	6,052– 7,737	Y-6	4–4	1,4,5,10,11	N	Y-1- –N	N	None	1,784	2,136
Austin, Tex	245	97	40	4,872– 5,220	Y-25	1–2	1,3,4,5,8,10,11	4	N	Y-Y	None	1,838	2,194
Baton Rouge, La	298	42	40	4,860– 5,700	Y-37	6–3	1,2,3,6,9,10,11	N	N	N	None	1,803	2,136
Beaumont, Tex	165	18	40	5,460– 5,460	Y-30	1–2	1,4,5,6,7,8,11	4	N	N	None	812	969
Berkeley, Calif	172	12	40	8,469– 9,317	Y-1	1–3	1,3,4,5,8,10,11,12	N	N	N	Y-65	1,579	1,955
Bridgeport, Conn	382	14	40	5,208– 6,108	Y-70	6–1	1,4,11	1	Y-3-Y-N	N	Y-61	2,414	2,803
Cambridge, Mass	240	10	40	5,800– 6,958	N	1–1	1	1	Y-1-Y-N	N	Y-63	1,785	1,858
Camden, N.J	251	17	42	5,250– 6,425	Y-24	6–1	1,8,10,11,12	1	Y-1-Y-N	N	--------	1,662	1,944
Canton, Ohio	176	13	40	5,750– 6,800	Y-4	5–2	1,5,7,10,11	N	Y-2-Y-N	N	None	1,076	1,272
Cedar Rapids, Iowa	139	23	40	5,580– 6,180	Y-10	6–3	1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11	4	N	N	None	808	973
Charlotte, N.C	396	43	40	5,400– 6,600	Y-15	1–5	1, 3, 10, 11	N	Y-1-N-N	N	--------	2,682	3,011
Chattanooga, Tenn	236	28	44	4,680– 5,600	Y-8	6–1	5, 11	4	Y-1-N-N	N	None	1,104	1,390
Columbia, S.C	173	14	44	4,706– 5,603	Y-18	1–3	1, 8, 11	N	Y-1-N-N	N	None	914	1,118
Columbus, Ga	206	14	48	4,874– 5,908	Y-26	------	7, 11	N	Y-2-Y-N	N	None	1,132	1,352
Corpus Christi, Tex	262	28	40	5,130– 5,424	Y-3	6–3	1, 3, 5, 10, 11	4	N	Y-Y	None	1,447	1,684
Dearborn, Mich	200	23	40	6,912– 7,838	Y-23	6–2	1, 5, 8, 11	2	Y-1-Y-Y	N	None	1,568	1,615
Des Moines, Iowa	269	29	40	6,107– 7,047	Y-19	4–3	1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11	4	N	N	Y-66	1,761	2,157

TABLE 3.—POLICE DEPARTMENT DATA FOR CITIES OVER 10,000—Continued

FIREARMS CONTROL—Continued

City	Employees		Duty hours per week	Salary of patrolmen—Entrance, maximum	Below authorized strength, number of men needed	Recruitment practices			Firearms control—Legal authority, source permits to purchase, registration	Citizen complaints—Special board, investigative powers	Police community relations program, year created	Police department expenditures, 1966 (in thousands)	
	Total	Civilian				Frequency, area covered	Methods	Residence policy				Salaries and wages	Total for department
100,000 to 250,000—Continued													
Duluth, Minn	129	13	40	$5,673–$6,672	Y–8	5–1	1, 3, 10, 11	1	N	N	None	$855	$944
Elizabeth, N.J	287	17	40	6,250– 6,850	Y–15	6–1	1, 8, 11, 12	1	Y–1–Y–N	N	Y–66	2,273	2,440
Erie, Pa	208	27	40	4,845– 7,800	Y–6	6–1	1	1	Y–3–Y–N	N	Y–66	1,110	1,355
Evansville, Ind	236	0	40	5,200– 6,100	Y–8	0–2	1, 3, 5, 7, 10, 11	1	Y–1–N–Y	N	None	1,404	1,475
Flint, Mich	384	53	40	6,301– 7,371	Y–2	6–5	1,2,5,11,12	N	Y–3–Y–N	Y–Y	Y–66	3,131	3,492
Fort Lauderdale, Fla	327	76	40	5,284– 7,364	Y–17	1–5	1,4,5,6,8,11	N	None	Y–Y	Y–59	1,791	2,091
Fort Wayne, Ind	257	14	40	----------	Y–11	1–2	1,3,4,5,10,11	4	Y–1–Y–N	N	Y–64	--------	--------
Fresno, Calif	290	39	40	7,140– 8,688	Y–1	3	3,5,7,11	2	Y–3–Y–Y	N	Y–65	2,484	2,883
Garden Grove, Calif	144	25	40	7,228– 8,580	Y–2	6–4	1,4,5,11	N	None	N	None	1,420	1,613
Gary, Ind	306	39	40	7,020– 7,020	Y–9	3–1	1,8,10	1	Y–1–N–N	N	None	1,965	2,183
Glendale, Calif	174	41	40	7,260– 8,736	Y–10	1–1	1,4,5,11	1	Y–1–N–Y	N	None	1,545	1,795
Grand Rapids, Mich	260	44	40	6,058– 6,864	Y–33	1–3	1,3,4,5,8,10,11,12	N	Y–1–Y–N	N	None	1,726	2,032
Greensboro, N.C	244	25	42	5,292– 7,116	Y–22	1–4	1,3,4,5,6,8,10,11,12	3	None	--------	None	1,461	1,797
Hammond, Ind	184	15	40	6,480– 6,900	Y–3	1–1	8,10,11	1	Y–1–N–Y	N	None	1,283	1,477
Hampton, Va	117	19	40	5,300– 6,100	Y–18	–4	1,11	N	None	N	None	729	858
Hartford, Conn	388	5	40	6,091– 7,124	Y–30	4–4	1,3,4,8	N	Y–1–N–N	Y–	None	2,969	3,162
Huntsville, Ala	230	55	46	5,225– 5,650	Y–2	1–5	1,3,11	N	Y–3–N–Y	N	None	1,226	1,559
Jackson, Miss	309	53	40	5,634– 6,072	Y–20	1–1	5,11	1	None	N	None	2,193	2,444
Jacksonville, Fla	477	85	40	5,343– 5,646	Y–15	6–3	1,4,10,11	N	Y–2–Y–N	N	--------	3,127	3,592
Kansas City, Kans	240	18	48	3,360– 6,600	Y–21	1–2	1,11	2	Y–2–Y–	Y–Y	Y–66	1,530	1,805
Knoxville, Tenn	276	54	48	4,410– 5,400	Y–47	4–1	1,8,11	1	Y–1–Y–N	N	Y–65	1,560	1,972
Lansing, Mich	222	41	40	6,742– 7,414	Y–5	3–2	1,4,5,11,12	3	Y–3–Y–N	N	None	1,494	1,738
Las Vegas, Nev	308	60	40	6,288– 7,956	Y–8	1–4	1,4,5,6,11,12	N	Y–2–N–N	Y–Y	Y–61	2,389	3,104
Lincoln, Nebr	184	30	40	5,412– 6,108	Y–4	6–2	1,5,6,10,11	3	Y–3–N–N	N	None	962	1,112
Little Rock, Ark	187	25	40	4,860– 5,580	Y–17	1–3	1,4,5,6,11,12	3	None	N	Y–63	933	1,114
Lubbock, Tex	208	17	40	5,004– 5,736	Y–3	6–4	1,3,5,6,7,8,11	N	None	N	None	1,018	1,281
Macon, Ga	165	3	48	5,202– 5,820	Y–3	6–3	1,3,6,10,12	3	None	N	Y–65	892	996
Madison, Wis	248	50	40	6,192– 7,104	Y–18	6–5	1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11	2	Y–3–N–N	Y–Y	Y–55	1,938	2,229
Mobile, Ala	331	79	40	4,296– 5,364	Y–42	1–2	1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11	2	Y–3–Y–N	N	None	1,766	2,086
Montgomery, Ala	236	46	40	4,320– 5,760	N	6–3	1, 8, 11	N	None	N	Y–63	1,357	1,545
New Haven, Conn	409	----	40	6,490– 6,890	Y–19	6–2	1, 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12	N	Y–1–Y–N	Y–	Y–59	2,814	3,066
Newport News, Va	147	10	40	5,112– 6,744	Y–13	1–4	1, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12	N	Y–2–Y–N	N	None	954	1,090
Niagara Falls, N.Y	182	20	40	5,787– 6,510	Y–3	------	----------	----	None	N	None	1,431	1,526
Paterson, N.J	360	28	40	----------	N	6–1	1, 4, 10, 11	1	Y–1–Y–Y	Y	Y–	--------	--------
Peoria, Ill	173	23	40	6,084– 7,046	Y–16	2–1	1, 3, 6, 10, 11	1	Y–2–N–Y	--------	--------	1,386	1,678
Portsmouth, Va	173	12	40	4,920– 6,060	Y–27	1–1	1, 11	1	Y–2–Y–N	--------	None	1,048	1,203
Providence, R.I	511	70	40	----------	Y–45	1–2	1, 3, 4, 6, 10, 11, 12	4	----------	--------	--------	--------	--------
Raleigh, N.C	184	17	42	5,280– 6,144	Y–10	1–3	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12.	2	N–	N	None	992	1,201
Richmond, Va	459	34	44	5,330– 6,864	Y–18	1–4	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12.	N	Y–3–Y–N	N	None	3,202	3,701
Riverside, Calif	179	37	40	7,194– 8,532	Y–9	6–3	1 4, 5, 8, 11	N	Y–1–Y–N	N	None	1,346	1,614
Roanoke, Va	143	7	40	4,920– 6,168	Y–12	------	1, 5, 6, 11	3	None	--------	Y–58	930	1,039
Rockford, Ill	191	25	40	6,074– 7,238	Y–16	1–4	1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 12	N	None	Y–N	None	1,256	1,416
St. Petersburg, Fla	334	79	40	5,265– 6,214	Y–21	6–5	1, 4, 5, 11, 12	N	None	N	--------	1,902	2,265
San Bernardino, Calif	207	46	40	7,344– 8,688	Y–4	1–2	1, 8, 11	2	Y–1–N–N	Y–N	Y–55	1,587	1,789
Santa Ana, Calif	202	----	40	7,620– 8,940	Y–24	1–5	1, 5, 8, 10, 11, 12	N	Y–1–N–N	N	Y–55	1,763	2,249
Savannah, Ga	212	35	48	4,500– 5,592	Y–7	1–5	1,2,4	N	Y–2–N–N	N	Y–66	1,019	1,391
Scranton, Pa	188	14	40	----------	N	6–1	1	1	Y– –Y–N	N	None	--------	--------
Shreveport, La	303	55	48	4,284– 4,728	Y–52	1–3	1,11	4	None	N	None	1,339	1,738
South Bend, Ind	205	11	40	5,700– 6,732	Y–10	–1	1,5,11	N	Y–1–Y–N	N	Y–	1,433	1,614
Spokane, Wash	262	31	40	5,585– 6,420	Y–2	6–5	1,4,10,11	N	None	N	None	1,651	2,088
Springfield, Mass	351	23	40	5,928– 6,864	Y–20	6–1	1,10,11	1	Y–1–Y–N	Y–Y	Y–65	2,555	2,678
Springfield, Mo	126	6	48	4,560– 5,544	Y–4	1–3	1,6,11	4	None	N	None	677	821
Stamford, Conn	211	9	40	5,950– 6,850	Y–22	1–1	1,10,11	1	Y–3–N–N	Y–Y	Y–65	1,515	1,679
Syracuse, N.Y	470	61	40	5,400– 6,915	Y–8	6–2	1,4,5,6,8,9,10,11,12	N	None	N	Y–63	3,167	3,383
Tacoma, Wash	247	23	40	6,600– 7,740	Y–3	6–5	1,5,6,10,11	N	Y–3–Y–N	N	None	2,075	2,474
Topeka, Kans	165	25	40	5,040– 5,940	------	1–2	1,7,11	2	None	N	None	931	1,104
Torrance, Calif	187	33	40	8,148– 8,976	Y–5	6–5	1, 5, 11	3	Y–1–N–N	Y–Y	Y–64	1,736	1,925
Tucson, Ariz	348	80	40	5,880– 6,900	Y–25	1–5	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11	N	None	N	Y–63	2,290	2,779
Upper Darby Township, Pa	168	29	42	5,650– 6,200	N	6–1	1, 11	1	None	N	None	880	1,804
Utica, N.Y	184	8	40	5,000– 5,750	Y–6	4–2	1, 3, 4, 10, 11	N	Y–1–N–	--------	--------	1,113	1,208
Virginia Beach, Va	147	11	40	4,896– 6,144	Y–9	6–1	1, 11	2	----------	N	None	816	1,048
Waco, Tex	120	33	40	4,980– 5,100	Y–18	1–2	1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11	2	None	N	None	685	798
Warren, Mich	172	23	40	7,273– 8,000	Y–42	3–1	1, 4, 6, 11, 12	1	Y–3–Y–Y	Y–Y	None	1,329	1,587
Waterbury, Conn	234	6	40	----------	Y–10	6–2	1, 6	2	Y–1	N	None	--------	--------
Wichita Falls, Tex	130	19	40	5,184– 5,940	Y–7	6–2	1, 3, 4, 6, 10, 11	4	None	N	None	682	843
Winston-Salem, N.C	216	21	42	5,580– 6,780	Y–22	1–2	1, 5, 6, 8, 11	N	None	N	Y–66	1,322	1,653
Worcester, Mass	420	50	40	5,865– 6,864	Y–13	5–1	1	1	Y–1–Y–N	N	None	2,715	3,168
Yonkers, N.Y	481	40	40	6,000– 8,210	Y–7	4–2	1, 5, 11	N	Y–1–Y–Y	N	None	3,903	4,081
Youngstown, Ohio	316	25	40	5,754– 6,330	Y–5	5–1	1, 11	1	None	N	None	1,896	2,033
50,000 to 100,000:													
Abington Township, Pa	68	2	42	5,850– 6,770	N	6–2	1,4,8,11	1	Y–1–N–N	N	Y–63	443	520
Alameda, Calif	81	7	40	7,920– 8,724	N	5–2	1,5,8,11,12	N	Y–1–N–N	Y–Y	None	729	788
Alhambra, Calif	103	18	40	7,464– 8,856	N	–2	1,5,8,11	N	Y–1–N–N	N	None	820	937
Altoona, Pa	104	12	40	4,500– 5,200	N	6–1	1,9,10,11	1	Y–3–Y–N	N	--------	459	562
Anderson, Ind	124	17	40	5,550– 5,750	N	6–2	1,5,10,11	4	Y–1–N–N	Y–Y	None	693	850
Ann Arbor, Mich	90	24	40	6,266– 7,150	Y–12	1–4	1,4,5,6,8,10,11	N	Y–1–Y–	--------	--------	855	964
Appleton, Wis	82	11	40	5,820– 6,660	Y–3	6–3	1,5,6,10,11	N	None	N	--------	510	595
Arlington, Tex	63	3	40	4,764– 5,796	N	6–2	1,5,6,11	2	None	N	None	314	441
Arlington, Mass	91	11	40	6,224– 6,880	Y–8	5–1	----------	1	Y–1–Y–N	N	None	648	694
Asheville, N.C	122	7	40	4,160– 5,200	N	3–3	1	1	None	--------	--------	653	770
Atlantic City, N.J	231	36	40	5,250– 5,750	N	1–1	1,11,12	1	Y–1–Y–N	N	Y–66	1,500	1,657
Augusta, Ga	147	15	40	4,620– 5,400	Y–11	1–2	1,3,6,10,11	N	None	--------	--------	786	869
Aurora, Colo	67	7	40	5,682– 6,786	Y–4	6–4	1,2,4,11	2	Y–3–N–N		None	429	494
Aurora, Ill	102	13	40	6,120– 6,408	Y–8	6–2	11,12	N	None	N	None	461	838
Bakersfield, Calif	160	37	40	7,248– 8,400	Y–8	1–2	1,3,4,5,10,11	2	Y–1–Y–N	N	Y–57	912	1,050
Bay City, Mich	90	8	40	5,477– 6,077	Y–2	6–2	1,3,5,6,7,10,11	3	None	N	None	574	644
Bayonne, N.J	222	48	40	----------	Y–15	6–1	1,5,11	1	Y–1–Y–N	N	Y–	--------	--------
Bellflower, Calif (contracts for police service, Los Angeles County).	------	----	----	----------	------	------	----------	----	----------	--------	--------	--------	--------
Berwyn, Ill	62	5	40	6,242– 7,290	Y–1	6–1	1,11	----	Y–2–Y–N	Y–Y	None	426	426
Bethlehem, Pa	120	11	40	4,600– 6,200	Y–4	6–2	1,4,6,10,11	3	Y–3–Y–N	N	None	721	791
Billings, Mont	78	7	40	5,148– 6,744	N	1–1	1,6,11	1	None	N	None	459	536
Binghamton, N.Y	149	13	40	5,650– 6,450	Y–1	5–2	1,3,4,6,8,10,11	2	Y–1–N–N	Y–Y	None	985	1,056
Bloomington, Minn	55	3	40	6,336– 7,716	Y–1	5–5	1,2,4,5,9,11	N	Y–1–N–N	N	None	105	490
Boise City, Idaho	102	14	40	4,896– 5,484	N	6–2	1,3,6,10,11	N	None	Y–Y	None	517	615
Boulder, Colo	70	7	40	5,364– 6,468	N	1–5	1,2,6,11	N	Y– –N–N	N	None	346	434

COMMEMORATION OF FINLAND'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, on December 6, 1967, Finland will celebrate 50 years of independence. Few peoples have so diligently earned their independence; fewer still have done so much with it.

Finland today boasts a modern economy, largely private, which produces products of excellence renowned throughout the world and supports an enviable standard of living for the Finnish people. Extremes of poverty have been all but abolished, while an advanced social system insures that those needs fundamental to the dignity of the individual are fully met. But most importantly, this economic and social progress has been carried out in a free society by a representative government freely elected by democratic means.

Finland is a comparatively small country of slightly over 4½ million people, yet it is widely known and admired in the United States. Those of us from the North Central American States are particularly fortunate in having as friends and neighbors many persons of Finnish extraction. Our fathers saw their fathers arrive and out of a wilderness of forests and lakes reminiscent of their native Finland, create what are today thriving and industrious American communities. From Longfellow's epic poem "Hiawatha," greatly indebted to the Finnish national epic "Kalevala"—KAL'-a-val-a—to the bold and imaginative architecture of the Dulles International Airport on the periphery of this city, Americans are grateful for Finnish contributions to American society and culture.

There is a Finnish word "sisu"—SEE'-soo—which, roughly translated, connotes a combination of courage and perseverance. We Americans have had occasion to observe these qualities of courage and perseverance in the Finnish nation through years of adversity as well as years of progress. In a world filled with unrest, they offer a lesson to all peoples.

I therefore believe, Mr. President, that it is fitting that we today, in recognition of the long ties of respect and friendship which exist between Finland and the United States, take this opportunity to convey to the people and the Parliament of Finland our best wishes on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Finland.

Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], I submit a concurrent resolution to observe the 50th anniversary of the Republic of Finland, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, the concurrent resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 49) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 49

Whereas the year 1967 marks the Fiftieth Anniversary of the independence of Finland; and

Whereas these fifty years have been marked by close ties of friendship and association between Finland and the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), that the Congress of the United States extends it congratulations and best wishes to the Parliament of Finland on the occasion of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the independence of Finland and in affirmation of the affection and friendship of the people of the United States for the people of Finland.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 423

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to H.R. 12080, and ask that it be printed and referred to the appropriate committee.

This amendment would remove an inflexible, arbitrary requirement as to the notice requirement for termination of coverage of old-age, survivors, and disability insurance, and instead provide the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare with some measure of discretion in termination cases.

This amendment would improve the administration of the social security laws, and I urge its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 423) was referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 424 AND 425

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, two amendments to H.R. 12080, the omnibus social security and welfare bill which is now pending in the Senate Finance Committee. The first provides for a 20-percent across-the-board increase in retirement benefits, for raising the minimum old-age benefit to $100 a month, and for financing these increases out of a limited general revenue contribution to begin in 1972. It is cosponsored by Senators CLARK, HART, INOUYE, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, MCGEE, MCGOVERN, MONDALE, MONTOYA, MORSE, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and YARBOROUGH. The second is a comprehensive series of amendments to the public assistance portion of the bill, which would remove the restrictive provisions recently enacted by the House. It is cosponsored by all the Senators mentioned a moment ago, plus Senator PELL, and minus Senator MONTOYA. I have prepared a memorandum explaining the amendments, as well as two others which I introduced last week regarding title XIX—medicaid—and I ask unanimous consent that this memorandum be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

I. SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, the reason for the first proposal is simple: our social security system has grown extensively over the years—so that 95 million people are now insured and 23 million receive benefits—but we have not yet succeeded in lifting millions of older Americans into a retirement of security and self-respect.

The 12½-percent increase in retirement benefits enacted by the House would barely get beneficiaries back to the level of real income they had in 1954. The two increases of 7 percent each which we enacted in 1958 and 1965 actually fell short of restoring the 1954 purchasing power of benefits—for the cost of living has risen about 25 percent since that time. Thus four-fifths of the increase which the House provided would be used up just to get back to 1954 levels. Meanwhile, wages have risen above 50 percent in those 13 years. The wealth of our Nation has steadily increased, but our older citizens have not shared in that affluence. Instead, many elderly couples retire each year—into a life of poverty.

We in Congress must share the responsibility for the inadequacy of retirement benefits. The plan I propose is feasible. It would raise benefits substantially at a cost we can afford. I am assured by officials of the Social Security Administration that it is in long-range actuarial balance. It would not result in any contribution from general revenues until January 1, 1972, and even then the contribution would be only 11 percent of the total financing of the social security system.

We have an obligation to our retired citizens, some 5 to 7 million of whom live in poverty. And no wonder—last year social security benefits averaged $84 a month—just $1,000 a year for individuals, and $142 a month; $1,704 annually, for couples. Passage of this amendment is the least we can do to begin to alleviate the difficulties of our elderly fellow citizens. It is a modified version of legislation which I introduced in the 89th Congress, and reintroduced earlier this year.

The latter bill, S. 1009, which was cosponsored by 10 Senators of both parties, would provide benefit increases averaging over 50 percent, and would finance these increases by a gradual infusion of general revenues. It envisioned a levelling off of the general revenue contribution at 35 percent of the costs of social security by the late 1970's.

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

But we must do everything that can feasibly be done for our older citizens. We could do more than the House provided, and we could do it equitably if we began a partial changeover to general revenue financing.

The payroll tax is scheduled under present law to increase to 4.85 percent each on employer and employee in 1973, plus a contribution for health insurance. The House bill would raise that to 5 percent each, plus 0.65 percent each for health insurance. But a tax on payrolls is highly regressive. For low-wage employees particularly, a required contribution beyond that contemplated in the House bill would be very burdensome. Many workers already pay more in payroll taxes than they do in income taxes.

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

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

I propose that the across-the-board increase in benefits be raised to 20 percent. I propose, in addition, that the minimum benefit be raised to $100 a month, $150 for couples. These proposals combined would produce an average benefit increase of 29 percent.

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

The increases in the contribution and benefit base are no more than what the Administration proposed in H.R. 5710, except that the $10,800 figure would go into effect 3 years earlier than the Administration proposed. This is substantially less than was proposed in S. 1009, under which the base would have risen to $15,000 on January 1, 1971.

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

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

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

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

S. 1009 contained a number of other proposals for the liberalizing and updating of the social security system, but I include only two of the most important in the amendment I introduce today.

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

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

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

II. PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

My second amendment is a comprehensive set of proposals which would reverse most of the public welfare restrictions enacted by the House of Representatives. The amendments to our public assistance program which the House enacted will not help, in my judgment, to solve the crisis in employment which grips the ghettos of our cities and the most impoverished of our rural areas. They will not help us to lighten the increasing fiscal burden of public assistance in any constructive way. Public money might be saved, but only because people badly in need of assistance would be eliminated from the welfare rolls without having anywhere else to turn. In short, the House proposals seem to punish the poor because they are there and we have not been able to do anything about them. But if this is our approach, they will still be there when we are done. And the problem will be no closer to solution.

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

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

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

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

For the people of the inner city live today with an unemployment rate far worse than the rest of the Nation knew during the depth of the great depression. In the typical big city ghetto, only two out of five adult men have jobs which pay $60 a week or more—enough for each member of a family of four to eat 70 cents' worth of food a day. Only half the adult men have full-time jobs at any rate of pay. Less than three out of five have any work at all.

We must, then, work out a system to provide jobs. But I do not believe that the approach adopted in the House bill will provide these jobs. The fact is, as the alarming unemployment and underemployment figures I have mentioned indicate, that there are not enough jobs available at the moment. We must find them, but in the meantime, it will not do to force people into training programs for jobs that are not there.

This is the basic problem which we must look to. For this problem welfare is neither the cause nor the remedy. But welfare has its role: helping those in need—and the House bill will hinder it in fulfilling that role. Indeed, instead of helping at all, it almost appears intended to punish the poor. And punish it will, particularly in areas of the country where welfare authorities have done their best to demean and degrade the recipient of welfare even under existing law.

First, the House bill says that no State may have a higher percentage of children on welfare than it had at the beginning of this year. This would force States and localities either to deny additional aid when more children are born into a family or to come up somehow with the money needed to pay the dif-

ference. The latter, of course, would shift the burden from the level of government that can best afford it to the one that can least afford it. But the more prevalent result will not be more local money for welfare, but more families cut off welfare even though they are in need. For the House bill, with all of the other restrictions on eligibility which it contains, is an open invitation to welfare departments in some areas of our country to find ways to tidy up their caseloads and discourage new applications.

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

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

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

We in the Senate must go on record as opposing this almshouse approach. We must go on record as forcefully as we can that this is not the direction which we want welfare to take. We must not allow this backward step.

What I propose, therefore, is a package of public assistance amendments that would eliminate the most objectionable features of the House bill: the arbitrary freeze on payments under the aid to dependent children program, the blanket compulsions on mothers and children to work, and the restrictions on assistance available to children of unemployed fathers. It contains a number of other proposals as well, and these are explained in the memorandum which appears at the close of my remarks.

This comprehensive package of amendments is in large part supported by the administration. It consists of most of the public assistance amendments which the administration has suggested to the Finance Committee; I have added in addition a number of other proposals which I believe should also be adopted if the punitive features of the House bill are to be neutralized.

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

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

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

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

I believe our welfare system is unsatisfactory because it causes welfare recipients to lose a dollar of benefits for every dollar they earn. The House bill does provide a small work incentive—$30 a month plus one-third of additional earnings. But this incentive is so small that it may well fail to encourage significant numbers of welfare recipients to work, and opponents of the idea may then succeed in claiming it will never work. My amendment provides a work incentive of $85 a month, plus one-half of additional earnings. That is a more realistic level, and should result in thousands of welfare recipients being encouraged to work.

Mr. President, if the proposals I make today are not adopted in large measure by the committee or by the Senate when the bill reaches the floor, I shall move to strike title II—the public assistance provisions—from the bill. The House bill provides useful new programs in day care and in work training, but does so in a context which invites serious abuse in some parts of our country. There is no question, in my judgment, that adoption of the provisions suggested by the House of Representatives would be a great step backward and I will act accordingly when this measure reaches the floor. For we must have the perspective to see that the welfare system is not something that exists by itself, that has no effect on the world in which its recipients live. We cannot afford to bury our heads in the sand. Our Nation has been ripped apart this summer by violence and civil disorders that have taken dozens of lives and caused billions of dollars of property damage. We face in our cities the gravest domestic crisis to confront this Nation since the Civil War. We are not going to solve that crisis by lopping people off the welfare rolls. We are not going to solve that crisis by forcing welfare recipients to accept training for jobs when we have absolutely no idea whether jobs will be available to them after their training. We are not going to solve that crisis by punishing the poor and hoping that they will bear that punishment silently, invisibly, graciously, without bitterness or hostility for their "benefactors."

The amendment I introduced today would reverse the punitive approach adopted by the House in title II of H.R. 12080, and put us back on the road toward developing the system for which the President's Advisory Council called "a nationwide comprehensive program of public assistance based upon a single criterion: need."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendments (Nos. 424 and 425) were referred to the Committee on Finance.

EXHIBIT 1

MEMORANDUM: AMENDMENTS OF SENATOR ROBERT F. KENNEDY TO H.R. 12080

I. SOCIAL SECURITY

Under this amendment, benefits would be increased 20 percent across the board instead of the 12½% which the House enacted. The minimum benefit would be raised to $100 a month, $150 for couples. A cost-of-living provision would be added to the law, and benefits for uninsured elderly people would be raised to $50 a month, $75 for couples. The contribution and benefit base would be raised to $8400 next January and $10,800 on January 1, 1971. The long-run financing for the increases in benefits would come from a limited general revenue contribution—11 percent of the total financing of the social security system—beginning January 1, 1972. This would be a cost of $4.5 billion a year beginning 4½ years from now.

The 12½% increase in retirement benefits enacted by the House would just barely get beneficiaries back to the level of real income which they had in 1954. The two increases of 7 percent which were enacted in 1958 and 1965 actually fell short of restoring the 1954 purchasing power of benefits—for the cost of living has risen about 25% since that time. Thus four-fifths of the increase which the House provided would be used up just to get back to 1954 levels. Meanwhile, wages have risen about 50 percent in those 13 years.

The increase proposed in this amendment is more realistic than the House bill. The financing proposed is feasible. Officials of the

Social Security Administration indicate that it is in long-range actuarial balance.

II. PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

This amendment is a series of amendments to Title II of H.R. 12080. Their purpose is to eliminate the most objectionable features of the House bill: the arbitrary freeze on payments under the Aid to Dependent Children Program, the blanket compulsions on mothers and children to work, and the restrictions on assistance available to children of unemployed parents.

This comprehensive package of amendments is in large part supported by the Administration. It consists of nearly all of the public assistance amendments which the Administration has suggested to the Finance Committee, as well as a number of other proposals which should also be adopted if the restrictive features of the House bill are to be fully neutralized.

A more detailed analysis follows. Paragraphs 1 through 12 are the Administration's proposals, except (1) the $100 million figure in paragraph 1 is more responsive to the need than the $60 million which the Administration proposed; (2) the $85 figure in paragraph 2 will create a greater incentive to work than the $50 which the Administration proposed; and (3) the portion of paragraph 7 relating to the elimination of vendor payments was not proposed by the Administration. Paragraphs 13 through 15 are additional proposals developed after consultation with independent experts.

1. Meeting full need.—Present law requires States to establish public assistance needs standards but does not require that payments meet the need in full. The amendment would: (1) require States to meet full need as reflected in their own standards; (2) require the standards to be at least as high as they were in January 1967; (3) require standards to be updated on July 1, 1968, and reviewed annually and modified with significant changes in the cost of living; and (4) provide an authorization of $100 million in fiscal years 1970 and 1971 to help States with special fiscal problems meet the new requirements.

2. Earned income exemptions.—The House bill requires States to allow AFDC recipients 16 and over an earned income exemption of the first $30 monthly earnings plus one-third of additional earnings. The amendment proposes: (1) to increase the exemption to $85 monthly plus one-half of additional earnings, and (2) to extend this same exemption to the aged and permanently and totally disabled.

3. Work Training.—The House bill requires States to establish community work and training programs (with 75% Federal matching) for virtually all appropriate AFDC adults and children over 16 not attending school full-time. In lieu of the House work training provisions, the amendment provides those proposed in H.R. 5710. This proposal would authorize the Secretary of Labor to provide work and training programs for AFDC recipients over 16. Funds for these programs would be transferred from public assistance appropriations. If the Secretary of Labor does not operate a program, or finds it impractical to do so throughout a State, programs could be set up by the State welfare agency. The Federal Government would pay 90% of the cost of training, supplies and material. The proposal also provides for training incentive payments of up to $20 a week for trainees, and project grants for needy persons ineligible for AFDC.

Present law requires that appropriate arrangements be provided for the care and protection of a child while his parent is participating in a work training program "in order to assure that such absence and work will not be inimical to the welfare of the child." The House bill omits the clause containing the word "inimical." The amendment restores it. No cost is involved.

4. Mandatory work training.—In the House bill, work training is mandatory both on the State and on the individual: The state must provide work training, and the AFDC recipient must accept it (unless she has good cause) or face the loss of assistance. The amendment recognizes the requirement that work training be offered in all parts of the State with significant numbers of AFDC recipients, but provides that acceptance of training not be mandatory on AFDC mothers. With such positive features of the bill as the availability of work training, training incentive payments, day care, and earned income exemptions, AFDC mothers do not have to be compelled to undergo training.

Along the same lines, the plan required by the House bill for each AFDC family should be truly comprehensive and not aimed solely at employment.

5. Limitation on Federal participation in AFDC.—The House bill requires that the rate of child dependency due to the absence of a parent be frozen as of January 1967 for purposes of Federal matching beginning January 1968. The amendment would delete this limitation.

6. Definition of unemployed parent under AFDC.—The House bill sets a Federal definition of unemployment. The amendment would delete these two limitations on the definition in the House bill: (1) the exclusion of fathers who have received any unemployment compensation during the month and (2) the exclusion of fathers who have had little or no connection with the labor force. The House bill associated no significant savings to these limitations since they involve relatively few persons; hence there is no significant cost in their reinstatement.

7. Protective and vendors payments.—The House bill requires all States to have a program of protective payments and vendor payments, which can be used in those relatively few cases of demonstrated, fiscal irresponsibility. The present law limits the existing provision to 5 percent of the cases. The House provision is appropriate insofar as it relates to protective payments, but the provision for vendor payments is unprecedented and invites coercion and abuse of recipients. Even as to protective payments, a State should be limited in their use to prevent abuse. The limit, however, might be raised from 5% to 10%, and the amendment would accomplish this. Since this provision concerns the method of payment rather than the amount, it would involve no significant cost or savings.

8. Emergency Assistance.—The House bill allows the State a large measure of flexibility in an emergency situation by providing 50% Federal matching or emergency assistance to children and their families for up to 30 days in a 12 month period. The provision in the House bill is an excellent one, but the time period is too limited. Emergency assistance should be available for up to 120 days, and the Federal share should be increased to 75%.

9. Migratory workers—The amendment would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to make project grants for temporary assistance to migratory workers and their families. The assistance would be limited to 60 days duration and would be consistent with assistance payments in that State.

10. Repatriated United States Nationals—Legislation originally enacted in 1961 authorized HEW to provide temporary assistance and care to United States citizens who have been returned to this country because of destitution, illness, war or similar crises and who are without resources. Since 1961, the program has assisted repatriates from two countries involved in such crises—Cuba and the Dominican Republic. The present authorization expires by June 30, 1968. The authorization for this small but significant program should be made permanent.

11. Public assistance demonstration grants—Five years ago, the Congress established a program under the Social Security Act to support demonstration grants in the area of public assistance. The program has a $2 million limitation under present law. The House bill increases this limit to $4 million. The amendment contemplates an increase in the authorization to $10 million in 1968 and $25 million thereafter.

12. Home repairs—The House bill provides 50% Federal matching to meet the cost (up to $500) of repairing the home of an assistance recipient if the home cannot be occupied and if the cost of rent would exceed the cost of repairs. This provision may prove a useful tool in allowing some recipients to remain in their own homes. Unfortunately, the House bill excludes AFDC recipients from this provision. The amendment would remove this exclusion. Since this provision can only be used if a higher rental is involved, there will be no additional cost.

13. Cooperation with the Courts in Cases of Desertion, Support, and Neglect—The Administration amendments do not touch a most dangerous section of H.R. 12080 beginning on line 7 of p. 109 insofar as coercion, threat, and intimidation of mothers is concerned. The mandate to report cases of neglect, abuse, or exploitation among AFDC families to the courts is an invitation to a double standard (especially in the light of the House Committee report and recent lower court actions as in Prince Georges County, Maryland) and acts primarily as a threat and deterrent to applications. The mandate to determine paternity of illegitimate children and seek paternal support likewise operates as a threat, deterrent, and ready excuse for discriminatory terminations. To the extent that these steps are practical at all, they are now taken. Thus this legislation will certainly be interpreted by some states as open invitation to purge their rolls of unacceptable (Negro) mothers of illegitimate children. The amendment therefore deletes all of the language which has the effect of putting the welfare department into the police and law enforcement business.

14. Exansion of AFDC-UP—The amendment would make the program for children of unemployed fathers a mandatory provision in the state plan, and extend it to children of underemployed fathers as well. Underemployment as used in the bill is intended to cover situations where the earnings of a father of a child or children otherwise eligible for assistance under Title II of H.R. 12080 and the laws it amends are insufficient, together with other resources available to the family to meet the definition of minimum need established for public assistance purposes by the State.

15. Child Welfare and Day Care Standards—The language of the bill is ambiguous on the point of whether child welfare services (including day care) furnished to AFDC recipients or potential recipients are to be governed by the same standards regarding licensing of institutions and similar matters governing now under Title V Part 3 and incorporated by H.R. 12080 into Title IV as Part B. The amendment clarifies the situation.

16. Day Care Facilities—The amendment authorizes $50 million a year for five years to aid in the construction and renovation of facilities to provide the day care services that are authorized elsewhere in the bill.

III. SHELTER COST AMENDMENT TO MEDICAID

This amendment contemplates variations in the income levels of eligibility within a State based on differences in shelter costs within a State. Studies have shown that shelter costs are the most significant variable in the cost of living as between urban and rural areas. The cost of rent and home purchase in rural areas is far less than in the cities. An income of $5,000 a year therefore buys far more in rural areas than it does in the city. As a result, there is no real need that eligi-

bility levels for Medicaid be as high in the rural areas of New York State as they are in its large cities, and this amendment would require the States to take variations in shelter costs into account when they determine eligibility levels. Officials at the Department of Health, Education and Welfare assisted in the drafting of this amendment, and indicated that it is feasible and workable.

This amendment would alleviate what has become a near-crisis situation in New York State. In some of our rural counties 75 to 80 percent of the population is eligible for Medicaid under the income eligibility levels which the State established. In these counties, welfare costs have skyrocketed over the past eighteen months. Increases of 50% and 60% in the cost of welfare are common, and 90% or more of the increases are due to the cost of Medicaid. Under this amendment, the State would objectively determine differences in shelter costs around the State, and would accordingly establish differences in eligibility levels. The result would be decreases of as much as 20% in eligibility levels in some of the counties which are the hardest pressed at the present time. A further result would be that Medicaid would come closer to being a program which in fact serves only those who need it.

IV. AMENDMENT REGULATING COSTS AND UTILIZATION OF SERVICES UNDER MEDICAID

This amendment would allow far more stringent regulations of the costs of hospital care and physician services than exists at the present time. It would also require the States to establish procedures to safeguard against unnecessary utilization of care and services. Medical costs have risen greatly in the past year and a half, and it is no accident that this has occurred since Medicare and Medicaid have been in effect. Many of these costs are unavoidable, of course, as nurses and other personnel finally begin to receive a living wage for their work. And the costs of materials and supplies have risen. But in some areas of our country, unfortunately, there are some physicians who and some institutions which have literally reaped bonanzas from these programs. A newspaper report recently, for example, indicated that in California 1200 physicians have received $83 million in the last eighteen months in reimbursement under Medi-Cal, that State's Title XIX program, an average of $70,000 for each physician.

In New York State, the physicians' fees paid under Medicaid have increased substantially over the past year. Fees for office visits to general practitioners and specialists have more than doubled. If these fees, as well as the reimbursement to hospitals and nursing homes, were regulated under this amendment, the fiscal pinch which many counties in New York have felt as a result of Medicaid would be substantially alleviated.

The amendment would operate as follows: for in-patient care, it would limit payments to hospitals and nursing homes to the amount paid for comparable services by either the Blue Cross Plan in the area or Title XVIII, whichever is less. At the same time, it would provide incentive payments for the efficient operation of hospitals and nursing homes based upon their demonstrated ability to develop new management procedures and discharge patients promptly. For out-patient care, the amendment directs that an out-patient visit be defined and that it must include seeing a physician, and it limits payments to a hospital for an out-patient visit to a ceiling of 18% of the per diem payment for in-patient care. For payments for the services of physicians and other professionals, the amendment directs that fee schedules shall be based upon the average level of fees charged in the county or metropolitan area over the ten years previous to the adoption of the plan. The amendment would allow the development of special reimbursement methods for group practice plans.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2573) to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to charter an Economic Opportunity Corporation to encourage the participation of private enterprise in the effort to rebuild urban slums and eliminate poverty in the United States.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2572) to establish a Domestic Development Bank to assist in the development of employment and business opportunities in certain urban and rural areas.

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

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] be added as cosponsors of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 47) relative to the establishment of a United Nations peacekeeping force.

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

VIETNAM—HOW NOT TO UTILIZE AIRPOWER

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, only 1 percent of sorties flown in 1966 against North Vietnam by Air Force and Navy pilots were against targets recommended by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

There follows additional testimony to this end given before the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee last August 29 by Maj. Gen. Gilbert L. Meyers, U.S. Air Force, retired.

The testimony speaks for itself and I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

TESTIMONY BY MAJ. GEN. GILBERT L. MEYERS, U.S. AIR FORCE, RETIRED, BEFORE PREPAREDNESS INVESTIGATING SUBCOMMITTEE, AUGUST 29, 1967

ONLY 1 PERCENT OF SORTIES IN 1966 AGAINST JCS TARGETS

Mr. KENDALL. We have in the record already the fact that less than 1 percent of the total sorties flown during 1966 were flown against JCS-designated targets, and that most of the remaining sorties were against pressure points in the armed recce role.

Let me ask you whether or not, in your opinion as an expert in this field, that is efficient use of our airpower?

General MEYERS. No; not in my judgment, and I have participated in three wars. I have also been involved in planning interdiction programs in three wars. Obviously the most effective, most remunerative targets in North Vietnam, of course, were not struck. They generally consisted of the 97 targets that we discussed earlier; namely, the ports, the bridges, the ferries, and various targets of this nature which North Vietnam had, and was using in its LOC system.

Of course, some of these targets were given to us over a period of time, but when you attack them over a period of time I repeat, you lose the impact that accrues when a series of targets are destroyed at one time. Our present approach provides the enemy an opportunity to, as I have said, to put his resources in position to repair in the shortest possible time. He has organized 500,000 troops to make repairs on his lines of communications. This took some doing. It was not done overnight. But we provided him with the time to do this sort of thing, which obviously reduced the effectiveness of our air campaign.

PROPOSED CHANGES IN THE FEDERAL BUDGET

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Economy of the Joint Economic Committee in Government will start hearings next week on the report of the President's Commission on Budget Concepts.

The report calls for far-reaching changes in the Federal budget to improve public understanding of the economic impact of Federal spending.

The Commission has made extensive proposals for revision of the present budget format. It has recommended that the confusing three-budget system now used by the Federal Government be replaced by a single comprehensive budget designed to give the public a better picture of the full range and effect of Federal financial activity and the Congress a better grip on these operations.

This is a proposal of major significance to the economy. The Federal budget, after all, is crucial in measuring the impact of Federal spending on the economy. If the Commission's proposals were adopted, the result would be a budget drastically different from the one to which we have become accustomed.

Because of the overriding importance of the Commission's report, the Subcommittee on Economy in Government intends to explore the Commission proposals in great detail.

We will hear on Tuesday, October 31, from Mr. David M. Kennedy, chairman of the board of the Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co., of Chicago and Chairman of the Commission on Budget Concepts, along with senior members of his staff.

On November 2, we will hear from Mr. Maurice Stans, former Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. William Capron, former Assistant Director of the Budget Bureau, and Prof. Herbert Stein of the Brookings Institution, one of the country's leading fiscal economists.

The subcommittee will hear later from the administration as well as from other expert witnesses when they have had more time to evaluate the report in detail.

MARINETTE, WIS., LOSES A TOP-NOTCH MAYOR

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, sitting astride the hot seat at the top of a local government is one of the most difficult and thankless jobs a man can be called upon to do. And one of the ablest of the men I have known who willingly took on that task is Ed Woleske, the mayor of the city of Marinette, Wis., and a dear friend of mine. After sitting on the hot seat for 6 years, however, Ed Woleske has decided to step down. Marinette is the loser because of that decision. There are those in Marinette who are trying to convince Mayor Woleske to change his mind. Needless to say, many of us are hoping they succeed. But if they do not the man who succeeds Mayor Woleske will have the solid foundation of accomplishment of the past 6 years to build on. Ed Woleske was a mayor with matchless energy who used it with great wisdom and imagination.

I ask unanimous consent that a recent article from the Marinette Eagle-Star and an editorial, both dealing with Ed Woleske's decision to resign, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Marinette (Wis.) Eagle-Star, Sept. 7, 1967]

MARINETTE SHOULD BID TO HOLD WOLESKE

We respect Mayor Edward Woleske's decision to resign so that he can accept a much better paying position in federal service. As he has pointed out, he has a young family whose welfare he must think of in a situation which these days stresses increased financial competence. We respect his decision but we don't think the Marinette City Council and the responsible citizens of this community should accept it without trying to make it worth his consideration to continue as mayor.

At least five very good reasons support this conclusion:

1. His background is that of a businessman and he has 27 years of experience in municipal government, eight of them as the city's chief executive.

2. He is a doer. Woleske has overcome some rather formidable problems in city administration, including improvement of the water and sewage systems and speedy repair of extensive damage resulting from a flood soon after he became mayor.

3. He knows his way around in the confusing maze of federal and state financial assistance programs and has won for the city a number of grants, including one under which a new fire station was erected. He was wise in withdrawing from an urban renewal plan when it became apparent that it would not work out to the city's advantage.

4. Marinette has a thriving Industrial Park and those who have been close to its development frankly admit that it would not have become a reality without the mayor's vigorous support. He sent city crews to clear away the brush on a factory site and convinced one of the initial tenants there that the city was cooperative. He established a drainage system which left the industries there undisturbed by heavy rains and flood conditions. He expanded the water and sewage capacity to cope with industrial needs.

Additional expansion of the water supply and pressure is in progress and it will include a new water tower and increasing the height of the existing tower in City Park. He has provided surfaced roads and a railroad spur to serve the industrial area.

We do not wish to convey the impression that Mayor Woleske was singlehandedly responsible for all of these improvements. He himself was the first to acknowledge in tendering his resignation the help of the council, other city officials and many public spirited citizens. It is, nevertheless, an inescapable fact that he was the leader and the prime mover in accomplishing many of these projects. He should, therefore, receive a generous measure of credit for increasing the city's tax base and improving its general economic well being along with increasing employment.

5. He has courage, not only to face up to formidable problems but to resist the pressures which threaten to interfere with the city's progress. The Menekaunee Bridge has been a bottleneck and a hazard to transportation for many years and he, with the support of his city council, has refused makeshift repairs to put it back in service. The result remains in doubt but the objective of building a more serviceable full-capacity bridge to replace the existing crippled structure never will receive stronger advocacy than Woleske has given it.

The mayor has stuck his neck way out in the purchase and wrecking of the former Hotel Marinette. A city executive with less courage and vision could have let the corner go to an unfortunate development. He has undergirded financially and otherwise the Marinette Downtown Development Corporation's efforts to convert it into a showplace with practical functions to serve this community and its guests.

This strategic corner at the moment is an unsightly hole in the ground but it isn't going to stay that way if the foresight of Woleske and MDDC prevails. We believe that the strongest insurance that it will prevail is to keep him on the job as mayor.

If Woleske has gathered the impression from the foregoing paragraphs that we're trying to make it tough for him to leave we don't deny it. We concede that other able men in the community could handle the job with credit to themselves and their fellow citizens. But Woleske has been shaped to the office and he has filled it to date with distinction.

The Eagle-Star hasn't always agreed with Mayor Woleske and if he should be persuaded to keep the office we may disagree with him again, perhaps even oppose him in some matters. But we think his leadership overall has been good.

We urge the city council and responsible citizens to confer with him at the earliest opportunity to determine what consideration would persuade him to stay in office. Obviously it would require a substantial increase in pay. For the reasons given and many others which might be mentioned, we think he is worth it.

[From the Marinette (Wis.) Eagle-Star, Sept. 6, 1967]

WOLESKE RESIGNS POST AS MAYOR—ANNOUNCES HE PLANS TO TAKE FEDERAL DUTIES—EFFECTIVE DATE SET AT DECEMBER 15

Mayor Edward Woleske informed the Marinette City Council Tuesday night that he is resigning his post as the head of the city government effective Dec. 15.

The mayor's decision to quit the post he has held since the city returned to the mayor-council form of government in 1961 came as a surprise to the aldermen. They were informed of the resignation just prior to their 8 p.m. council session.

Although Mayor Woleske will not vacate his position officially until mid-December, he announced that the Tuesday night council meeting would be his last. He announced his intention to utilize unused vacation time accumulated over the past five years and, in effect, would leave his post about Sept. 13.

However, Woleske assured councilmen that he would assist in completing many of the projects which now are pending. He also said he would assist with the preparation of the 1968 municipal budget.

The mayor's formal letter of resignation was read to the council by Sharon Johnson, deputy city clerk. It was the first word of the stunning news for most of the department heads and spectators in the audience.

"The economic factors involved" and "a generous offer" from his future employer were listed by Mayor Woleske as the prime reasons for ending a career in municipal government which began with his election as fifth ward alderman in 1940.

Both in the letter to the council and in a lengthy statement following its reading, he declined to disclose the nature of his new employment. However, he indicated that he had been offered an appointment to a federal government position and that his new job would require him to leave Marinette.

"This didn't come by haste," Mayor Woleske assured the aldermen. "It required a deep amount of thought on the part of myself and my family."

Four of the mayor's children were present.

He cited the increase in the city's evaluation from $28 million in 1961 to more than $36 million today as in indication of the community's progress in recent years. He pointed out that the growth has not been confined to industry noting that Marinette has built four new schools in the past five years as an example.

He reminded aldermen that the progress was accomplished with an increase of only $1 million in the city's indebtedness including schools and that the indebtedness incurred by the water utility was not a direct obligation of the city.

"It was with your cooperation and your vision that things have changed for the good," Woleske told the councilmen. He also praised the heads of city departments for their loyalty to him and their dedication to the welfare of the community.

Also singled out for commendation were the more than 70 citizens who serve without compensation as members of various city boards and commissions. And he praised the civic clubs, labor groups, chamber of commerce and other community organizations for their interest and participation in city affairs.

"That's what's making Marinette," Mayor Woleske declared in his brief but highly emotional remarks. And he added a special commendation to George S. Robbins, secretary of Marinette Area Chamber of Commerce, whom he described as "a dedicated man."

Turning to pending affairs, the mayor discussed the long negotiations which he said will culminate in construction of a five-story Holiday Inn motel on the site of the former Marinette Downtowner.

He told the aldermen that failure of the Holiday Inn board to approve the contract between the developer and operator of the motor inn had stymied progress on the project in July. He revealed that lack of sufficient parking facilities appears to be the final obstacle to be overcome before construction of the new facilities becomes a reality.

The mayor informed the council that land already procured for the project would provide for only 119 cars. Space must be provided for 160, he said.

"To buy the additional land would be too costly," he stated. He revealed that he had held a special meeting with the aldermen at which it was agreed to expand the parking lot at the rear of Stephenson Public Library to make the added parking space available.

According to Woleske, the parking facilities would be leased for use by the motor inn from 5 p.m. to 8 a.m. It would be available for public use during the daytime shopping hours.

Because expansion of the library lot will require filling in of a portion of the Menominee River, permission of the Army Corps

of Engineers must be obtained, he said. The council authorized an application for the authority. The mayor said this action along with an agreement to lease the expanded lot to the motel operator "will be enough at this point to get the show on the road."

"My resignation is not to be misconstrued as my having weakened or being fearful of any problem facing Marinette," he added. He declared that his firm stand on the Menekaunee Bridge problem had not changed and that he intended to testify in behalf of the city against claims filed by Moke H. Adams.

"It's Marinette I have at heart and I will be here to protect your interests," he declared. He added a call for more citizens to play an active role in city government.

Woleske re-emphasized that his decision to leave the mayor's office and the community was a matter of economics. He added that he and his family always would be "100 per cent for Marinette" and that all of its members had enjoyed working for the betterment of the community.

"I think this news is a sad occasion for the people of Marinette," was the response of Louis W. Staudenmaier, president of Stephenson National Bank, first of those present to respond. He said he was unaware the salary being offered by the mayor's new employer but whatever it be, "you are worth more to the City of Marinette."

George Robbins, chamber secretary called on the council to "do whatever we need to do to continue the present administration."

William Hansen, president of the council, read letters from Marinette Area Industrial Development Corporation urging the council to take whatever steps might be necessary to persuade the mayor to remain at his post.

"In the best interest of the City of Marinette, I believe that something should be done immediately to retain Edward Woleske as mayor," E. D. Bargren, MAIDC president wrote. He credited the cooperation of the mayor and council for the "fine progress" made by the city in recent years. He called upon the council to offer a substantial increase in the mayor's compensation.

Charles Goldberg, president of the development corporation, wrote: "If salary remuneration should be the prime consideration involved in the acceptance of a federal governmental position, we urge the city council to consider doing whatever may be necessary from a salary standpoint to retain Mayor Woleske."

Several of the aldermen also added their commendations and councilmen voted unanimously to refer the matter to the personnel and finance committees.

CHINA-WATCHERS DISCOUNT PEKING AS A THREAT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President—

The Administration's present effort to portray Communist China as an aggressive, expansionist power posed to sweep across Asia is widely considered by the community of Far East experts here to be inaccurate, misleading and, perhaps most important, potentially detrimental to future United States policies in the Orient.

This telling sentence begins a story in this morning's Washington Post by Stanley Karnow.

Writing from Hong Kong, where he has spent many years, Mr. Karnow notes that Asian experts see China not as a "menacing colossus" but as a poor and backward country focusing on its own critical domestic problems. He questions the administration's presumption "that a huge population represents strength." He characterizes the thesis that "China has failed to overrun Southeast Asia because we are there resisting aggression" as a gross misinterpretation of Peking's revolutionary dynamics which, in fact, emphasize that revolutionaries must pursue their own struggles and stress self-reliance as the key to Communist victory.

In this connection, Mr. Karnow observes that the most active revolutions in the Far East have strongly resisted satellization by China." And he remarks that the record shows that Asian communism is most successful where it is identified with nationalism and not solely inspired by Peking.

Mr. President, I commend Mr. Karnow's article to the attention of my fellow Senators and ask unanimous consent that it be included in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 25, 1967]

CHINA-WATCHERS DISCOUNT PEKING AS A THREAT

(By Stanley Karnow)

HONG KONG, October 24.—The Administration's present effort to portray Communist China as an aggressive, expansionist power posed to sweep across Asia is widely considered by the community of Far East experts here to be inaccurate, misleading and, perhaps most important, potentially detrimental to future United States policies in the Orient.

As analysts here see it, China is scarcely the menacing colossus described by Vice President Hubert Humphrey, Secretary of State Dean Rusk and others, but rather a poor, backward country primarily focused on its own critical domestic problems and desperately seeking strategists to hasten its lagging development.

With a century of foreign domination and humiliation behind them, moreover, the Chinese are justifiably or fancifully persuaded that they are being encircled by the United States and the Soviet Union.

FEAR BRINGS BLUSTER

This fear, coupled with an awareness of their weakness, has prompted Peking to bluster belligerently while behaving with extreme caution—very much the way superstitious Chinese beat drums and explode firecrackers to scare off ghosts and spirits they wouldn't dream of fighting.

Therefore, specialists here submit, the Administration is committing the serious error of exaggerating China's intentions and capabilities at a time when it might better be preparing American public opinion for the possibility of a rapprochement with the more pragmatic Chinese leaders who may follow Mao Tse-tung's crumbling dynasty.

One shortcoming in the Administration line, implied in Rusk's prediction of a billion Chinese in the coming decades, is the presumption that a huge population represents strength. In reality, people are China's greatest liability, weighing heavily as they do on the country's marginal food resources.

To suggest that the Chinese might spill into Southeast Asia in quest of food is, in the opinion of the Hong Kong experts, an outmoded, 19th Century-type geopolitical notion. The total rice surplus of Southeast Asia is only about 4 million tons—hardly worth the cost of a military operation, much less the trouble of an occupation.

At the same time, the thesis advanced by Humphrey that "China has failed to overrun Southeast Asia because we are there resisting aggression" is also regarded by analysts here to be a gross misinterpretation of Peking's revolutionary dynamics.

There is no doubt that the Chinese Communists, publicizing their own experience as the model, are urging activists in Asia, Africa and Latin America to initiate "wars of national liberation." And in a relatively modest manner they are encouraging these activists with money, weapons and moral support.

Peking has repeatedly emphasized, however, that revolutionaries in other lands must pursue their own struggles. Indeed, the concept of "people's war" as defined by Mao's chief adjutant, Lin Piao, is war fought by peoples themselves. At a reception for the President of Mauretania in Peking last night, Premier Chou En-lai similarly stressed that "self-reliance" is the key to communist victory.

DUAL CONVICTION

That theory is underpinned by Peking's dual conviction that deteriorating economic and social conditions in underdeveloped countries will inevitably make them ripe for revolution, and that the United States cannot realistically become engaged in several Vietnams concurrently.

Consistent with this doctrine, the Chinese have limited their military thrusts to situations involving their national interests rather than their revolutionary aspirations.

They conquered Tibet, probed Quemoy and Matsu, grabbed a disputed piece of the Indian border, and intervened in Korea after United Nations troops crossed the 38th Parallel. But they have prudently avoided committing more than measured aid and unrestrained rhetoric to so-called "wars of national liberation" in Laos, Thailand, Burma and Vietnam.

Despite Humphrey's claim that "militant aggressive Asian communism" has its headquarters in Peking, moreover, evidence points to the fact that the most active revolutionaries in the Far East at present, the North Vietnamese and Vietcong, have very strongly resisted satellization by China.

LITTLE VIETMINH AID

The record shows, too, that Asian communism has scored most significantly where it has been identified with nationalism, and not where it has solely been inspired by Peking. The Vietminh beat the French with only a modicum of Chinese help. Chinese propaganda has done little to fortify Communist insurgents in Burma, Borneo or India.

There also is a good deal of doubt among analysts here that China's growing atomic arsenal will necessarily make Peking more threatening, as Dean Rusk recently asserted.

For one thing, these experts indicate, China's arithmetical nuclear progress is being outstripped by geometric American and Soviet strides. It is believed, consequently, that the Chinese realize that they would get the worst of an atomic exchange with either the United States or the Soviet Union.

These experts also calculate that in the years ahead, as China strives to modernize its weaponry, Peking's future leaders are apt to be increasingly concerned about the vulnerability of their painfully built industries.

In contrast to the Administration's warnings against Chinese might, several specialists here paradoxically contend that the real danger to the United States lies in China's prolonged weakness.

As their argument goes, a continuation of the turmoil that has convulsed China over the past year might eventually tempt both American and Soviet intervention, just as the break-up of Chinese empires throughout history was attended by foreign penetration.

American intervention on the Chinese mainland would plainly be the road to nowhere. So the prevailing view among Hong Kong's Far East analysts is that the Administration may gain more from toning down its alarmist talk about the perils of Peking, and perhaps join with Singapore Premier Lee Kuan Yew in praying, as he did in New York yesterday, for a modern, prosperous China.

DOES ASIA FEAR RED APOCALYPSE?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, one of the things which bears on what I have just been stating, dealing with the question of to what extent Asia is concerned about Chinese aggression, was skillfully handled in a recent column by Clayton Fritchey, entitled "Does Asia Fear Red Apocalypse?" in which he comes to the conclusion that the Asian nations are not half as afraid of China as we are.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Fritchey's article may appear 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:

DOES ASIA FEAR RED APOCALYPSE?

(By Clayton Fritchey)

Secretary of State Dean Rusk now denies raising the specter of the "Yellow Peril" in defending the Vietnam war as a means of containing China, but his rebuttal is, to put it politely, as careless and wide of the mark as his press conference statement of last week.

In that statement he foresaw a future Asia perilously balanced between "a billion Chinese, armed with nuclear weapons," and a billion non-Communists looking to the U.S. for help in saving themselves from Red China. "They don't want China to overrun them on the basis of world revolution", Rusk said.

The State Department's principal spokesman now explains that Rusk was only giving voice to the fear that Asia itself feels over the supposed menace of "militant" Chinese communism. The secretary was just "calling attention to the concern of the free nations of Asia, and the concerns their leaders have expressed in similar terms about their long-term security."

If there is any evidence to support the proposition that most Asian leaders share Rusk's apocalyptic view of the future, it is not in the public domain. This contention is as unfounded as Rusk's claim that Asia supports our conduct of the Vietnam war, and our containment policy in general.

With the exception of three small client states (Thailand, South Korea, South Vietnam) nearly all Asian mainland nations disagree with U.S. policy in the area, both as it relates to the war and our three-alarm assessment of future Chinese intentions.

This is significantly true of the nations that border on China: India, Pakistan, Nepal, Russia, Burma, Laos, North Vietnam. They would be the most vulnerable to Chinese aggression, but their leaders are not "expressing" themselves in "similar terms" to Rusk. Quite the contrary.

Although India has to depend on American wheat to stave off mass starvation, Prime Minister Indira Gandhi has flatly rejected the Johnson Vietnam policy. She calls the war a "brutal and tragic conflict." On Oct. 6, India's Defense Minister told the United Nations there should be an "unconditional ending of the bombing of North Vietnam." On the same day, Prince Souvanna Phouma, premier of Laos, warned that prolonging the war might lead to the "disappearance of all the small nations of the area."

In Pakistan (a SEATO ally of the U.S.) President Ayub says, "There is no danger to the subcontinent from China provided no uncalled-for provocation is aimed against that country." The government of Nepal strongly supports U Thant, the Burmese secretary-general of the U.N., in calling on the U.S. to stop bombing North Vietnam.

Russia, locked in a bitter struggle with Peking, would have the most to gain from a Chinese setback, but it obviously thinks the Vietnam escalation is neither good policy nor good containment. It apparently rates the Yankee Peril ahead of the yellow one.

To the east, the Japanese government, deeply beholden to the U.S., keeps a civil tongue in its face, but meanwhile quietly promotes trade and cultural relations with China. Japanese polls show 75 percent of the people against Johnson's Vietnam policy.

Even Indonesia, after one of the greatest Communist purges in history, is against us. Ambassador R. Nugroho says U.S. bombing is hindering peace negotiations, and warns that it may trigger a nuclear world war. Finally, although the United States makes much of its supposed obligations under SEATO, none of the other major signatories (Britain, France, Pakistan) are with us in Vietnam.

There is the record. China may be haunting Rusk, but clearly not Asia. It also may be that Rusk understands Asia better than most of the foreign ministers of that area put together. And finally it may be that the United States has a duty to intervene and help these nations against China whether they want to be helped or not.

This destiny, however, is not manifest to the East. Even the administration's great friend, Lee Kuan Yew, the prime minister of Singapore, who has been visiting the White House this week, has said, "The Americans don't understand the overseas Chinese. They don't understand the Vietnamese. That is why it is such a mess . . ."

COMMEMORATION OF RECEIVING OF THE LAW BY JEWISH COMMUNITIES

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on Friday Jewish communities around the world will commemorate the receiving of the Jewish law. Like their brothers in other nations, many Jews in the Soviet Union will come together to rejoice in remembering the event which is at the center of their history. Yet for Soviet Jews that celebration will be to some degree a hollow one, for it will represent an increasingly rare expression of their communal life, undertaken against the pressure of severe restrictions on their existence as Jews.

So it is a fitting time for all men committed to the protection of human rights and dignity to reiterate their alarm at the Soviet policy of cultural starvation which is pinching so much of the life out of Soviet Jewry. Evidence is abundant that this policy persists and that it gravely threatens the future of the Jewish community. Alone among nationalities represented in the Soviet Union, Jews are forbidden those educational and cultural activities and institutions which permit the preservation and enjoyment of a common heritage. Alone among the religions represented in the Soviet Union, the Jews are forbidden both access to seminaries for the training of clergy and nationwide organizations of their congregations and religious leaders. Prohibited from publishing even the Bible and prayerbooks, lacking a daily or weekly newspaper, without representation in the curriculum of any university, without general access to any volumes of Jewish history in any language, discriminated against in higher education and employment, Soviet Jews must mount a constant struggle against the quiet forces of cultural annihilation by attrition. And the struggle must be carried on in an atmosphere thick with the fear which comes from knowing that the synagogues themselves are laced with networks of informers, and that the antisemitism of the general public is frequently and easily inflamed.

Such hardships cannot fail to cause anguish among all men who value the basic human right to discover and exercise one's own identity in the light of his religious and national heritage.

The Jewish community in the Soviet Union represents the last major segment of the huge culturally and spiritually rich East European Jewish community which was decimated under Hitler. On Friday those Jews and others throughout the world will celebrate the receiving of the moral law which is at the heart of their history. In response, let all of us pay heed to the moral law which is binding on all men, and urge the Soviet Union to free its Jews to celebrate their heritage in peace and in hope.

THE PLIGHT OF SOVIET JEWRY

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, in the winter of 1966, I paid an extended visit to the Soviet Union, and in addition to the other purposes of my trip, I saw for myself the unhappy plight of the many Jews who live there. I reported my impressions in the May 1967, issue of the National Jewish Monthly. Because today is the eve of the Jewish holiday of Simchath Torah, which for the past 3 years has seen an outpouring of Soviet Jewish youth to the synagogues and the streets outside to express their fervent desires to uphold the religion of their forefathers, I believe it is appropriate to invite to the attention of the Senate the unfortunate situation of Soviet Jewry as I saw it. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that my article in the National Jewish Monthly be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATOR VISITS JEWS IN THE U.S.S.R.

(By Senator JOSEPH D. TYDINGS)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Joseph D. Tydings has been U.S. Senator from Maryland since January, 1965. The son of the late Sen. Millard E. Tydings and grandson of Ambassador Joseph E. Davies, he was a close friend of the late President John F. Kennedy. He has been a delegate to several international conferences, is chairman of two Senate subcommittees, and before he entered the Senate he was active in the Baltimore Junior Chamber of Commerce, YMCA, and other civic agencies.

(Senator Tydings spent 10 days in the Soviet Union as a representative of the Senate Judiciary Committee. Between his official appointments he explored the status of Soviet Jewry as described in this article.

(During his talks with Soviet officials, the Senator interceded on behalf of two American Jewish families with relatives in the Soviet Union. Recently, Soviet Ambassador Dobrynin in Washington informed him that both cases had been successfully resolved: permission was granted for the mother of a Baltimore family to emigrate from the Soviet Union, and another family has been reunited through the location of a missing relative.)

"Is not peace, in the last analysis, a matter of human rights?" President John F. Kennedy once asked rhetorically. This is the fundamental truth of our epoch, and those

of us who are morally obligated to search out every avenue to reduce internal tensions are compelled to focus upon the state of human rights everywhere, for therein often lie the irritants that can lead to national and international strife and violence.

A principal purpose of my mission to the U.S.S.R last winter was aimed at making some small contribution to the promotion of greater understanding between our two powerful countries, and to the removal of those frictions that spark suspicions and conflict. It was in this context that I took it upon myself—in addition to my other duties—to visit synagogues in the Soviet Union, for the condition of Jewry in any country is frequently a measure of the human rights standard of that country. What I found was not encouraging.

My first stop of any duration was in Tbilisi, the capital of the Republic of Georgia, between the Black and Caspian Seas. It was there that I made my first effort to see a synagogue: It was frustrating there—and at other Soviet cities. The conversation with my Intourist guide, Gela, went like this:

"Is there a synagogue in town?"

"Well, yes, there is, but not very many people go to it any more."

I asked, "Why is that?"

"Well, we are just not a very religious people. We think it's an outmoded pattern of cultural behavior."

"Is the synagogue right in the city?"

"Yes."

"Can we stop by and take a look?"

"Well, if you really want to, perhaps we can. But there is nothing there of interest to see. It's a part of town that is somewhat run down, and all of the interesting things we had planned for this morning will take all our time."

After I insisted, Gela finally shrugged and we drove to a street that followed the Kura River. We obviously were leaving the central, more modern part of the city and turning into a much older section.

The synagogue was an imposing structure that looked as though at one time it had been a building of some grandeur. It was meticulously clean on the inside—obviously well cared for—and sunlight streamed in the windows into the main room of worship, creating a very pleasant and cheerful atmosphere. There were small groups of people standing around and sitting or reading in the pews. It must have been about 10:00 a.m. I asked for the rabbi, but was told he had been ill for about two weeks and unable to participate in any of the functions of the synagogue. How old was he? Sixty. Was there any other rabbi in Tbilisi? No.

By this time most of the questions were being fielded by a comparatively young man of about 40. He wore a very attractively-decorated skull-cap—little beaded designs of white upon black. The rest of the circle was comprised of men in their 60's and 70's, plus one or two who looked ancient. The latter were some of the most magnificent looking individuals I have ever seen. Long white beards, wire-rimmed glasses, and in appearance the very epitome of wisdom and experience. Virtually everyone held a prayer book. The books appeared very old and much used—not tattered, but gradually worn by many years of careful handling.

"Who conducts the services when the rabbi isn't able to do so?" "I do," the younger member of the assemblage responded. "Do you have any formal training in leading the services?" "No, but I am the synagogue's ritual slaughter, and as such I am as close as anyone to the position of the rabbi." "Do many of the young people come to worship?" "A few, but most of the congregation is older." "Why is that?" The young fellow shrugged his shoulders.

"What are you going to do when your rabbi is so old that he can no longer lead the services?" "We shall have to get another rabbi." "Is there anyone in training for the rabbi's position?" "Yes." "Who?" "Well, I don't know." "Is there a seminary where young people who want to study to be rabbis can go and be trained?" "Yes, in Moscow." Most of the people present were listening very intently. "And how do you know that there are in fact people studying to be rabbis in Moscow?" "I have been told that." "Are there any persons from Tbilisi studying in Moscow to be rabbis?"

There was a slight pause, and the younger fellow turned and talked to the members of the congregation surrounding him. There was a discussion for a few moments, then he turned back and said, "No one that we know of." "You don't have anybody in mind, then, that you can turn to if and when your rabbi becomes so old that he is not able to continue his duties here?" "No," the young man said, and looked at the floor.

The lengthy exchange was warm and friendly and we left with the impression that the Georgian Jews were carrying on because of deep devotion to their religious convictions, and "making do" with what they have in a not altogether sympathetic climate for religious activity. But the religious climate in Georgia was much better than elsewhere in the USSR.

The saddest part of the encounter in Tbilisi was the hopeless look on the people's faces when asked what they would do after the present rabbi passed away—the only one in the capital of Georgia. It was clear that they did not know what they were going to do, that there would be no rabbi to replace him. I wondered, as we drove away, whether our visit had done any good. I suspected that everything that had happened would be carefully reported back to the Soviet officials and I hoped that the fact that a non-Jewish American official had been concerned about the plight of the Jews in Tbilisi might give Russian officialdom some pause.

From Tbilisi I flew to Tashkent in Uzbekistan, about a thousand miles to the east. Tashkent is a city of over a million people, which the Soviets have tried to make the show-place of Central Asia. Upon my arrival, late on a November Sunday evening, I told our Intourist guide, an Uzbek of about 30 years of age, whose name was Lufthala, that we wanted to visit some of the mosques and synagogues in Tashkent while we were there. His immediate reply was, "Well, I don't know whether we can visit any of the synagogues. We shall be very, very busy while you are here, and I'm not sure that any of the synagogues are active any more. However, there are some mosques that we can take a look at."

We let the matter rest there. The next morning, however, when I sat down to confirm the arrangements for interviews with high-ranking Soviet officials that had been made prior to our arrival, I re-emphasized to both Lufthala and the head of Tashkent's Intourist Bureau that I wanted to take a look at the synagogues. "We shall see," was the answer.

EXCUSES, EXCUSES, EXCUSES

We set out for our previously scheduled interviews. Throughout the day I would ask Lufthala periodically, "We have 30 minutes now, can we go by the synagogue?" The excuses were numerous. First, Lufthala claimed he didn't know where the synagogues were. After being directed to find out, he said, "Well, we know where they are, but they are not open today. There are no services going on there now." "Why don't we just drive by and take a look from the outside and see if there happens to be someone there." "Well," Lufthala shrugged his shoulders, "we could do that, if you want to, but I think it's not a very good idea. It's in a part of the city that was heavily damaged by the earthquake and we are not supposed to go there." "Can't you drive in that part of the city? Is it impossible to walk through the streets there?" "Well, no." "Then let's go." "Well, there isn't time between now and the next appointment." "All right, then, we'll go after the appointment." "We shall see," Lufthala responded.

Finally, after a day and a half of verbal jockeying, I flatly told him that I wanted to go to a synagogue, and *right away*. We drove through the streets of Tashkent in stony silence. It was in the very late afternoon, and a slight drizzle was falling slowly. The weather seemed to match the mood inside the car. We had left the shiny new central part of the city that the Russians have built in the last 20 years, and were now winding our way through narrow streets lined by clay-walled houses, many of which had been badly damaged by the recent earthquakes. On street corners old Moslem Uzbeks in their *tubiteikas* were gathered in clusters of two and three. Ours was the only car in the streets. The driver stopped in front of a small alley.

We got out and started to walk down the unlighted passage which was perhaps 8 feet wide and lined with about an inch of mud. On either side were hovels even more depressing than the ones that lined the streets. Most of the walls were made of mud. There were some shacks that had tin siding. I wondered how they could have withstood the earthquakes. Finally, after about a hundred yards, we came into a small courtyard.

On one side, there was a small frame building painted pale blue. From the Star of David over the doorway, we could see that this was the Synagogue. We went inside. It consisted of a single room perhaps 20 or 25 feet square. The building was badly run down, but inside there was an air of opulence because of the rich tapestries and rugs that hung on the walls or were draped over the *bima* in the center of the room. There was a pot-bellied stove in one corner. As we came in, it was evident that a service was under way. There were only 10 or 12 people present, most of whom appeared to be in their 70's or 80's. Once again I was struck by the magnificent features of the old men, with their long beards and the wrinkles of the ages on their brows.

Our entry disrupted everything. We stood for a moment a bit ill at ease. Finally, the old man who had been leading the service came over to us. I shook hands with a few people and then began inquiring about their circumstances. Was the fellow who had been leading the service a rabbi? No. Did they have a rabbi? No; they had had one until a few months before, but he had to go to a larger synagogue in another city, where the rabbi had died. Was anyone in Tashkent in training to be a rabbi? Not that they knew of. They understood that the Yeshiva in Moscow was training rabbis, but they did not know of anyone from Tashkent who was studying there. What about the congregation; did many people come to worship at the synagogue? Not very many any more, was the answer. Only the old people came. How young was the youngest person who came? Perhaps 40. What would happen when the generation that was present in the synagogue today passed on? Would there be anyone to carry on the traditions and the faith? There was no answer.

Did they do anything to teach their children the Jewish faith? Yes, they did. There were no schools for that, but they gather their young children informally and try to educate them in some small way in their religion and language. How often did these informal gatherings take place? Every day for an hour or so in the afternoon; there were usually 25 or 30 children in attendance, and sometimes more. How many synagogues were there in Tashkent? Four; this was the largest. I thought to myself that this could not possibly be the largest, but later, when I had seen a second one, I could believe it.

The rabbi who had left recently to go to the other synagogue was a new one; his predecessor had died. In Tashkent now, they

said, there were two rabbis for the four synagogues, but both were old and sometimes sick and did not come to lead the services very often.

THE SAME OLD STORY AGAIN

Did the Jews have any publications in Tashkent? No, there were no Hebrew or Yiddish language periodicals in the city. Why don't the young people study more, or why don't they attend services in the synagogue? They did not know, was the answer. Do they have any source for new prayer books? No, all the prayer books they had were old ones.

Could they send anyone outside the country, say to Israel, for training to be a rabbi? They did not know. They said that they were Bukhara, or Oriental Jews, and that no Bukhara Jews immigrated to Israel. Did any European Jews go to Israel for rabbinical training? They did not know.

We left the synagogue in silence, and headed back toward the main part of town. Lufthala was very unhappy. I now demanded that we go to one of the European synagogues. He said, "I only know where one of them is, and it's closed. It has been condemned because of earthquake damage. There have not been any services there for several weeks." "Take us there," I said.

We changed our course. After some weaving through the city, we wound up on a bumpy unpaved road, again lined with mud-walled hovels. We finally reached the right neighborhood. It was difficult in the car to locate the precise address we had been given, so we got out and walked up and down the muddy street, and I could feel the dampness seeping into my shoes. By this time, night had fallen and it was pitch dark. There were no lights in the street and very few in the buildings on either side. We used the headlights of the car to guide us. Finally, we came to an unmarked gate in a wall. We knocked, and a gatekeeper admitted us.

The synagogue was behind the wall, facing on a courtyard. We walked over to the building. It had received a considerable amount of earthquake damage; by looking through the dirty windows one could see huge cracks in the plaster walls. It was very difficult to see much of what was inside.

"Is there a rabbi around?" I asked. "No," the gatekeeper said. "There is no one around. No one has been to worship here since the earthquake." "Before the earthquake, did many people come?" "Not very many, but people came regularly every day."

We took another look through the windows. We could see the Star of David and the Menorah painted on the *hima*. Sadly, I turned and walked back to the muddy street.

VISIT TO MOSCOW SYNAGOGUE

Moscow was my next stop. Having benefited from the agonizing experiences in Tbilisi and Tashkent in attempting to see the synagogues, I decided the best procedure was not to ask but simply to go, accompanied by foreign service officers from our Embassy. We decided to take an Intourist driver, however, so that the report of our visit would be sure to reach appropriate ears. We drove to the principal synagogue in Moscow, on a comparatively nice street. It is a rather imposing building, sand-colored in appearance, perhaps made of some sort of stucco material. There is a long flight of steps leading up to the main entrance. We walked into a dimly-lit corridor.

To the right there was a lot of chanting and activity. We went into a large room, perhaps 60 feet long and about 40 feet wide, where a service was being conducted. This was on Friday, at 9:30 or 10:00 a.m. There were perhaps 50 worshippers in the room. They were well-dressed, but all old men. There was no one in the room whom I could identify as being under 50, and most were obviously in their 60's and 70's with gray or white hair, and long beards.

We stood for a moment before we were recognized by anyone, then a couple of the worshipers in the back rows came over to ask us what we wanted. We inquired first if the rabbi was there. No, they said; he was away "resting." Was there a school at which the young were taught the tenets of Judaism? There was no school as such, one of the people volunteered, and the young were taught mainly on an individual basis. Did the congregation have enough prayer books? After exchanging glances and words with each other, they noted that there were some prayer books, but that they could use more. What would happen when the rabbi at the synagogue died? The single word, "Yeshiva," was spoken. Are there any people in training to be rabbis at the Yeshiva? The question was not answered.

At this point a comparatively younger man of about 45 or 50 came up and said he was the president of the congregation; if we had any further questions to ask, he would answer them for us. He invited us into his office. Meanwhile, the small circle of people who had been around us began drifting away. In the president's smallish office, he delivered a long speech welcoming us, saying how privileged the synagogue was to have an official visitor from the United States.

I returned to my previous inquiries. What will happen when the rabbi dies? That will be no problem, was the ready answer; there is a seminary in Moscow, a Yeshiva to train new rabbis. Were there any students at the Yeshiva now? Yes. How many? There are 12 students there now, he answered, and arrangements are being made for many more. (All of this was simple fabrication, I subsequently learned from our Embassy.) This synagogue, the president continued, is the largest in Moscow, and the congregation has a number of recruits or possible candidates for the seminary.

DISTRUSTS SOME ANSWERS

I turned to other questions. "Do you have bar mitzvahs?" "People prepare for this at home and not in Jewish schools." "How many of the congregation were at the recent celebration of Simchath Torah?"

"Very difficult to say," the president responded. "Perhaps as many as 30,000; there were at least 15,000. All the young people were here," and then he emphasized, "they were all in *perfect* order. There was no disorder, no rioting." Then, as though we didn't believe him, he continued, "This was even announced abroad, including the numbers of people who were here. It was reported in your own press."

"Is it possible to obtain kosher meat?" "Yes, we prepare our own meat. We have enough." "What about matzoth?"

At this point, with a very pleased look on his face, the president turned around and whipped out a notebook in which there were a number of photographs encased in plastic envelopes, in the best salesman's display technique. "Of course, we have enough matzoth. Here," he said, pointing to a couple of the pictures, "these are pictures of our own rabbi baking the matzoth for the congregation. We do it every year."

"How many new prayer books do you need?" I asked. "Well, there is no great shortage of prayer books," was the answer. "We have placed an order for 10,000." "When were they ordered?" "Not long ago. The problem is in getting them run off. They are already being put in type." (The fact is that the promise to print more prayer books was made over two years ago and it has yet to be kept.)

SEES CULTURE THROTTLED

I decided to inquire about schools or classes in the native tongue of the Jews—Yiddish. "Other nationalities in the USSR have their own schools; do Jews?"

"No," the president responded. "The parents themselves do not want a Yiddish school. The regular schools are free and the parents want the best education they can have for their children. They want them to go on to the schools of higher education and to become professional people, and the quality of education would not be as good if there were a Yiddish school, so no one wants it." There was silence for a moment. The president then shifted back to religion. "The government here allows perfect freedom of religion. All who want to pray, come and pray. Indeed, the situation is so open and free that the rabbi from the synagogue here was invited to the Kremlin not long ago. That shows the status of religion in the Soviet Union."

It was useless—this robot-like response. But the reality of the situation spoke louder than the apologetics. In terms of culture, no schools in Yiddish or Hebrew, and but a single periodical (*Sovietish Heimland*) to keep alive a rich tradition that as late as 1946–47 was still comparatively healthy. With reference to religion, as my own experience showed, the situation is even more poignant. Today, there are but 62 synagogues left in the Soviet Union—some 400 having been shut down since a decade ago. With a somewhat smaller number of rabbis, whose average age is 65–70 years, and a Yeshiva virtually closed (I was advised that it has but one or two students) the immediate future of Judaism in the USSR borders on the abyss.

The tragedy is that these throttling circumstances should not and need not be. For the Soviet Constitution and ideology purport to provide guarantees of national and religious rights. Uniquely, they are observed in the breach so far so far as Jews are concerned. This is the kind or irritant that needs to be removed if we are to attain that type of mutual understanding for which our peoples long.

THE FUTURE OF AVIATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MONRONEY

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, at the October 13, 1967, convention of the Association of Local Transport Airlines, the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] delivered a noteworthy speech in which he took a look at the future of aviation.

Probably no other Member of this body knows as much as the senior Senator from Oklahoma knows about aviation. He has had and, I am sure, will continue to have an important hand in this fast changing, fast developing industry.

In his Boston speech, he painted an exciting picture of the future of aviation, but, as he pointed out, it is a picture requiring bold, imaginative strokes if it is to live up to its potential.

Senator MONRONEY outlined a number of major problems which must be solved if the aviation industry is to take full advantage of changes in technology.

Senator MONRONEY's speech should be read by anyone interested in the future of aviation, in particular, and of the transportation industry in general. I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS OF SENATOR A. S. MIKE MONRONEY BEFORE THE ASSOCIATION OF LOCAL TRANSPORT AIRLINES, BOSTON, MASS., OCTOBER 13, 1967

Twenty-three months ago I had the pleasure of joining ALTA at Houston. I spoke to you about the past, present and future of the local service industry as it then appeared. I find myself now reporting back to you that history has done well by my predictions. The Golden Age which was then dawning for

the local service carriers is becoming a reality.

At Houston I said you should strive to maintain the highest level of service possible and attain the independence to operate a successful and profitable enterprise. You are rapidly reaching that goal.

Passengers reached an all-time high of almost *17 million* in the twelve months ended June 30, 1967, up 37% from 1965. Revenue passenger miles reached *3.9 billion*, up 48% over 1965.

The quality of your service has been dramatically modernized with pure jet and jet prop aircraft replacing older, obsolete equipment.

This magnificent growth has been achieved with declining support from the federal government in terms of subsidy payments. Subsidy for the twelve months ended June 30, 1967, was down more than $10 million from 1965's level of $66 million. Subsidy declined to 14.8% of total operating revenues as compared with 22.7% in 1965.

In an age when subsidy has become a permanent part of certain other industries, I believe that the air transportation industry should be applauded for its cooperation with the CAB in finding ways to reduce subsidy need drastically. I urge the carriers and the Board to continue their efforts in this direction. But I would caution that we not take subsidy away so fast that the carriers find themselves in deep economic trouble during 1967 and 1968 when the carriers introduce large volumes of new service with new equipment. Profits frequently are tempered during such a period. I am confident that the CAB will administer its subsidy reduction program wisely during this transition period.

Equipment upgrading, schedule improvement and new promotional fares are yielding a multitude of benefits for your customers. I am impressed with the aggressive attitude being shown by the management of the carriers. You are, indeed, moving in the very direction which I urged two years ago.

Equipment is being improved at a rapid rate. The CAB's route policy is rapidly providing economic strengthening for the carriers. I wish to take this opportunity to express Congress' appreciation to the CAB for a positive, active role in promoting a larger role for the local carriers. The CAB's efforts on your behalf are producing a reduction in your dependence on federal subsidy, while vastly encouraged by the CAB's open-mindedness in awarding you authority in markets which a few years ago were the sole preserve of the grandfather carriers, and by its continuing efforts to modify its procedures so you will not have to wait until 1975 to share the wealth of our current travel boom.

The policy has been possible in large part because of the dynamic growth pattern of the air transport industry. *American economic growth is without doubt the significant factor for the airline industry.* It produces a continuing demand and need for more and better air service.

The nation has grown tremendously since the original certification of local service carriers 20 years ago. Our population reached almost 200 million persons by 1966, with a gross national product of $740 billion compared to only $234 billion in 1947.

In September 1965 the CAB issued a 10-year forecast of revenue passenger miles for the scheduled domestic operations of the trunklines for the years 1965 through 1975. For 1975 the forecast reflected a range between 84.4 and 118.9 billion RPM's.

The CAB recently released an updated 10-year forecast for 1968 through 1977. It is significant that the 1975 range as estimated in this forecast is for a low of 132 billion to a high of 197 billion revenue passenger miles. This compares with an estimated *70 billion* to be generated in 1967. The new CAB forecast for 1971 is approximately the same level as that originally forecast for 1975. *The industry, therefore, would appear to be four years ahead in reaching the estimates made just two years ago.*

At Houston I urged that you re-examine the way in which small marginal points can be served with new, small twin-engine aircraft, either through actual operation by local service carriers or by contractual agreement with air taxis. Two of your membership have moved in this direction. West Coast has launched an experiment with light, twin aircraft in the far northwest. Allegheny has recently devised a program which appears to be a "responsible replacement" by an established air taxi at Hagerstown, Maryland. Through such experimentation we should learn much about the ways of providing improved service at these small marginal points while reducing the economic burden.

At Houston I also urged the carriers to consider mergers as a means of providing the greater area, strength and resources which you will need. The accomplished merger of Frontier and Central, the proposed merger of Bonanza, Pacific and West Coast, and the consolidation of certain of the Alaskan carriers, are evidence that this trend is growing.

This change is also reflected in various efforts to label yourselves more in harmony with the job which you are doing. Whether the designation of your class of carrier should be "regional", or "regional trunk", or some other designation, the important thing is that we all recognize that the role which you should fulfill is *regional in character*, without being encumbered by unnecessary restrictions.

In my opinion, you should have equal stature with our trunklines within your service area, since the service you can and will render should be of equal, or better quality. But whatever label is used, do not forget your obligation to serve the smaller marginal points, and be sure that *all* service which you provide does credit to your name.

Now I would like to discuss aviation and the problems that will confront the industry in the 70's—a short time away when you consider the tremendous lead time inherent in reaching solutions. I think it is essential to start long-range thinking *now* in order to identify the problems that will arise by 1975. Of course, many of the problems facing aviation today will still be with us in 1975. The only difference will be the degree of magnification. There will also be entirely new sets of difficulties with which to cope. But basically they deal with the spectacular growth in the air travel market.

The lead time required to initiate and implement solutions to the technical and sociological problems of our transportation system is increasing. So to begin now to formulate solutions is not a minute too early. There is always a technological lead time. But I think the lead time problem which will be more serious is that required to get our government institutions prepared to handle air transportation problems effectively, efficiently and fairly.

Beginning in the 1950's and continuing on a much greater scale through the 1960's, private industry, the government and our educational institutions have joined in a cooperative effort to solve the problems of modern America. Industry has been responsible for amazing technological advances and, through the systems approach perfected by the aerospace industry, has placed a major role in bringing the benefits of modern technology to every American.

The government has helped greatly by providing a major share of the money needed to fund these technological advances. Government has, through its regulatory function, exercised a restraining influence where unfair competition or aggressive pursuit of profit threatened to destroy the transportation industry. It has been an impetus to advancement where the short-range profit motive of the private enterprise system deterred actions which were in the long-range interest of the public, as well as private industry.

Our educational institutions have provided the impartial, intellectual objectivity which has given important guidance to the direction of our private and public endeavors.

Having served as a legislator during the past two decades—when advances in aviation technology made many of our legislative solutions out-moded and obsolete before the printer's ink was dry—I know that the developments in the 80's and 90's will present greater challenges to the representative branch of government.

Before discussing some of the inevitable problems of air transportation, I think we must make some basic assumptions as to what the technology will be in 1975 and what our society will be like. I will take technology first, because the research and development work which has been done in this decade has *already* determined what the technology will be. And what the Congress does now, for example on the SST and on airports, will determine the extent to which technology will alleviate or aggravate the sociological and governmental problems caused by aviation's rapid progress.

For example in the past few weeks we have read the announcement of the retirement by the Cunard Line of the Queen Mary and the Queen Elizabeth. This marked the passing of an era of transportation over the main line routes of the sea. From here on the role of the ship in passenger service will undoubtedly be that of a floating deluxe hotel.

In my own state—and in yours undoubtedly—you have seen the crack trains of the past reduced by 50 to 75 per cent because the passengers—like those who formerly sailed the Queens—just naturally prefer to travel by air. We are seeing—I believe—even the bus falling prey to the tourist jet or at least the supplemental jet. And the family car is too slow to carry us great distances and thus waste days on our treasured vacation tours. And on top of that we are too spoiled by four hours to Los Angeles to spend four or five days to make the same trip by car. And besides that, it is actually cheaper and safer to fly.

Thus, instead of being the tiny brother of the transportation family, air transport has become the major means of moving people everywhere—except those going for short distances. Thus the problem is more complex because we are talking about almost all transportation of persons—and soon an ever-increasing amount of cargo as well that can travel faster, better and in certain cases cheaper than by train, barge or truck.

Let's look at what has happened in the meantime to aviation. For more than a score of years aviation survived essentially on one all-purpose airplane—the venerable and respected DC-3. It is still flying, although it has retired from the general purpose field to the specialized field of short haul air transportation. Nobody has found a substitute for it to this day. Gradually we moved into longer haul and larger planes—designed for different loads and various stage lengths.

In 1975 we will be in an era of highly specialized aircraft designed for specific transportation purposes. There will be twin-engine air buses for use on medium haul routes which will carry 250 to 300 passengers. The Boeing 747 jumbo jet will have been in operation for five years hauling up to 500 passengers at the cheaper and conservative subsonic speeds on the long haul high density routes. In all probability Lockheed will have a civilian version of the C-5A both for cargo and for extra cheap tourist fares for people. The Concorde will already have been operating on the international trans-oceanic routes at Mach 2 and, hopefully the U.S. SST will be ready for its inaugural flight.

With respect to short-haul transportation in high density markets, the Civil Aero-

nautics Board's investigation of V/TOL, V/STOL and STOL service in the Northeast corridor will long since have been completed by 1975. I commend the Board for launching this far-sighted investigation into the aviation needs of the future.

In the short-haul high-density markets on the East coast and West coast, and in other selective markets, there will be V/STOL aircraft operating to haul the business traveler, whose time is valuable enough to pay for this premium transportation, from city center to city center. They will be operating off short, inexpensive 1000-foot or less runways near the city center or, in places like New York and San Francisco, right off the wharves or from roofs of special terminal buildings.

I doubt that the economics of V/STOL aircraft will have been refined to the point where they can be operated profitably at a low enough fare to attract the average passenger. They will, however, probably be in use for specialized purposes where price is not the determining consideration. The operational problems of the V/TOL will largely be solved and with continued improvements in power plants the prospects for economic break-throughs by the late 80's and early 90's will be good.

We will not see the resurrection of the dead, but a transfiguration of the railroad into a new trim body, for on the ground there will be high speed surface transportation through the high density and far-flung population corridors of the megalopolis. The work being done now by the Department of Transportation will be successful, I believe, and in those parts of the country where high speed surface transportation is available, the competitive impact on the short-haul air trips will be severe.

By 1975 we will have begun actual planning of the first breed of hypersonic aircraft made of boron filament material, using hydrogen fuel, and designed to fly at speeds of 6000 miles per hour at an altitude of 150,000 feet with a range of better than 10,000 miles. But where will the hypersonic fit into the aviation activities of the 80's when SST's and large subsonics are plying the airways of the world? What will its civilian uses be? What are the commercial prospects of the hypersonic? We know it will be technically feasible to construct the hypersonic. We need to state clearly now why we should build it and the purposes for which it will be used.

And will it be able to earn its own living against the slower SST's? Its ultimate cost, of which I shall say more later, may be far more a determining factor than the cost of the SST. And I keep asking myself where will the customers come from—or—go to?

Active research will be underway on a nuclear-powered, subsonic aircraft weighing one to one and one-half million pounds capable of carrying 500,000 pounds of cargo half way around the world.

The introduction of laminar flow control on production aircraft to reduce drag substantially will be eminent, as will engines with by-pass ratios of ten to one.

From the socio-economic standpoint, massive changes of great consequence will occur. Our cities will be much larger, but different in nature. They will extend across state boundaries connected by a series of contiguous smaller, self-sufficient communities. The political problems of jurisdiction will not have been solved and they will still be in desperate need of new sources of revenue.

By 1975 the gross national product will be $1.3 trillion! The population will probably be in excess of 225 million people, over half under the age of 25. Just think of the millions of teenagers who will be begging their parents for a new fuel cell automobile.

There will be more leisure time. Disposable income available for leisure activities will be $80 billion—more than double that available today. Travel will become the great hobby of the American people.

If you will concede these basic assumptions, let us now get into the future problems of air transportation. First, let's look at it from the standpoint of the *airlines* and the *aircraft manufacturers*. *What difficulties* will they encounter in providing air transportation which will move one passenger or one ton of cargo from point X to Y in the fastest, most convenient and most economical manner?

For both the airlines and the manufacturers, financing will continue to be a major problem. For the manufacturer, his cost of production will run into the billions of dollars. The SST will require almost $5 billion from private and public sources before the first production model is delivered.

The technical director of IATA has estimated that the peak investment required for production of a hypersonic may be $20–$25 billion. This represents by way of comparison the total overseas income of the United Kingdom. It is four times its defense budget and twice the gross annual trading profits of all companies in the United Kingdom.

How does the manufacturer raise this much capital? For that matter could the United Kingdom itself afford that much investment in one project? What sources of capital will be available? To what extent will the government play a continuing role in aircraft research and development and provide funds for aircraft production?

For the airlines, where will one airline get the $250 million needed to finance a fleet of 747's, the $300 million needed for a fleet of 20 air buses and the $500 million needed for ten SST's? That adds up to a capital requirement in excess of $1 billion just for one presently foreseeable airline fleet.

Just buying a few DC–9s or 737s is an expensive proposition. Legislation to extend the guaranteed loan program, which I recently introduced, will be needed, if these fat years are followed by the biblical seven lean years.

I have seen one estimate of the amount that will be required by 1985 for commercial aircraft investment for a worldwide fleet by 5,000 aircraft. The total is *$100 to $150 billion dollars!* That is too big for Wall Street and Switzerland combined.

The insurance risk alone on a 747 carrying 500 passengers would expose an airline and its insurer, should a fatal crash occur, to a minimum loss of $75 million. It would be about $125 million for a 1000-passenger aircraft. If the safety record is not improved and traffic increases as vastly much as predicted, can the airlines absorb this much risk? Two crashes could bankrupt an airline and shake the public's confidence in the safety of air travel.

Another financial problem for the airlines will be a vast increase in landing fees which will be enacted to pay the cost of airport improvements. I will discuss the airport issue in greater detail in a moment, but I believe that the cost of airport improvement will be a major concern to the commercial airlines. Stuart Tipton estimates the airlines will be paying a quarter of a billion dollars for landing fees just by 1971 up from $80 million in 1966. By 1985 the figure will be at least one billion dollars a year.

What will the competitive picture be in 1975 vis-a-vis other modes of transportation and among the airlines themselves? Will the airline industry still be divided into international carriers, domestic trunks, local and air taxis? In line with our purpose of getting from X to Y, actually from portal to portal, should the structure be changed so that one carrier could provide service the whole distance?

I think we are going to see a change in this structure, even during the next five years. For all practical purposes the locals and the trunks are operating the same type of equipment today. The pressures will be to upgrade the locals into regional trunks. At the same time many domestic trunks are trying to expand into the international field. The clear line of distinction we have had in the past will become blurred as this trend continues.

How will the airlines divide up the transportation market? Is surface transportation more efficient on short hauls than air transportation and if so, should the airlines be relegated the role of medium to long haul transportation? To what extent will low ton mile costs permit aviation to invade hitherto untapped cargo markets? Can the intermodal documentation and multi-standard container barriers be breached to permit greater coordination in the movement of cargo among modes of transportation domestically and internationally? Is it possible that we may see a 1975 model piggy-back movement by C–5A's of especially designed truck trailers—less wheels—that can roll on or roll off with the greatest of ease?

As the big jets come into the fleets, the airlines will undoubtedly tap a greater share of the cargo market and begin to transport lower priority items. Bulk freight will still be the province of rail and barge. The future of air freight is tied, however at both ends of the journey to ground transportation and the interfaces which currently exist between air cargo transportation and surface movement must be eliminated.

When you consider the advances which will be made in containerization of cargo, the improvements in ground handling techniques and the availability of an aircraft like the nuclear-powered subsonic air freighter, I believe this ugly duckling of Air Cargo can become a Cinderella overnight. The Princes of the Airlines will be courting her with the same ardor they now bestow on over-coddled passengers. (Those riding in first class, that is.) Those who fill the plane and make possible the profits will still be crammed into seats too close and too small except for a troup of Singer's Midgets.

Low cost, bargain-basement air freight rates, coupled with the "factory fresh" delivery air transportation can give, will attract to the air thousands of products and produce now lumbering on a one week's trip across continents and a month's trip over oceans by rail and by ship. But again, I emphasize that air freight is tied at both ends to surface transportation and the technical and competitive problems which exist today between modes have got to be removed.

It is possible—yes, probable—that air cargo may develop so well that combination cargo and passenger transports with low steerage type rates may introduce an entirely new service into air transport.

Let's look now at the airport problem. The Senate Aviation Subcommittee held hearings in late August on airports. So far we have come up with lots of unanswered questions and no visible solutions.

Everything that goes up must come down, the old childhood saying goes. That's true for the aircraft of today and tomorrow. Only an airport can launch and retrieve an airplane. I'm afraid that our airport problem, mundane as it is, may be the most crucial transportation problem of tomorrow. For with the ground problem goes the upper side of the coin—the air space above the airport and the approach zones into that air space. It is limited, a point few airline operators have realized.

First, where can we find sufficient land, properly located and usable? How can we possibly dig up the money to pay for the tremendous investment in new airports which must be made? I think by 1975 we will have completed what I call the second round of airport construction that is essentially beginning now. By 1975 the total cost of this second round of development will be $6 billion, including terminals and other facilities for which federal funds are not presently available. I think we will need another two

dozen new jet airports in major cities which already have existing airports.

There are two measures of an airport's capacity—its IFR and its VFR capacity. We have already exceeded the instrument weather capacity at virtually all our major airports during peak hours. We are rapidly approaching the time when our good weather capacity will be exceeded. We have already passed it at Washington National and the estimates are that it will be exceeded in the New York area by 1970. This means not just an increase in the size of the airport. It means new airports at different locations in the same metropolitan area, because of the dangerous air space congestion over and around an airport.

It takes a good seven or eight years from the initial planning to the construction of a major airport. So you have to decide now how many new airports will be needed to handle the traffic demands of the future, where they will be located and what type of aircraft they will handle, and then try to get by with the property owners with a neighborly spirit.

This entails some discussion as to what kind of airports there will be. Can we continue to have airports open to all kinds of traffic or should we have specialized airports, some for general aviation, some for suburban and feeder lines, some for domestic trunks and some for overseas airlines?

Also with respect to the airlines, would it be better to have relatively close-in low cost airports to handle STOL flights and separate far-out airports for long haul and international flights? I think we must come to a system of specialized and separate airports, not only for convenience but also for safety. The CAB's Northeast Corridor Investigation will, I believe, lead to this conclusion.

At the same time we construct new airports, we must modernize the air traffic control system above the airports. The Senate has appropriated $50 million above the President's budget request for fiscal 1968 for just this purpose, much more will be required.

With the tremendous increase in general aviation aircraft, anticipated to be at least 180,000 by 1976, our airways will become as crowded as our highways are during peak traffic hours. Since most of our air trips, particularly general aviation, are 250 miles or less, I think we can anticipate quite a traffic jam in the airways which are not now under positive control.

I believe positive control itself must be extended to all types of aircraft. This presents quite a problem for general aviation because the electronic equipment now available that is compatible with the present control system is prohibitive in both cost and weight for general aviation aircraft. Serious research efforts must be made during the coming decade to perfect low cost, light weight electronic equipment, so that general aviation aircraft could be placed under positive control. But what system can handle positive control for all commercial transports plus 180,000 possible small aircraft?

From the government policy standpoint, I think the systems approach, coupled with the technology which will be available in the late 70's and early 80's, will require a close examination of our concepts of competition, common ownership of transportation companies, and antitrust laws. The Department of Transportation will play an active role in this examination and in recommending to the Congress the policies that should be adopted.

If the capital requirements are too great for any one airline to finance its fleet, should we then permit a merger between major airlines? What substitute for competition would you have if mergers reduce the number of airlines to a few giant companies? It may be that new airline companies will have to be formed to raise the capital and provide the service required by the public in the 80's. This means a relaxation in current government attitudes on new entrants.

Secretary Boyd has already indicated in public speeches that he is looking very deeply into the question of common ownership of transportation companies. This crosses modal lines and is contrary to current views on competition.

Noise and air pollution will be significant problems, unless technology can produce a quieter engine and a cleaner fuel. We are rapidly reaching the time where an aroused citizenry will just not tolerate any more noise around the airport.

There are just a few problems that come into the mind of this legislator. I must confess they are more of a policy nature than some which you will undoubtedly encounter in operating your airlines. But I toss them out in the hope you will give them some consideration, because I do not believe that air transportation can ever be the effective mode of transportation it promises to be unless some of the social problems technology creates are solved.

Before I close I want to say that the questions I have raised and the manner in which I have phrased them do not in any way indicate any particular inclination of my own. In most respects I just regard them as problems that will arise for which solutions must be found.

I have enjoyed being with you again and appreciate the opportunity to talk aviation with you. I commend you on the progress you have made and urge you to continue your tradition of excellence and public service.

THE FEDERAL HEARING EXAMINER

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, today at noon, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] made a speech at the fifth annual seminar luncheon of the Federal Trial Examiners Conference, entitled "The Future for the Federal Hearing Examiner." I ask unanimous consent that this address be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

THE FUTURE FOR THE FEDERAL HEARING EXAMINER

(Speech by Senator FRANK CARLSON, Fifth Annual Seminar Luncheon, Federal Trial Examiners Conference, University Club, Washington, D.C., October 25, 1967)

My good friend George, Chairman Youngblood, Chairman Macy, ladies and gentlemen and members of the Federal Trial Examiners Conference.

I feel deeply honored to appear before this distinguished group of jurists in the field of administrative law. I also welcome the opportunity to talk with you today because I think it is a good thing for those of us on Capitol Hill who serve our government as members of Congress to have this kind of direct contact with others who serve our government in a different but equally important way. In your case—the most important and interesting area of administrative law.

You know, I accepted your cordial invitation to speak with some nervousness. I am just a little nervous about speaking to an audience comprised of lawyers. I am hopeful you will give my remarks a fair and unbiased hearing. Inasmuch as I am not a lawyer, I feel somewhat like our belabored President, surrounded by many experts. Perhaps I should have taken a poll amongst you to determine my subject.

I have a great respect for lawyers. The legal profession has—as all Americans know—made tremendous contributions to our remarkable and frankly, I think wonderful, basic principles of government.

Today, you good people here at this luncheon, are continuing this great tradition. Your contributions have been made possible through a new and exciting addition to our government—some have even called it the fourth branch of government.

This fourth branch was conceived only a score of years ago—a short time in the history of any branch of law—when the Administrative Procedure Act was unanimously approved by Congress. Since becoming a member of the Senate, I have become keenly aware of its importance and more important, the effect its personnel system has had on our nation.

Enthusiastic supporters of the Act hailed it as a "bill of rights" for the hundreds of thousands of Americans whose affairs are controlled or regulated in one way or another by agencies of the Federal Government—they called it a long sought advance in democratic government—or comprehensive charter of private liberty and a solemn undertaking of official fairness.

The Act actually shaped your future destiny. It bound the activities of administrative agencies, it changed the status of hearing officers, it assigned more responsibility to the Civil Service Commissioner in the field of administration and to all of these people it presented challenging problems—some of these problems we still have with us today, problems that are of concern to all of us.

The passage of the Administrative Procedure Act, and it might well be called your act, climaxed years of effort and controversy. Its infancy was stormy and its adolescence painful. Now, today, it is still misunderstood and not appreciated by many whom it should challenge and who might help shape its still unfulfilled future. You who are appointed under the Act, make records and recommend or hand down binding decisions of Government that have far reaching impact on the individual rights and property that affect the daily lives of every American.

There are three items that perhaps I can touch on very briefly that concern your most important responsibility. In your fall newsletter, your most able president talked about ways in which compensation of examiners might be increased. I know that in these times of inflation that honest, forthright discussion concerning compensation is a necessary topic.

Secondly, I know there is strong sentiment among you for elevating the status and dignity of your position and the proceedings over which you preside to the level enjoyed by our courts. I share this sentiment.

Finally, I want to make it very clear how I feel about the importance of the Administrative Process in our government, and therefore, in our way of life.

It has been my privilege to serve many years on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee in the Senate—a committee I know you are familiar with. I have long made it a special point to get adequate pay and appropriate prestige and recognition for all Federal employees. I assure you that includes the high level classification that you here today presently hold—and I am sure enjoy.

Frankly, I feel your President's remarks in your fall newsletter are as candid and proper as any that I could make. President Youngblood said, and I quote:

"I do not believe that a primary thrust should be made in the area of increased compensation for Hearing Examiners in the immediate foreseeable future. The climate is not right on the Hill and off the Hill among those whose support we would need for a successful campaign.

"We will, of couse, be alert for any change in the situation that might affect this conclusion."

Your President continued by saying:

"I am pleased to report, however, that all

former GS-14 examiners except four, are now at the GS-15 level. We will continue to upgrade all examiners."

Now I know that some of you feel you are not yet adequately paid for the high level and most important service you render—I happen to share this view. I hope, however, you will reflect seriously on the improvements that have been made in the years that coincide with your own tenure in office.

I assure you that many of my colleagues on Capitol Hill have joined me in continuing to narrow the differential that has existed in pay available from Government and the private sector of our society. This work has not been in vain. We narrowed the gap and I promise our efforts will continue. I think the key thing to remember concerning an increase in pay is the statement by your President—

"We will, of course, be alert for any change in the present situation that could lead to realistic proposals for increased compensation."

I am sure that virtually everyone that works for a living feels proper compensation is his basic or primary goal. However, this country is beginning to realize that all Americans—regardless of occupation—must also have recognition and dignity. Dignity that stems from the knowledge that they are doing an important job—and doing it well.

Frankly, I feel the confusing title of Hearing Examiner now applied to your office should be replaced with something more accurately describing the service you perform—a title that would also dignify your office.

All too often in government today, names are changed to protect and perhaps project the ego of the agency. However, I feel that any change that would add to the dignity and the definition of your office in the eyes of the public and those people who come before you as witnesses and litigants is certainly worthwhile. I have heard several suggestions—Administrative Judge or possibly Federal Trial Judge—both, I think, more accurately describe your work.

Whatever the title, it should lend dignity and clarification to your office. Many people do not realize who Hearing Examiners are or what their function is.

I am reminded of the time a man in a rural community read in the local newspaper where a Hearing Examiner had been assigned to a specific case. He told his friends a traveling ear specialist had come to town.

Now, I know few people would come up with that definition, but it is quite likely many more are not fully aware of the wide scope and tremendous importance of the decisions a Hearing Examiner makes. Usually, the agency you represent, state or federal, gets the credit—or the blame—but if the job is well done and credit is due, it should go to that man who is known now as a Hearing Examiner and whose title in the future should reflect this kind of contribution towards our American Government.

Let us look now at the other side of the coin and mention a word that many times seems to be forgotten in today's world—responsibility. Quite a storm raged around Administrative Law in the past. Your critics argued that administrative agencies were infringing upon the traditional function of the court system and charged with bitterness that there was a basic defect in a system that permitted one entity to act as prosecutor, judge and jury in a given case.

I feel this storm has subsided considerably and largely due to your efforts. It is tremendously important that we who work in government must remain impartial. We must eliminate the mistaken idea that administrative decisions are based on partisan politics. It should be the goal of you here today to achieve that degree of public acceptance and high respect paid to our courts and judges.

In a highly publicized decision some years ago, involving the "Appalachian Conspiracy" and the Mafia, a U.S. Court of Appeals said, "we cannot state too strongly our view that it is incumbent for trial judges to analyze with meticulous care the evidence as to each defendant. You, as trial judges, have a grave responsibility to go over the evidence in every case you try and to relate it to the Congressional intent of the statute you interpret, rather than to render decisions on a basis of personal opinions concerning social improvement.

In essence, what I am trying to say is that your interpretation of social justice must not become the controlling reason for pronouncing our citizens in violation of administrative law as a substitute for adequate evidence and proof of the violation.

I have a pretty strong conviction that no court can be better than the judge presiding over it and that no quasi-judicial system or Administrative Process can be any better than the individual or the Board or the Commission that renders the decision. It seems certain to me that no one individual has as great an impact on the end result of the whole Administrative Process as the Hearing or Trial Examiner who makes the initial decision.

The importance of what you ladies and gentlemen are doing really becomes significant when we realize the Administrative Process reaches into our lives and affects each and every one of us in the vital problem areas of what we shall eat—what we shall wear—what we shall earn—and under what conditions we shall work. Every step that you take must be with the highest integrity—the greatest ability—and the fairest sense of justice.

Reflecting upon the importance of your task, it becomes obvious to me that you should be adequately paid—that you should enjoy the recognition and dignity that your performance of this most difficult and important job deserves—that you should be provided with the appropriate facilities needed to render your services at a maximum level of performance.

Too often we take the obvious for granted however. I acknowledge that it is one of my duties and the duty of each of my colleagues to keep in close touch with the requirements necessary for trial judges to continue to do such a fine job.

When I started this talk, I made a mental note that I wouldn't try to outtalk a group of talented lawyers. It occurs to me that perhaps I have already spoken too long and said far to little.

I want to say though, that I have really enjoyed being here with you—that I appreciate so much having been invited—and that I personally have a keen respect for the most important and vital job that you are doing.

We are both so very lucky. You as lawyers—and more precisely as lawyers who exercise your legal skill as judges—and I as a member of that great lawmaking body called the United States Senate, are both engaged in activities unexcelled in the opportunities they afford to be of service to mankind.

There can be no finer service or occupation than guaranteeing to all men everywhere, reasonable justice, personal liberty and a favorable climate and situation in which every individual can secure for himself and his family the fruits of a life well lived.

This is your purpose and your function. It is also mine. I pledge to you my continued support of your activity and congratulate you for what you have done and what you will continue to do.

JEWS IN THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, this year the Soviet Union celebrates the 50th anniversary of the revolution which brought its present form of government to power.

It is a time for Russians to look back at what they have accomplished and to look forward to what may be possible. Taking stock is serious business for a great power in a world which depends for its future existence on improving international relationships.

Still unaccomplished in the Soviet Union is the complete guarantee of rights to 3 million Jewish citizens who seek nothing more than to be allowed to be Jews. Although there has been considerable progress in recent years, Soviet Jews who wish to practice their religion and cultural tradition are still not as free to do so as other minority groups in that country.

Publication of devotional literature and production of devotional articles are both restricted. Official communication with Jews throughout the world is prohibited, in contrast to the practice with other religious groups. Study at home and abroad for prospective religious leaders is almost completely prohibited, and worship facilities themselves are becoming increasingly inadequate.

Jews who wish to leave the country are kept from doing so, and Jews are discouraged from holding significant positions in and out of government. In short, there is still an important difference in the Soviet Union between the treatment of Jews and the treatment of other minority groups.

Mr. President, it is difficult to understand why this should be true. Soviet ideology condemns anti-Semitism, and officially there is no rationale in Russia for discrimination against Jews. Still, even though the treatment of Jews in the Soviet Union today bears no resemblance to earlier persecution there and elsewhere, Russian Jews remain a disadvantaged minority—with restrictions which affect the practices and traditions which are vital to their continuing existence as Jews.

The desire of Russian Jews to be Jewish is certainly no threat to the Soviet structure. It is difficult to see why Soviet Jews should be denied the rights afforded other religious and ethnic groups.

Mr. President, every great nation of the world has much to accomplish in guaranteeing the rights of minorities of all kinds. Let us hope that one manifestation of continuing progress toward a better world will be the relief of discrimination against Jews in the Soviet Union.

THE CHAMIZAL TREATY: NOT AN END, BUT A BEGINNING

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, this Saturday will be a historic day in my State, and a landmark day in the history of cooperation and friendship between the people of Mexico and of the United States. On Saturday, President Lyndon B. Johnson of the United States and President Gustavo Diaz Ordaz of Mexico will meet on a piece of land between the cities of El Paso, Tex., and Ciudad Juarez, Chihuahua. The land is called "El Chamizal" by the Mexicans, which means "the thicket."

The two Presidents will sign the final acts carrying out the Chamizal Treaty, finalizing an agreement that stems from

three score years of negotiations, settling a long disagreement over the boundary that runs along the Rio Grande between my State and the Mexican state of Chihuahua.

But the signing of the deeds under the Chamizal Treaty is not just the end of a friendly disagreement. It is the beginning of a whole new chapter in what has already been a beautiful and rewarding brotherhood between the people of Texas and the United States as a whole and the Mexican people. On Saturday, Americans and Mexicans should feel a deep sense of pride and satisfaction as we clasp hands in friendship founded upon mutual respect. Although the Chamizal is a small tract of land, the eradication of doubt about its possesion is a monumental event in international relations and an event that could only happen in an atmosphere of absolute trust and cordiality.

Many people have played a role in this settlement. The late President Kennedy went to Mexico on June 29, 1962, on a state visit to discuss hemispheric and international problems with then-President Adolfo Lopez Mateos of Mexico, and it was during that meeting that the seeds of agreement on the need for settling the Chamizal dispute came about. The next day, June 30, the two Presidents issued a joint communique affirming a new era of friendship and understanding between Mexico and the United States and pledging to find a solution to the Chamizal question.

Since that day 5 years and 5 months ago, the spirit of cooperation and mutual determination to settle this area of conflict has been magnificent. The list of credits in this remarkable negotiation should include hundreds of persons—representatives of the U.S. State Department, the Mexican Foreign Office, the States of Texas and Chihuahua, the cities of El Paso and Juarez, officials of El Paso County, and many private citizens representing business, labor, the church, schools, and virtually every aspect of community life.

Two key figures in what must often have been a tediously complicated affair were Joseph F. Friedkin and David Herrera Jordan, the American and Mexican members, respectively, on the International Boundary and Water Commission. Mr. Friedkin and Mr. Herrera Jordan and their staffs worked tirelessly for 5 years and 5 months toward this settlement, and Saturday's ceremony should be a very satisfying climax to their labor.

The same praise is certainly justified for our former Ambassador to Mexico, my fellow Texan, Thomas Mann, for Mr. Manuel Tello, the former Mexican Secretary of Foreign Relations, and for Mr. Antonio Carrillo Flores, who was Mexican Ambassador to the United States when the Chamizal talks were initiated in 1962 and who is now the very capable Minister of Foreign Relations under President Diaz Ordaz.

Locally, former El Paso County Judges Glenn Woodard and Travis Johnson worked closely with American and Mexican Government representatives, as did Mayor Judson Williams, of El Paso. The city officials of Juarez have been extremely helpful throughout the negotiating and planning, and Congressman RICHARD WHITE and the present El Paso County Judge, Colbert Coldwell, have been instrumental in following through on final details.

Mr. President, since the days of President Taft, every U.S. President has made a concerted and honest effort to resolve the Chamizal border question, but it was not until President John F. Kennedy took action that a settlement seemed a possible reality.

At the Chamizal ceremony in El Paso, on September 25, 1964, to commemorate the successful signing of the Convention, President Johnson remarked:

> Let us always remember that . . . (a) great man whose visionary statesmanship made this possible was John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Through the determined efforts of our late President, U.S. policy on the Chamizal dispute was viewed in a new light. It was President Kennedy's belief that this longstanding dispute should not continue to interfere with United States-Mexican harmony, and he took definite steps to insure that a complete solution, satisfactory to both Governments, be arrived at.

By August of 1963, a Chamizal Convention was drawn up and signed which provided for the ceding of 437 acres of land in the El Paso area to the Mexican city of Juarez, near the lines of a 1911 arbitration award.

The Senate of the United States ratified the Chamizal Treaty on December 17, 1963. It was my privilege to present the case for ratification to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and to speak on the floor of the Senate for ratification. As a young lawyer, I lived and practiced law in El Paso for 3½ years, and to me the settlement of this old source of irritation between our two nations was a matter of prime importance. I am glad to have been privileged to have a small part in the ratification chapter of the settlement.

A few days later, in December of 1963, President Johnson signed the instrument of ratification, and on January 14, 1964, the convention entered into force.

To the people of El Paso, the Chamizal settlement means a new future for the growth and development of their city, hitherto impeded for the past 100 years. Property owners who had been plagued by uncertain titles to land in the disputed area can proceed with improvement projects. The Chamizal settlement has removed an area of Mexican territory in downtown El Paso which had before been an obstacle to construction of efficient traffic arteries and public utility projects. The riverfront on both sides of the boundary has been enhanced as part of an overall beautification project. With the eradication of the dispute, international flood control measures are being instituted for the general benefit of both cities. Always harmonious ties between El Paso and Juarez—sister cities of the Rio Grande—are even stronger today.

The 1964 conclusion of the Chamizal Convention was only the first phase of the termination of this dispute. The responsibility for fulfilling the terms of the settlement fell upon the U.S. Government, and President Johnson saw it through. The U.S. Government was charged with acquiring all the land to be ceded to Mexico. In order for this to be accomplished, 4,500 U.S. citizens, residents of that land, had to be compensated and relocated in other parts of El Paso. Businesses had to be moved, Federal facilities and railroads had to be relocated.

The challenge was met. The U.S. Congress responded to the needs by appropriating $44.9 million to facilitate the settlement. From the beginning, President Johnson and the Congress were determined that the cost of the Chamizal settlement should not fall upon the citizens of El Paso. Proceeding on this premise, the Government consulted and worked closely with officials and civic leaders of the city. All attempts were made to make adequate compensation to the dislocated citizens and to aid them in making new homes.

Mr. President, this is a great day for the people of Texas and for inter-American relations. The signing of this treaty represents a victory for reason. In the words of President Johnson the Chamizal Treaty will stand as "a symbol to all the world that the most troublesome of problems can yield to the tools of peace."

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST JEWS IN THE U.S.S.R.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in approximately 2 weeks, on November 7, the Soviet Union will celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Russian revolution. No doubt there will be dancing in the streets and other joyful events that accompany a nation's celebration of its birthday.

One segment of the Russian society, however, will have little or no reason to join in these festivities. Mr. President, I speak of the 3 million Jews who now live in the Soviet Union.

Today, October 25, is the eve of the Jewish holiday Simchath Torah—meaning "Rejoice in the Law." For the past 3 years thousands of Soviet Jewish youth have demonstrated in the streets and synagogues on this day to illustrate graphically their intense hunger for a distinctive Jewish experience in the face of Soviet pressures. It also provides an occasion for measuring Soviet performance against its continued denial to Soviet Jews the rights permitted other Soviet nationality groups.

There is ample evidence of religious and cultural discrimination against Jews in the U.S.S.R. Today, for example, there is not a single Yiddish school or a single Yiddish class in the Soviet Union, although Soviet law requires the organization of such classe at the request of 10 parents.

There are no schools or clases in any language to enable Jews to learn something Jewish; whether it be history, culture, literature, or even their most recent past—the martyrdom of Soviet Jews during the Nazi holocaust.

Jewish communal-cultural institutions have been destroy. Jewish publishing houses and book distributing agencies do not exist.

The famed Jewish State Theater of Moscow has been "padlocked" since 1949. Jewish participation in political affairs is unknown.

The paradox is that Soviet ideology, practices, law, and the Soviet Constitution all encourage nationalities to perpetuate their group existence through cultural and educational institutions in their own languages. And Jews are legally defined by Russia as a nationality. But the suppression of Jewish culture and religion is without parallel among religious and ethnic minorities of the Soviet Union. The extent to which this suppression is carried is reflected in the latest edition of the large Soviet Encyclopedia. Yiddish is there defined as the "former language of the Russian Jews." We might call this "linguacide."

Mr. President, we must not commit the sin of silence. The basic and fundamental injustices practiced against Soviet Jewry must be exposed in the marketplace of world opinion.

I call upon the United Nations to continue and to strengthen its discussion of the religious and cultural persecution of Jews in the Soviet Union. It is through this international forum that world opinion can make itself most effectively felt in Russia.

JOB CORPS TRAINING

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, earlier this fall, the Senate enacted a 2-year authorization to continue and expand the programs of the war on poverty.

One of the most successful and productive of those programs has been the Job Corps. It has been the subject of much controversy and much criticism, much of which is undeserved.

The Job Corps has attempted to deal with the most severely disadvantaged of America's young people. It attempts to make productive taxpayers out of potential welfare clients. In a recent article printed in the Commercial Car Journal, the work of the Camp Kilmer Job Corps Center in New Jersey is described. At Camp Kilmer young men are trained to handle trucks and to drive them. This is just an example of the work and training Job Corps trainees receive. I ask unanimous consent to have this article 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:

JOB CORPS DRIVERS BETTER THAN "90 DAY" WONDERS

(By Carl Glines)

Depending on your political and sociological outlook, Sargent Shriver's "War on Poverty" program is either a total success or total failure or somewhere in-between.

Most so-called liberals accept the successful theory. Their opposite numbers—the arch conservatives—think the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) is a mountain of bureaucratic gobbledegook. The white racist doesn't like OEO because it involves Negroes. And Negro leaders don't like it because they say it doesn't do . . . or go far enough.

There are 180 million Americans walking the face of this country, most of them have some kind of opinion about OEO. That means 180 million different opinions.

This is not a story about Sargent Shriver or OEO, or what 180 million Americans think. This is one reporter's opinion, about one school producing skilled drivers for the nation's trucking industry at one Job Corps Center in one OEO program.

The school, located at Camp Kilmer in Edison, New Jersey, is called officially the "Transportation and Warehousing School." In practice, it is an elaborate experiment in American sociology . . . a project aimed at giving those youths from the bottom of the social, economic and educational bucket another opportunity before they are zapped by society and industry alike for good.

A representative for Rentar Corp., operators of the school for Federal Electric Corp., OEO's prime Kilmer contractor, described the show for CCJ this way:

"We take raw animals and turn them into human beings." Maybe so. But comparing human beings to raw animals is a crass comparison. Those who share similar opinions are without question in the minority.

PAST MEMORIES

For the interested, Camp Kilmer looks today much like it did during the days of World War II. Most of the two-story barracks still stand, although time, weather and an occasional fire have taken their toll. The camp is still partially surrounded by a high barbed-wire fence bearing the legend: "U.S. Government Property. Keep Out."

If one stands silent, it seems almost possible to hear the sounds of pounding feet of GIs.

But today's pounding feet belong to a new—if not down-troddened generation—of 16, 17 and 18-year olds walking to classes, some for the first time in more than 12 months. (Being a school drop-out is one of the basic requirements for the Job Corps.)

Phil Green, FEC's spokesman at Kilmer, says approximately 1000 Corpsmen have entered the "T&W" school since it opened. Of this number, 502 have graduated from one of the four—light, heavy, tractor-trailer or forklift—courses offered. Of the remaining 500, 275 are still attending courses and another 225 have either dropped out or transferred to other Job Corps centers. Officials report that of the 225 drop-outs, about 150 lacked the skills necessary for driving trucks. The remaining 75 were chronic disciplinary problems. They are the ones who have been zapped.

The "T&W" course is actually four in one. All corpsmen entering the program must complete the 12-week light truck course. If they successfully navigate the first three months, they can go on to the nine-week heavy truck course. The tractor-trailer program is next. That's six weeks. Those who can't negotiate the light truck course are shuttled over to the six-weeks forklift program.

Whether or not a corpsman ever enters the program is determined from basic testing given when he arrives.

And from whence does he arrive?

"HELL, WE DON'T KNOW"

"Hell, we don't know where they come from. All we know is that Washington tells us they're sending us some corpsmen. Who they are, what they are, we don't know. That's one of the things that we have to determine," a Job Corps official explained.

Indoctrination includes a complete physical examination, criminal record and education check, outfitting in a blue uniform and and cap. One uniform to the corpsman. The cap color designates the school. The uniform must be returned, but corpsmen can keep their caps.

Those who have serious criminal records (10% of all corpsmen have one serious conviction; 27% minor) are weeded out. They must also be at least 18 years old and have a 4th or 5th grade level education. A corpsman with some high school training may not be any better equipped educationally than one who hasn't, especially if he is non-white and comes from the South. The average reading level of all corpsmen is 4.7 grade level with seven years of schooling.

The ratio of Negroes and non-whites to whites is high, 70–30, according to records. Most of the corpsmen I talked with came from the South, but not all.

Although some who enter the Center may already come armed with driver licenses, each corpsman is re-educated with the viewpoint that they have never been behind the wheel of a vehicle.

Sometime during the 12-weeks of the light truck course, they are given the written driver's test administered by the N.J. Motor Vehicle Department. If they pass the written test, they are given the driver's examination and eventually a Garden State license.

The driver's license is a convenience (they also get a regular government permit) because sometime later, corpsmen are permitted to drive outside the camp area as part of their training. Under new procedures just recently adopted, "T&W" corpsmen have assumed almost all the hauling for the entire Kilmer JC Center. The corpsmen are assigned to take a tractor-trailer into the New York-North Jersey area, with each student limited to a total of three hours behind the wheel per trip.

Originally, Rentar equipment was used for practical driver training. This equipment—23 vehicles—has since been purchased by FEC for the government from Rentar for $69,690, for Kilmer use. Rentar officials declined any comment on the terms of the sale.

EQUIPMENT SHORTAGE

One major difficulty at Kilmer is the lack of training equipment. The inventory includes three 1963 series Mack COE's; one White 7000 tractor with a 10-speed Road-Ranger, leased to the school for $1 a year; three used I-H tractors, four Ford Econoline and seven Dodge vans; nine Dodge pick-ups; six 38-ft vans and one lowboy trailer. Most equipment is grabbed off from military surplus as it becomes available and refurbished at the center's corpsmen-operated automotive repair school.

Aside from the 90 minutes daily of academic instruction, a corpsman gets three hours a day driving practice. The program begins in the class room with the Drivotrainer, an electronic driver-trainer device, and progresses on to instruction in highway driving, city driving, pre-trip inspection, material handling and range skills. (The range was the site of the July Mid-Atlantic States Safe Driver Roadeo.) Lack of equipment, however, forces many corpsmen to wait for their chance behind the wheel in some instances. The equipment to pupil ratio is one-to-four. Admittedly the school could use additional tractors.

Each incoming "T&W" corpsman is given a dark blue plastic briefcase containing such items as White's "Driver Manual"; Babaco's trailer alarm book; Smith's "Defensive Driving Manual"; Pure's truck stop directory; ICC's 1967 Safety Regulations; ATA's driver fact book and a driver's daily log.

A corpsman who successfully completes the light truck course has 180 hours behind the wheel. The wheel time jumps up to 316 hours if he continues into the heavy truck program and 436 hours if he completes the tractor-trailer course.

NO PROMISES

A corpsman entering Kilmer gets no guarantee of a job. He is guaranteed at least three job interviews. This phase of the program has complications, however, because reportedly each corpsman must return to the area he came from. Corpsmen under 21 who want to relocate must have written parental permission.

Whether OEO has a firm policy of placing

corpsmen in jobs within their own community is disputed. Rentar officials maintain that such a policy does exist. But FEC people deny it. One FEC official says such a policy would be self-defeating because sending some corpsmen home is the last thing they want to do. The situation does pose major problems for Rentar who runs what it calls a nationwide employment office at Kilmer.

How, for example, do you place a corpsman trained as a truck driver in a job if he comes from the Virgin Islands where some have? Obviously, job opportunities for drivers are few. Or how do you get a JC graduate a driving job if he lives in a rural or farming area? Obviously, again, you don't and some corpsmen have completed the school only to return to the family farm.

Rentar and FEC officials both agree that placing graduates has been difficult. The age factor is one major stumbling bloc, but racial prejudice and discrimination among employers is suspected to be wide-spread.

Of 192 corpsmen graduated from the program in the past 7 months, 86.5% have obtained employment, but not necessarily in the trucking industry. Because of the lack of any comprehensive and continuous follow-up program there is no realistic way of telling how many of these have stayed. The best figures available from Federal Electric is that 82% or 358 corpsmen of 437 placed since the school opened have stayed on the job for at least two months.

As one official said: "We are dealing with boys who because of their family and educational background tend to be very mobile."

Since the school opened, officials estimate that 25% of the "T&W" graduates are working at jobs other than for what they were trained.

Some long-haul common carriers are reportedly hiring corpsmen as "yard jockies" until they reach 21-years or older. But the greater employment opportunities appear to be with firms in the soda bottling business, such as Coca-Cola, 7-Up and Pepsi-Cola, for example.

Many are getting jobs as garbage and refuse drivers while still others end up as delivery men for grocery stores, florists and small specialty shops.

Just how good is a Kilmer corpsman?

PROGRAM GOOD—BUT

The answer obviously depends on the individual. But at least three major common carriers in the North Jersey and New York City area are more than satisfied with the training.

"Marvelous." "The best." "Top-notch." This is typical of fleet reaction.

Harry Stevens, a safety supervisor for Eastern Express says: "The training is great and I'm sorry there isn't another school like it around."

Still and despite the enthusiastic support from the field, corpsmen working for Eastern Express and Bilkay's Express and others are *not* working there today.

"One came from Tennessee and after a few weeks became homesick. Another lived in Brooklyn and had a commuting problem," Stevens says.

At Bilkay's, the corpsman, also from Brooklyn didn't know the territory and was let go after two weeks. But while he was there, he handled himself better than many professional drivers, one company official said.

"He checked under the vehicle every day for leaks. He positioned himself in the cab and adjusted the rear-view mirrors so he could see. And he asked for a rag to clean the windshield." Bilkay's says they would rehire him if he could learn the streets and avenues. "And that's something that we don't often promise," the official added.

Eastern and others say they would hire JCs if they lived within reasonable commuting distance to company operations. Others said they would hire them if they were older, but too many are under 21.

When OEO first opened the Job Corps program, critics said it cost more to train a corpsman than it did to keep a boy in Harvard for a year. JC officials admit that in the beginning at least, the criticism was factually correct. But the longer the program runs and the more youths who are trained, the lower the costs become.

In 1966, for example, the cost of training a single corpsman was $6090 for nine months and $8120 for a year. This year the costs dropped to $5825 and $7765 and reportedly haven't bottomed yet.

INDUSTRY SUPPORTS THE JOB CORPS

Some of America's industrial giants are behind the Job Corps program 100%. They include RCA, Litton Industries, General Electric, IBM, Xerox and others. Like Federal Electric, they are making it work.

Kilmer Job Corps center opened in February 1965, with Federal Electric and Rutgers—The State University—as working partners. FEC bid $11,520,000 to operate the center under the original contract. Last year, FEC received a second contract for $12,687,000 covering a 17-month period which expires next June. Federal Electric's profit—before taxes—for running the center is estimated at about 4.2% or approximately $500,000. Rutgers has dropped out as a partner because of some basic and rather disagreeable developments. The State University did have about 30 members of its faculty involved in the academic side of the program. Now, it has only one and he is just a part-time consultant. Others are on call, however, for special academic problems.

Although publicly disavowed, a report leaked to the press in the fall of 1965 attacked the center for overcrowding, high absenteeism, slow implementation of vocational programs and other assorted criticisms. The charges were denied by FEC, but the bitterness and memory of the incident still lingers.

The Job Corps isn't perfect. Nothing ever is. But if only 15, 20 or 25% of the graduates can be converted into tax paying, wage-earning American citizens, then the national return is many times greater than the national investment.

OEO has started the merry-go-round turning and some of those who have climbed aboard are beginning to reach for the brass ring that spells jobs, income and more important, self-respect.

Camp Kilmer Job Corps Center houses five training schools:

1. Automotive, building and metal trades
2. Electrical, printing and welding
3. Food service
4. Transportation and warehousing
5. General vocational

The courses and training hours for the transportation school are:

Light truck, 360 hours, 12 weeks.
Heavy truck, 270 hours, 9 weeks.
Tractor trailer, 180 hours, 6 weeks.

Classroom sessions incorporate the following subjects:

ICC Regulations, Safety standards, Customer relations, Personal injury prevention, "Smith" system of defensive driving, Preventive Maintenance, Pre-trip inspection, Tire inspection and care, PUC regulations, Fire prevention, Freight handling.

Obtain information on availability of graduates by contacting:

Placement Department, Rentar Corporation, Transportation-Warehousing School, Kilmer Job Corps Center, Edison, New Jersey 08817.

SOVIET UNION CONTINUES TO PERSECUTE JEWS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I join many of my distinguished colleagues this week in calling attention to the continuing problems of those of the Jewish faith in the Soviet Union. Stories of incidents of persecution and discrimination have reached such a proportion that the U.S. Senate has, on several occasions, expressed itself formally on this issue.

This Nation of ours—a "nation of immigrants" as President Kennedy called it—understands the rich heritage that different cultures and traditions give to a country. And we realize as well that the culture and tradition and religious observances of any one group of citizens must be completely respected and fully protected or else the entire nation suffers an irreparable loss of freedom.

Unfortunately, evidence indicates that the Soviet Union has confiscated synagogues, closed Jewish cemeteries, arrested rabbis and lay religious leaders, and discriminated against Jews in cultural activities and access to higher education. Such persecution against any culture affects all freedom-loving men everywhere and compels us to speak out against it.

The Soviet Union will soon celebrate its 50th anniversary. The time of celebration should also be a time of examination—and the world will judge the Soviet performance that has been outstanding in some areas against the continued denial of those rights so eloquently spelled out in the Russian constitution. We all hope that this 50th year can mark a turning point in national policy and a new day of decency and of humanity that will provide freedom and dignity for Russian Jews.

IS PRIVACY DEAD?

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President—

The bugs—they're coming in the windows, thru the hole in the back fence, down the chimney. Tonight, they may be listening in on you.

This is the theme of an article by Philip Wylie which was published in the Chicago Tribune of September 24, 1967. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

IS PRIVACY DEAD?

(NOTE.—The bugs—they're coming in the windows, thru the hole in the back fence, down the chimney. Tonight, they may be listening in on you.)

(By Philip Wylie)

Our recent indignation at the use of "bugs" by almost anybody for nearly any reason has lessened since the Supreme court acted. Now we know who will be legally allowed to bug others. But we will remain uncomfortable because we've learned how easy it is to spy-by-gadget. A bright teen-ager can acquire the know-how to monitor your phone or bug your bedroom—for a gag.

Privacy is our right. A man's house, if not quite a fortified castle, is subject to forcible entrance, or to secret invasion-by-gadgetry by constituted authority, solely, and under court-defined conditions. It's in the communist- and dictator-run nations that "Big Brother" watches everybody. For liberty *means* privacy: the secret ballot, the right to hold any opinion, discuss any idea, so long as the widest use of that privilege does not lead to acts endangering the very government that is guarantor of such freedom.

Privacy is essential for liberty. Big Brother

cannot get at free men to learn their every act and word so as to force them to conform to his will. No tyrant can take over a free people while they defend the right not to be watched. But vigilance is required. Rights can be lost by ignoring their defense.

Suppose, for example, growing numbers of people in a liberty-loving land allowed others to watch them in various acts that had previously been held private? And suppose everybody else realized such invasions of privacy were being allowed but, instead of being furious, they were merely avid to learn whatever was discovered? Wouldn't such people still be free? If people authorized the bugging of their houses, where's the violation of privacy? And if everybody is permitted to know what happens in the monitored homes, isn't that more freedom, not less?

It's a vital question, these days, but one nobody asks, much. Vital, because you and I and all Americans *are* being watched, by hordes of experts—for thousands of special purposes. And we permit this intrusion into our personal lives. We do so because the people-watchers convince us that their motives are sound. They say our assent to being watched [or questioned intimately] will advance science. Or it will aid industry. Assist progress. Discover our future wants and help business supply them. So we agree to set some part of our privacy aside for what seems the general good.

But *is* it?

When the people-watchers sample what they say is a scientific cross-section of all Americans, they assume their figures represent a true picture of whatever they surveyed. That may be correct—for the time of the inquiry already past, that is, historic. But even if it's correct, the effect will be harmful.

Whatever emerges from the appraisals of the watched or questioned volunteers is taken as a standard by all but the hardiest individuals. Most will try to adapt to what the polled sample indicates as the general or popular response. For we want, naturally enough, to be on the winning side. To do the "in" thing. To keep up with [or surpass] the folks next door. People-watchers have now shown us how, in some special form.

So, at the very least, people-watching tends to make us less ourselves and more and more *conformist*. It limits us—and our choices.

One of the major concerns engaged in TV rating studies, I am told, monitors the sets of a few thousand families [or less] who have been chosen "scientifically" to make up a sample of all Americans with TV sets. Therefore, what they tune in—or tune out—has a powerful influence on which programs all of us will [and won't] be able to view, in the year ahead, and the years ahead. That seems satisfactory to the networks and even to most TV viewers. At the level of persons addicted to daily, multihour TV viewing, it may even *be* satisfactory. But not every family would allow a rating company to monitor its TV set, or sets. Why? To let watchers watch what *you* watch on TV, you must first be willing to assume that your taste is good enough to be used in setting TV standards for everybody.

TV sampling to determine universal programming is but a single, if flagrant, instance of people-watching we allow, and of results that we endure. Somebody, these days, is scrutinizing somebody else's every act and word, no matter how intimate. Using samples who volunteer. Who are these human bugs?

Well, scientists, among others. Anthropologists, say, who study cultures as minutely as they are able: primitive, rural, barbaric, pre-literate, and American cultures. Psychologists, too—people who are forever probing into our private [and even our unconscious] lives, and turning out mountains of printed reports. Sociologists—in slums, suburbs, penthouses, and on farms—asking questions and getting answers from people willing to cooperate with that "science." Many others.

Then there are market survey people. Their invasion, whether by phone or in person by door-to-door survey, is aimed, ostensibly, at finding out what we consumers need. However, as John K. Galbraith has declared in a new book, such market studying is mainly aimed at calculating what we consumers can be *made* to buy in the years ahead. What products, too, that industry can manufacture at the maximum profit. For, in a society as technical as our own, long-range planning is a goal. The products that will sell five years hence must be known now so they can be designed, tested, and so the machines for their mass-production can be built.

The old idea that competition rules industry and insures high quality in our gross national product, as Galbraith insists, is false. America, he says, is not a buyer's market now; it is a nation of buyers pre-polled to find what goods and services they could pay for, and how to lead to that. What you get, then, may or may not be what you need; but it will surely be what the market-survey snoops found you could be induced to *imagine* you needed and would purchase in sufficient quantities to justify the surveys, the long planning, the changes in factory equipment, and the final, massive output of each item—at, remember, maximum profit.

Poll-takers are, of course, yet another and very visible species of people-watchers. Poll-watching is, in turn, a fervent occupation of almost everybody in our land, the President, included. On the face of it, the pollsters' efforts seem both interesting and harmless. Their scientific cross-sections are sampled daily about all sorts of subjects; and their computerized reports appear as if instantly.

Yesterday's question may have been: "What do you think of teen-age and college boys who wear long hair?" Today's report will show that "X" per cent of us detest male tresses; another "X" per cent think the custom is all right; and a third fraction will be noted as having no opinion.

The scores of millions who pore over such polls will then assume they know where America stands on the long-locks-lads. [Mostly, of course, "agin'."] Those already against the pageboy-bob, or the Robert-Kennedy-uncut, will feel confirmed in their view. Those for it, or neutral, will, perhaps, perceive how out-of-step their permissive opinion has been—and some will change their attitude to match the majority. As to those with no opinion, the pollsters are forever mute. Plainly, on some subjects, such as Viet Nam, say, some Americans actually have no useful or lucid opinion. Often, however, people with intensely held views feel them to be private; and no people-watcher can get a usable word out of them. Yet in close differences of opinion these silent ones may hold the final decision.

Their right not to expose their views is constitutional and guaranteed. Poll-takers, inquiring photographers, market-researchers, and all the rest haven't the slightest right to expect any answer, or even a true one from those who reply. Yet their figures are regarded as sound—and often, I am sure, influence myriads. In that way, we are in danger of becoming followers, conformists, people eager to be "with it" irrespective of what "it" may be so long as their act provides a seeming of sophistication, style, status—a sense of what's popular and momentarily right. Polls, then, may sway opinion—even where elections are concerned. Who wants to vote for a candidate the polls show a sure loser. Not *most* of us!

When people-watchers approach us, furthermore, we may tend to do something very un-free, and so, non-American. We may try to find out which answer would please the people-watcher, and give him [or her] *that* response. We don't want to hurt his feelings, or disappoint him; we dislike to take a view that his query suggests would be contrary to the expected reply. And how often we do so is not known.

As my friend Bill Lederer said in a book title, are we a nation of sheep? Boosters, scared to knock? People who won't bail the boat that's sure to sink, otherwise—because bailing rocks the boat?

Anything in human thought or experience is now open to scrutiny and public assay. The late Dr. Alfred Kinsey was a comparative fuddy-duddy by current criteria. He confined his efforts to a long series of questions asked privately and designed, he said, to rule out liars, boasters, and guilty truth-hiders. That is people-watching at one remove, but, even so, the Kinsey reports created a sensation. Times have changed.

A medical doctor and his woman associate recently published the results of direct people-watching in the same area. They observed the erotic activities of thousands of men and women both directly and by tape-recorded movies. Their highly technical summary was the recent best-seller, "Human Sexual Response."

One must admit that its authors, the Masters-Johnson team, were people-watchers of the most dedicated and intimately probing sort. Moreover, some of their findings about psychological nature of impotency, for example, are of value, tho they were known before verification by these scientific Peeping Toms. However, I, at least find it difficult to accept all their ideas, since I don't believe that either the witnessed responses or the subjects who responded can represent everybody.

The first subjects were paid. Later, many hundreds volunteered, in behalf of science. A noble deed. But when such an effort involves one's erotic acts, one's sexual responses and/or one's real love-life, under scrutiny and on camera, I am not sure that the results can be regarded as of general relevance. Most of us [the sex revolution to the contrary notwithstanding] would not respond in our usual manner under those conditions. Most of us wouldn't volunteer, no matter how urgently scientists begged.

The extent and the perils of people-watching are not always noticed by the general public. And I began my concerned assay only lately. That happened when a friend who publishes a magazine sent me a brochure about its proven readership in an area where it is generally found: barbershops. A device called Dynascope had been invented, the brochure exulted, and several had been set unobtrusively in barbershops chosen at random. Focused on the chairs where men waited their turns, each Dynascope snapped a picture every 30 seconds. When developed, these showed that, of the men who read anything while waiting in those barbershops, nearly a third read my friend's magazine.

He was jubilant since he had proof for readership claims [and, doubtless, could raise his advertising rates as a result]. He was entranced by Dynascope. His brochure said, in effect: *Think how many other, equally priceless uses it will have!*

I began to do that: *Think*. About being watched.

I thought right away that I don't like my picture snapped without my knowledge or consent. Legally, one's photograph cannot be used for any commercial end unless one consents. Here, of course, tho the every-30-seconds snapshots were being used indirectly to boost my friend's business, the subject didn't consent—being unaware. Whether that use of photographs [or tape or whatever] is legal or not, only the Supreme Court could decide, perhaps.

But my thinking led me on, fast and far. Hundreds of banks are robbed every year. Shoplifting in supermarkets causes an annual loss of a billion. Such places, in conse-

quence, are often fitted with closed circuit TV so that all who enter are watched constantly.

But I, for one, feel nobody has a right to watch me, covertly on any medium, Dynascope or TV. Not, that is, without either a legal writ or else my knowledge and permission. I think that quasi-public places like banks and supermarkets should be obliged to notify all persons of any surveillance. By big signs, say, that announce they are on TV or facing a Dynascope. Such signs would tend greatly to discourage thieves so the actual and costly apparatus might be dispensed with. And only a few of us would avoid such banks and stores.

As I realized we'd become a more watched people than those under the eye of "Big Brother," I tried to find out how many people-watchers there are. I could not. Almost nobody watches people-watchers in our land. But I did arrive at some scary orders-of-magnitude.

Take science. A recent questionnaire sent out by a publication that lists America's scientific and technical people had 1,000 different classes of these specialists. There are tens and tens of sorts of chemists, for example. Scores of sorts of biologists. Engineers of special sorts that most of us never heard of. However, a study of them all was made to ascertain how many categories consisted of, or were founded on, or engaged part time in *people-watching*. Answer: 289, or, nearly a third.

Almost 300 *branches* of science are, therefore, directly or indirectly involved in watching you—and me—and everybody in America. That means there are *hundreds of thousands* of those specialist watchers, alone!

To try to find out about the rest—the market-surveyors, pollsters, phone-inquirers, industrial researchers, public relations quiz people, and so on [almost endlessly] I finally asked the research department [people-watchers, all] of a great corporation to act for me. In time, these wizards reported there was *no way* to count or even estimate the nonscientific [trained and/or amateur, but hired] watchers.

But that research outfit, tho defeated, did help in one way. Its experts pointed out endless kinds of people-watchers I hadn't even considered. Doctors and health officials who report intimate facts about all of us. Census takers. Even clergymen may get up reports on quizzed parishioners. Many perfectly legal inspectors [as of fire hazards] can also be peeking furtively into other details of our ways, habits, and possessions. Lots of canvassers, furthermore, are deceptive, apparently trying to learn one's taste in carpets while actually noting the lack [or ownership] of a hi-fi, power mower, you-name-it.

People can even pass by your house in an electronic-spy truck and find out if your TV is on, and the channel to which it is tuned. People can hear what you say, blocks away, with certain gadgets, and find out various things, especially if you're talking to a trained and skilled stranger, who leads you in some desired way.

It shook me severely to realize how vast the army of people-watchers has become, not even including those who needle and peek in the name of science or law. Hundreds of thousands more. Their sum in the United States surely passes a million. And they are setting goals for us that meet their wants. Not ours!

The situation, obviously, calls for rebellion.

To rebel while we still have any hope of being or again becoming individuals, the target must be seen. The foe. If we can thwart the people-watchers, we can lick the trend toward conformity they foster.

It wouldn't be too difficult a campaign, as rebellions go.

Meek troops will merely refuse to respond to any opinion sampler, poll-taker, or phone-interrogator; they will refuse to volunteer to be watcher, sampled, tested, or to allow even the baby's rattle to be monitored. They need just—*refuse*.

If even a small fraction of us do that, the people-watchers are going to suffer. Their computations will be less accurate. The corporation employers, the politicians who hire them, and all the self-serving rest, will begin to lose faith in them. Even scientists will start to think twice before they start on people-watching. Only legally constituted authorities, then, will be able to get your slant on anything, whatever.

If there is to be any exception here—as, for scientific ends—let the would-be watchers get a license for their espionage—and also a favorable, two-thirds-majority vote of their colleagues, prior to embarking on watching our table manners, or the way we behave in bed with our wives, etc.

Hardier recruits to an army in rebellion against people-watchers can accomplish more than the great lot that would be done by mere negation. Generally, I oppose lying and regard cheating as near the lowest of all shameful deeds. Here, however, the criteria are other. Here, the enemy is wide open to sabotage.

Thus whenever I get an opportunity to assist people-watchers I take it as a chance to foul up the foe. My phone rings and [say] a pleasant-voiced dame asks me [after a little chat that shows she's attached to some big foundation or the like] about our laundry. Do we send it out? No, I reply. Have it done in a washer, at home? Again, I say, no. Wash it by hand? Her voice, now, will be startled. So—how *do* we have our clothes washed? She has an inspiration: Our laundress takes them home?

No, again, I say. My wife, I say, launders everything as they do on the gahts at Benares, India. She uses the nearby canal and beats our wash clean, with a board.

That, perhaps, is little better than not answering at all. The lady phone pest will write me off as a "no opinion," or, perhaps, I'll be skipped entirely.

The reader, however, will see the opportunities I imply for creative wrecking. I could have told that [imaginary] laundry-surveying dame that I was a chemist and had invented a molecular substance that dry-cleaned all material in seconds. No need for any laundering. *That* would have really rocked her—since she would be doing her survey for some washer manufacturer, detergent maker, sewage pollution investigation, or the like.

If her call was for business reasons [as would be most probable] my answers, if honest, might have brought a real dame on our doorstep with a product or gadget to demonstrate. But my fanciful tale of a wash-all chemical would likely have gotten some vice president around, posthaste. In any case, I'd have wasted enough of the woman's time to cut five or six other [probably eager and truthful] fools off her day's schedule.

Those examples suffice to show how you can help rescue America from the Big Brotherhood watching us, the horde that slowly squeezes us into shapes that increase them but leave us diminished.

One last word to all hero-volunteers. Do not write in to say you want to enroll in the anti-people-watching movement. Don't ask for an organizational chart and pertinent literature. There isn't any organization, any gung-ho pamphlet or printed instruction book.

Such things are precisely what I here oppose.

You must act as an individual if at all. You can urge friends and neighbors to emulate you, but don't form clubs or groups. *Think!* The first time you refuse to volunteer as a watched or questioned person in a sampling, the first time you hang up the phone on an inquisitor or turn your back on a poll-taker, will be your first step in self-emancipation. And the first time you deliberately foul up such a people-watcher or one of their questionnaires, you'll have made your first step as a crusader, a creative individual, the supreme sort of human being.

That's why this must be a do-it-yourself effort.

For its purpose is to disorganize the organized assault upon us all. That counterattack must be personal and impromptu, not planned and arranged. The people-watchers would soon see thru organized opposition and circumvent that sort of thing. It's the way *they* operate, after all. But they will never be able to go on shattering our privacy, busting into our homes, culling our secret thoughts and then using it to make us ever squarer squares, and smaller ones, at that. You all set to help? Fine!

Want to know what my wife and I are having for supper tonight?

Well, liver. And, incidentally, we're cannibals.

SIMCHAT TORAH

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, this evening Jews throughout the world will usher in the holiday of Simchat Torah, a celebration which reaffirms the dedication of the Jewish people to the law and traditions of their forefathers.

But for 3 million of the world's Jews, this day is not a cause of rejoicing or of celebration. For the persecuted masses of Jews living in the Soviet Union, this day is but another in the struggle to survive, to continue to live. For 50 years, since the Bolshevik revolution of 1917, the Jewish religion has been suppressed in the Soviet Union. More than any other group, its adherents have been discriminated against. Religious studies are forbidden, publications are not available, and religious articles nonexistent. But still the spark of religious life flickers among the Jewish youth of the Soviet Union.

Though they are largely ignorant of the tenets of their faith, they learn to identify with their people. Government suppression has limited the number of young people who dare to appear at the one remaining synagogue in Moscow on holidays. But still thousands come.

At this crucial period of world history, when the Soviet Union and the United States both recognize the imperative need for coexistence and reason, I would hope that the Soviet leaders would abandon their heartless and senseless suppression of the Jewish people.

Throughout history nations have persecuted and sought to physically exterminate the Jews and they have failed. Spiritual genocide will also fail.

AMERICAN COMMITMENT IN VIETNAM REAFFIRMED

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, with headlines still fresh about the Washington protest march against our Vietnam policies, Congress must not overlook the fact that there were corresponding demonstrations of support for U.S. policies in cities across the country.

Lest we let our minds be turned by seeing only one side of the news, I would like to cite recent news stories from different parts of the country which demon-

strate that there is stronger grassroots support for the President in Vietnam than one might believe.

A strong and clear article by Victor Riesel, noted labor writer, published in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer of October 13, dwells in great detail on the overwhelming support for the American position in Vietnam by the 14 million members of the Nation's labor organization, the AFL–CIO.

Mr. Riesel said that organized labor believes "it is America's obligation to fight in Vietnam. And that no choice need be made between spending billions for guns, butter or ghettos because there is enough for all."

The Democratic Farm Labor Party of Minnesota recently gave its strong endorsement to the President's stand in Vietnam and commended him for "sticking to the rough road of responsibility both at home and abroad."

In Colorado, the former Governor of that State, a distinguished Democrat, Steve McNichols, was reported as saying to a party meeting that "supporting the President is the quickest way to end the war."

There is a good deal of support in the country for our present balanced position in Vietnam, only we don't always hear about it.

The President has chosen to exercise U.S. might with restraint, although no American doubts that we could annihilate Vietnam if we wanted to. But this is the line of fanatics, and the President is not a fanatic.

We cannot withdraw from Vietnam until we receive assurances that what we are fighting for—independence for South Vietnam—is guaranteed.

So the long hard fight will have to continue. And we will have to call on the fundamental citizenship of every American to sustain our President in these hard and terrible days.

I ask unanimous consent that articles published in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, the Denver Post, and the Minneapolis Tribune, all supporting President Johnson in Vietnam, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, Oct. 13, 1967]

LABOR LEADERS BACK JOHNSON VIETNAM POLICY

(By Victor Riesel)

WASHINGTON.—Those bird watchers who are transfixed by the doves and the hawks and are impressed by the foreign policy polls are overlooking a mighty force whose legions, equipped with every weapon of modern political warfare, will march solidly behind Lyndon Johnson into the next presidential campaign.

Leaders of these legions have just issued a call to action which says bluntly that it is America's "obligation" to fight in Vietnam. And that no choice need be made between spending billions for guns, butter or ghettos because there is enough for all. And that the South Vietnamese are fighting the very same kind of war as that fought by America's early revolutionists.

These words—and a good deal more—are in the official call just issued by the national AFL–CIO headquarters to the American delegates to its Seventh Constitutional Convention opening December 7 in Bal Harbour, Fla.

Labor's leaders go all the way with LBJ.

It is the signal to their 14 million followers to mobilize. Hardly insignificant, this. The federation is the most solidly organized force in the land. It has the most futuristic political campaign machinery in the world. One of its lesser efforts, for example, will be a drive to put 100,000 campaign workers into the precincts in Pennsylvania alone.

No doubt the AFL–CIO will be the most cohesive and dependable bloc behind Mr. Johnson next year, what with defections from his policies piling up on the left and right.

It may well be the only united force in his camp by mid-1968. If Vietnam should be the issue in '68, there is no doubt that labor's leaders will be the loyalists of the year. And there will be no variation on this theme. It has gone unreported, for example, that the recent convention of the huge (two million-member) New York State AFL–CIO adopted a strong pro-Vietnam policy resolution by a vote of almost 1,000 to 12. That's a fairly comfortable margin.

Thus it is across the land; at the Oregon AFL–CIO conclave, the delegates cheered a resolution calling for "bringing to bear whatever power is necessary to prevent a Viet Cong victory."

All this does not insinuate that the labor leaders are just hawks. If anything, the bird watchers from now on will note that the powerful union chiefs are falcons, should there be any room in the aviary.

This can be observed in the unreported unpublished call to the National Convention which is being whipped into a series of resolutions for the 900 delegates who will attend the national gathering. Since all this will make the headlines on Pearl Harbor Day, the call's most urgent words should be put into the record now:

"Beyond the domestic issues there remains the grave problem of the defense of freedom in South Vietnam," says AFL–CIO president George Meany.

"It is testing as never before the calmness, the patience and the good sense of the nation.

"There are some who cry for a wider, 'get it over with' war, regardless of risk. There are others who call for total disengagement, regardless of the impact on freedom's cause. And from both camps . . . rises the charge that there must be a choice between war and social progress; that America cannot afford both at once.

"This vast, rich . . . country has no need to make an impossible choice. The fight for freedom in South Vietnam must be carried on, with patient restraint and with continuing efforts to reach an honorable peace . . ."

These words are the labor chiefs' challenge to the leaders of the dump-Johnson movement. Inside the Democratic Party, these words may well drown out the cries of the hawks and the cooing of the doves.

[From the Denver Post, Oct. 11, 1967]

STEVE MCNICHOLS BACKS PRESIDENT'S VIETNAM POLICY FULLY

(By Tom Gavin)

An uncluttered Vietnam policy—one of simple support of President Johnson's approach to the war in Southeast Asia—was enunciated by former Gov. Steve McNichols Tuesday night.

McNichols appeared with State Rep. Tom Farley, D-Pueblo, in the second in a series of Denver Democratic district captains' meetings at which prospective candidates for the party's 1963 U.S. Senate nomination are being heard.

The Denver party leaders heard Farley, as he has in at least one other public appearance, differ sharply with the President on Vietnam—but declare he will support Johnson's anticipated re-election bid without reservation.

McNichols, although he didn't state it baldly, seemed to equate support of Johnson on Vietnam with patriotism.

"As a group of party people, and a group of good Americans, we ought to support our President," he said.

AMERICAN FIRST

And, at another point: "I always try to support my President. I feel I am an American before I am a Democrat, and I think Senator Dirksen (Senate Minority Leader Everett Dirksen, who has also supported Johnson's Vietnam approach) feels he is an American before he is a Republican," McNichols said.

McNichols also said he feels that "supporting the President is the quickest way to end the war" and that "the more we talk about this the less chance we have to end it."

The Vietnam war, he added, should not be a party issue, nor a reason for dissident Democrats to abandon their party.

Farley, as he did before Denver Young Democrats last week, said he is in "serious disagreement" with Johnson on Vietnam, but added:

"I want to emphasize that I will strongly support the (presidential) nominee of this party—and it's 99 and 99-100ths per cent certain that the nominee will be Lyndon Johnson."

If the nation is to solve its problems, Farley added, "we are going to have to have someone who is liberally oriented, as the Johnson administration is."

ANTI-JOHNSON FEELING

Farley, minority leader in the State House of Representatives, said he has encountered "a lot of anti-Johnson feeling around the state," however, and added: "I seriously doubt that Johnson can carry Colorado" in the '68 presidential election.

McNichols, too, talking about Colorado voters' proven leanings toward split-ticket voting, said it is possible that Colorado Democrats could lose in presidential balloting next year while winning the Senate election against incumbent Republican Peter Dominick.

Farley, as he has earlier, called for a Vietnam policy involving American willingness to negotiate peace terms with the Viet Cong as well as North Vietnam; ultimate admission of both North and South Vietnamese participation in both pacification and military efforts there.

BACKS U THANT

He also endorsed the suggestion of U Thant and others that an unconditional halt in American bombing of North Vietnam would lead to peace negotiations in four to six weeks.

"I think this is a limited risk we cannot afford not to take," he declared.

Farley, in discussing next year's senatorial campaign, said no Democrat should seriously consider challenging Dominick unless he can count on a campaign treasury of at least $225,000.

"I think that anyone who doesn't have $225,000 ought to forget it," he said, and added with a smile: "Right now I don't have $225,000."

McNichols at times sounded as if he were still campaigning against Republican Gov. John Love, who won the governorship from him in 1962. He cited Love's 15 per cent tax cut campaign pledge, and later tax increases, as evidence that the credibility gap in politics is Republican, not Democratic.

SCOFFS AT DOMINICK

He also criticized Dominick, though, saying Colorado suffers from not having at least one Democrat with access to the White House in the Senate. He also ridiculed Dominick's publicized horseback look at the controversial Red Buffalo interstate highway route through a wilderness area west of Denver.

"Our senator waits for three years," he said derisively, "and then he goes over the hill on horseback. What he should have done is look at the bill three years ago when it came through the Senate."

Farley said Democrats could be in political trouble next year because of feeling against War on Poverty programs. Its weak spots must be shored up, he said, but the program is of great ultimate value and must not be emasculated.

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, Oct. 15, 1967]

DFL BACKS JOHNSON ON VIETNAM—STATE CENTRAL GROUP DIVIDES ON RESOLUTIONS

(By Frank Wright)

WILLMAR, MINN.—A resolution supporting President Johnson's Vietnam policies but welcoming dissent was adopted Saturday by the DFL State Central Committee.

Action came on a divided voice vote after an hour of debate and the defeat of proposed amendments criticizing the administration.

Between 150 and 200 of the committee's 416 members attended yesterday's meeting.

The issue came to a head when several resolutions, most of them opposing the war, were submitted to the committee by local DFL clubs in the Twin Cities area.

The key section of the statement adopted yesterday commended the administration for "sticking to the rough road of responsibility both at home and abroad" and pledged the state party to work for "responsible" Democratic victories in next year's elections.

That section was added on the floor at the urging of William Kubicek, Bloomington, party secretary. It gave a distinctly pro-administration flavor to a Resolutions Committee draft that attempted to find a middle ground acceptable to the President's supporters and critics in the party.

The Resolutions Committee, chaired by Kingsley Holman, Bloomington, party treasurer, had hoped that its draft would preserve party unity and delay an all-out battle at least until next year's state convention.

The State Central Committee is the party's governing body between state conventions.

In addition to commending the President, yesterday's resolution called upon all Democrats to remain within the party organization and attempt to settle the issue there rather than through third-party movements.

The resolution expressed the hope that "all possible avenues be explored with maximum effort in our search for a response to all peace efforts."

It further urged that U.S. military forces be withdrawn from Vietnam "as areas become stabilized, to the fullest extent consistent with the national security of the people of South Vietnam."

Although there was objection, a section backing the President for "his refusal to yield to the pressure of those reckless advocates who impatiently call for the further extension of the war" was retained.

The Central Committee set aside an amendment by Mrs. Kitty Alcott of Hopkins which favored unconditional cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam.

Nat Hart, a faculty member at University of Minnesota, Morris, and Stevens County DFL chairman, attacked the resolution on grounds that it offered "aid and comfort" to Mr. Johnson and Vice-President Hubert Humphrey but none to administration critics such as Sen. Eugene McCarthy and Reps. Donald Fraser, Joseph Karth and John Blatnik, all Minnesota DFLers.

Hart was booed when he said Mr. Johnson, who campaigned on a platform of restraint in 1964, had "deserted" the party by escalating the war since his election.

Sen. Walter F. Mondale, who has been the strongest administration supporter in the Minnesota DFL congressional delegation, said the Central Committee "acted responsibly on the most decisive issue confronting the party and the country."

Mondale spoke at a Central Committee dinner last night.

Supporters of the resolution said they believed that it accurately reflected the views of the state party organization, but opponents claimed it did not. They pointed out that less than half the committee attended the meeting and claimed that many of those who did were fearful of any resolution which might tend to embarrass the Vice-President, a former Minnesota senator.

In other business, the committee:

Heard Finance Director Warren Spannaus report that the state party's $64,600 in outstanding obligations and unpaid bills had been virtually wiped out by proceeds from last Sunday's "Night of Stars" gala and a prolonged Sustaining Fund drive.

Set June 20, 21 and 22 as the dates for next year's state convention in St. Paul.

Adopted a resolution commending Humphrey's proposal for a "Marshall Plan" to aid U.S. cities, a proposal which has been quashed by the President.

Listened to four Minnesota farm leaders discuss programs for farmers. The four were Ed Christensen, president of the Minnesota Farmers' Union; P. D. Hempsted, president of the Minnesota Farm Bureau; William Pearson, master of the Minnesota Grange, and George Matson, president of the Minnesota Branch of the National Farmers' Organization.

THE PROBLEMS OF THE JEWS IN THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, tonight in the Soviet Union thousands of the 3 million Jews in that country will gather at their local synagogues to observe Simchat Torah, the climax of the Jewish holy season.

This celebration for them will only serve to underline their continuing desire to follow their cultural and religious traditions free of Soviet pressures.

Soviet leaders claim that their people have freedom and equality. But Jews are not allowed contact with their own people abroad as are members of other minority groups in Soviet Russia. Since 1956, the Government, directly or indirectly, has closed more than 380 synagogues. As a result, today less than 70 remain; and accordingly, education and instruction in their own cultural and linguistic heritage is denied them.

I join with millons of those who today would welcome efforts by the Government and people of the U.S.S.R. to assure equal rights for Soviet Jews, thereby ending discriminatory practices against this minority group.

EDITORIAL OF SCHOOL BOARDS MAGAZINE ENDORSES BILINGUAL EDUCATION BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the September issue of School Boards, the publication of the National School Boards Association, contains an endorsement of the bilingual education bill (S. 428). Communities having large numbers of non-English-speaking children are advised to "look anew at the language barrier problem of the first few grades."

The article is indicative of the growing awareness of the problem which faces children entering schools with limited English-speaking ability, and it illustrates the growing support for the establishment of bilingual education programs. Only this morning, the House Subcommittee on General Education reported out a bill to establish bilingual education programs. The Senate Subcommittee on Bilingual Education has already favorably reported out the bilingual education bill and the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will soon have it under consideration.

To illustrate the need for this important legislation, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "The Language Barrier," published in the September issue of School Boards, be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE LANGUAGE BARRIER

Educational handicaps are not limited to those of a physical, emotional, racial, or poverty nature. One type of handicap currently receiving attention is that associated with the non-English speaking student.

Significant numbers of children who have little or no ability to speak the language of their teacher are now enrolled in public schools. These children may come from homes in which a language other than English is spoken.

Imagine, by way of comparison, an American child enrolling in a French school where neither the teacher nor the majority of the students spoke English.

Communication and understanding problems facing such children are enormous and cannot be dismissed lightly.

However, efforts are being made to alleviate the linguistic handicap confronting millions of this nation's children.

The Bilingual American Education Bill (S. 428), introduced by Senator Ralph Yarborough (D-Tex.), at press time is being considered in the Senate. Washington observers predict the passage of this bill—either in separate form or as an amendment to ESEA.

The measure would provide federal funds to local districts to develop programs to teach non-English speaking children in their native language. Districts having large Spanish-speaking populations would be encouraged to treat English as a second language in the early grades.

California is one state that is striving to make the first day of school this fall a richer experience for its one-half million Spanish-speaking children. A new state law provides that Spanish can be used in school. English would replace Spanish as the major language by the third grade—after the children have learned the concepts and fundamentals of the basic three R's.

School boards representing communities having large numbers of non-English speaking children would do well to look anew at the language barrier problem of the first few grades. The child's initial exposure to school is indeed *el primer paso importante*—the "first big step."

SOME PROBLEMS OF THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY AND SUGGESTED SOLUTIONS FOR THEM

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on October 6, 1967, the Honorable John T. Connor, one of America's finest public servants and most enlightened industrialists, made an eloquent speech before the North Carolina Textile Manufacturers Association meeting at Pinehurst,

N.C., in which he discussed some of the problems now confronting the American textile industry, and advanced certain suggestions for their solution.

This speech merits the thoughtful consideration of all Americans interested in the welfare of this great industry and of the Americans who work in it. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY MR. JOHN T. CONNOR, NORTH CAROLINA TEXTILE MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION, PINEHURST, N.C., OCTOBER 6, 1967

The invitation you extended to me through Charley Myers to speak at your meeting was most welcome. For several reasons: First and most important, I think I have something to say that will be of interest to you. Second, it seems to me that people from various industry groups should talk more often across industry lines, rather than just within our own circles. After all, so many of our problems and opportunities have a common basis and some common interest, especially when relationships with the Federal Government are involved. And last, you have provided me with a legitimate excuse for visiting this wonderful mecca of golfers—good, bad and even indifferent, although I personally know very few indifferent golfers.

What I have to say can be stated simply and directly, and is based on my experience, in and out of government, with the trade problems of the U.S. textile industry. In my opinion the time has come to make an all out effort to extend import controls—of the kind now applicable to cotton textiles—to all segments of the textile business, that is, to man-made fiber textiles, wool textiles and blends. And have them cover all stages of the manufacturing process, from yarns through such finished products as sweaters, dresses and blankets. Preferably, this effort should be made with the understanding and support of the Administration in Washington. But if, for understandable reasons affecting international relations, that support is not forthcoming, the effort should nevertheless be pressed as vigorously as possible in the Congress, with the expectation that, if the effort is successful, some accommodation will be made by the Congress with the Administration at an opportune time. The evidence is quite persuasive by now that textile import quotas, as determined on some reasonable basis to fit the overall needs of both foreign and domestic manufacturers in the orderly development of U.S. textile markets, are needed in the broad public interest—if we are to avoid the chaotic and disruptive conditions characteristic of some earlier periods.

The problems are more acute than they otherwise would be because of the recent conclusion of the Kennedy Round of international trade agreements in Geneva.

The Kennedy Round is an accomplished fact. It's an international obligation into which this country has freely entered. Regardless of reservations some of us may have about some of its provisions, about its effect on various American industries, about how it came into being, and about what was left undone, we all have the obligation to make whatever accommodations are necessary—and learn to live with it. No less than others, the textile industry must make these accommodations and adjustments.

Now, the big question is: Where do we go from here?

And the simple answer, as I see it: to seek more equitable non-tariff importation practices—which will enable foreign producers to participate in an orderly way in the growth of U.S. textile markets, but not to dominate or disrupt them.

Imports of textiles into the United States have risen sharply in recent years, even before the Kennedy Round goes into effect. I mix together all categories of textiles: cottons, wools, man-made fibers and blends, in all stages of process, from yarn to finished product. In fact, the rate of the increasing volume of imports is outstripping the growth rate of the domestic market in textiles and apparel, and by a wide margin.

Domestic production has expanded since 1961 by approximately one-third. But in that same period, imports of cotton and wool textiles have just about doubled and since 1962, those of man-made fiber textiles have about quadrupled.

The problems of all segments of the textile business must be settled on a multi-fiber basis, not sparately, as though their interests coincided only by occasional accident. Although on the face of it cotton textiles appear to be in better shape than wool or man-mades or blends, most observers say that cotton imports have risen more substantially than was contemplated when the Long Term Arrangements were negotiated.

The evidence is clear. For their own sound business purposes, foreign manufacturers have increasingly been blending their cottons with polyesters and other synthetics, thereby effectively excluding them from LTA controls. And of course they are sending man-made fibers into this country in ever-growing volume to compete with U.S. cotton products, as well as with U.S. man-made products.

I realize that not everybody shares the view that the American textile industry should be treated differently from other industries. The general industrial community in the United States is being asked by our government to accept the effect of broad reductions in trade restraints among nations. In an era when economics and diplomacy are so closely entangled, why make an exception of the textile industry? Why the special treatment?

It isn't enough to answer: With regard to imports, the government has treated the textile industry as a unique entity—as a matter of tradition.

The meaningful answer is *survival*. Without such special treatment, this industry might well have gone under years ago. In 1935, President Roosevelt, at the recommendation of Secretary of State Cordell Hull, authorized an agreement by which the Japanese, from whom we received most of our imports, volunteered to cut their exports to the United States. This was a particularly significant agreement in light of the fact that Mr. Hull was a staunch supporter of the concept of reciprocal trade. In 1956, President Eisenhower also limited Japanese cotton textile exports to this country when they rose to a dangerous level. In 1961, President Kennedy, too, offered special protection—by negotiating the LTA. This year, even while the Kennedy Round was being conducted in Geneva, the Johnson Administration was holding separate discussions that led to the extension of the LTA—for a period of three years.

These presidential decisions have not been made as a sign of favoritism or as acts of grace on behalf of textile manufacturers. They were made because economic realities required them. And they still do today, as much as ever.

What are the characteristics of the unusual economic metabolism of the American textile business? Why does it require special consideration?

One of the major reasons lies outside our own borders, within the developing countries of the world.

Having decided that industrialization is a good route to financial viability, these nations have concluded that the production of textiles is a sensible point of departure for their largely untrained and unsophisticated labor force.

Clearly, the infant textile operations of many of the developing nations cannot prosper if they are not able to export a large part of what they produce. And in the years after World War II, one of the few logical markets was the United States—since this was one of the few countries that could afford to pay for foreign-made goods.

At the same time, as other countries built or re-built their industrial capacity, they found it imperative to protect their home markets from external competition. The result is, the United States is effectively barred from trading in textiles on a freely competitive basis with large areas of the world. Simultaneously, the U.S. became the destination of products from fiercely protective nations that could ship them to few other places.

Fortunately for our favorable standard of living, wages in the American textile industry are manifestly higher than they are anywhere else in the world. That means, of course, that competitors abroad can produce the same items we do at considerably less cost. And, as time passes, their capacity and refinement grow. They use better machinery, train their workers in improved techniques, produce higher-quality fabrics. Many of them, starting from scratch, use the latest equipment—even if that means a lower rate of employment.

Before the mid-thirties, we had no real textile import problem. The average U.S. tariff on all dutiable imports, including textiles, was 47%. Last year it was 12%. I've already spoken of the recent precipitous rise in imports of yarns, fabrics and garments. From the mid-thirties to the present, imports shot up from $124 million to $1.5 billion.

Curtailed in its efforts to compete in international markets, forced to compete in domestic markets against goods that are manufactured more cheaply abroad and are offered for sale here at lower competitive prices, the U.S. textile business was in serious trouble by the late fifties. In those years, from '57 to '60, imports of cotton textiles jumped from 400 million to over a billion square yards. In the domestic industry, wages fell, unemployment rose, the rate of return on investments declined, research activity dropped. So did investments in capital equipment. In effect, the textile industry became a depression industry, with serious ramifications for the entire national economy.

As much as many of our overseas competitors, we were hurting. Recognizing the problem, President Kennedy instituted a seven-point program to help textile manufacturers to help themselves. He said at the time—and I might add it is equally true today—"That it was one of the industries essential to our national security." And it was, he added, "of vital importance in peacetime and it has a direct effect upon our total economy. All studies have shown that unemployment in textile mills strikes hardest at those communities suffering most from depressed conditions."

One of the most important aspects of the seven-point program was that it offered financial incentives to those investing in new textile machinery and equipment. As Mr. Stanley Nehmer, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Commerce, recently said, "it has been estimated that the liberalized depreciation guidelines and the subsequent seven percent investment tax credit increased the average return on new equipment investments by 35 to 45 percent for all manufacturing industries, including textiles." It's interesting to note that capital spending in textiles, in the five years from 1961 to 1966, rose from a level of $500 million to $1.2 billion a year.

Another point in the textile recovery program was the legislation that enabled Amer-

ican mills to buy cotton at the world market price, thus ending the domestic industry's disadvantage in raw material costs.

Probably the most famous and unusual aspect of the program was the call by President Kennedy for an international conference to negotiate a cotton textile agreement on a voluntary basis. The result was the 1962 Long Term Arrangement for cotton textiles. Although some may argue that the LTA is not working out as expected, all in the U.S. textile industry will agree, I'm sure, that it was a step worth taking. In spite of complaints from some exporting countries that its provisions are onerous, and from some domestic manufacturers that its administration is not tight enough, the arrangement has provided a fairly satisfactory answer to a difficult problem.

What was the effect of the whole Kennedy-Johnson program? I've already spoken of some of them. The others: Textile profits rose to an almost decent level. Sales and production levels reached new highs. So did average weekly wages and salaries. Plant and equipment expenditures rose at almost twice the rate of the rest of American industry. By early 1966 the worst was over, and the textile industry was back on its feet, although profit levels were still below the average of American industry.

Then came a real test—one that was met successfully, for two specific reasons: because the textile industry is so well organized to conduct necessary activities in Washington. And because management and labor officials work together so well on these matters for the good of the industry. And the test itself: As the United States commitment in Vietnam rose sharply through 1965 and into 1966, the demand for textile products for the military also rose, again emphasizing the need for a strong domestic textile business for defense purposes. Although there were anxious moments, this demand was satisfied by a combination of increased domestic production and some import quota and "one shot" accommodations. By early 1966, government officials concerned with economic stabilization activities feared that the effects of the law of supply and demand would result in serious price rises. In their view, the way to maintain economic stabilization was to liberalize—even demolish—our import quota agreements for cotton textiles—so there would be a vast influx of textiles into the country, and thus drive down the price levels.

Others of us in government disagreed strenuously. We urged delaying a decision until the completion of a study of supply and demand prospects for the rest of 1966 and into 1967—a study to be made jointly by the Department of Commerce and the Council of Economic Advisers, and which would include data and opinions from the industry. It would thus properly reflect realities and realistic prospects.

As a result, the study was made—with management and labor representatives participating—including long and short term, in-depth projections of the state of the market. The conclusion reached was that there would be a sufficient increase in the availability of cotton, wool and man-made textiles, including those produced at home and those imported under the current quota levels, to meet foreseeable needs, normal and emergency. Further, the prediction was made, based on the opinions and commitments of industry leaders, that there would be no increase in the level of textile prices. Therefore, the study concluded that no drastic rise in import quotas was necessary or desirable.

You people are of course better acquainted with what happened than I am. In short summary: early in the second half of 1966 and continuing into 1967, textile production levels, prices and profits declined. By April of 1967 employment in the textile and apparel industries dropped 3.5% from the 1966 high. Investments in plant and equipment declined, but average hourly wages arose. Even cotton textile imports declined in the first five months of 1967, although man-made fiber textile imports soared 37% above the comparable 1966 figure.

What a mistake it would have been if the import quota system had in fact been junked! And it probably would have been if your industry leaders had not been alert to the situation. And if they had not had the industry's vital statistics organized for presentation.

I realize not everybody sees the quota system in the same light. The opponents of quotas and other non-tariff barriers are legion. They are articulate. They are influential. The reputable *Wall Street Journal*, in its August 16th lead editorial, said, in part, "By curbing import competition, quotas naturally tend to push domestic prices higher than they otherwise would be; like tariffs, they thus represent a hidden subsidy to domestic producers, a subsidy paid by consumers through the higher prices."

Yesterday's *Wall Street Journal* carried another editorial to the same effect, entitled "The Pains of Protectionism." The conclusion is stated as follows: "For some businessmen, import competition can prove quite painful. From the standpoint of the rest of the nation, however, the agonies of protectionism could be a good deal worse."

Professor Milton Friedman, the eminent Republican economist, agrees in spades, and deplores the imposition of quotas as the mark of the special interest state. Other prominent economists, most of whom seem to be constitutionally addicted to free trade, contend that the less restricted our trade the greater the number of jobs that are created.

Many of us would agree that in an ideal world people would be far better off if all the nations could trade across frontiers without regard to tariff or non-tariff barriers of any kind. Where, ideally, one nation could exploit to the fullest its own geographical and geophysical resources, its skills and techniques, its artistic and technological excellence. And exchange them for the complementary goods and services of a neighboring or distant people. Where everything one people had to sell could find a market, at home or abroad. But the facts of today's world and of the tomorrow we see on the horizon do not make that possible. We do not, alas, live in a utopian world community. We live on this so familiar earth. Where some nations are agricultural, some industrialized, some highly advanced, some undeveloped. Where living standards and traditions differ, where wages and costs vary enormously, where each nation has its own sharply delineated views of economic self protection, and rigorously applies them. Where unemployment ratios differ, where governments take dissimilar stands on subsidies to domestic industries. Where natural resources are limited or abundant. Where political objectives differ widely from nation to nation and bloc to bloc.

It seems to me that we must re-examine our nation's position from time to time, in the light of new developments and new realities. However admirable our role of big brother, no matter how urgent and justified earlier pleas for assistance, the fact is: conditions change. Nations develop a certain degree of security, self-reliance, capacity for achievement. They back away from the brink of disaster; if they are not altogether viable—sociologically and economically—the prognosis for their survival is at least hopeful. They may still require help, but possibly less than before. Or help of a different nature.

And by the same token, our own needs change. And the kind of help we're in a position to offer changes from time to time, particularly by way of trade arrangements.

As conditions change in the constant ebb and flow of international concourse, it even becomes necessary to use new terms to label those new conditions and the ways we look at them.

The terms free trader and protectionist don't really tell the full story any more. They leave a gap in the philosophical spectrum of international trade relations, far too complex and polarized today not to require at least one bridge between them.

What about the label: conservationist? A conservationist, as I see it, wants to conserve for the American people the wage levels to which they are accustomed. And the profit levels. And the high standards of investment and research and general working conditions.

Do we want to see the U.S. textile industry revert to the depressed conditions of the late fifties and very early sixties? Or its employees plunge to the living and working standards of their opposite numbers in many other countries?

Today a conservationist would not *bar* imports, but wants to see them enter this country on an orderly, reasonable basis, avoiding disruption and hardship among domestic producers.

I would say a conservationist is a realist. In respect to textiles, he realizes that under present conditions imports will increase substantially because of a combination of factors: the Kennedy Round, the increased capacity of foreign manufacturers, the easy availability of the latest technology to other countries, the continued divergence in production costs between home and abroad, and the continuing subsidies given to private producers by some foreign governments specifically to encourage exportation.

The conservationist also realizes that the result will be a smaller share of the U.S. market for domestic manufacturers. And probably a decreasing share of the world market, as well, since U.S. textile products are totally or partially barred from many countries, either by price levels or nationalistic or regional barriers.

Consequently, the conservationist is not afraid of world competition, but is not eager for American producers to enter the fray with one arm tied behind their backs. He wants an arrangement that will offer reciprocal and equitable terms to all nations and that will offer special consideration for those developing countries still in need of it.

Such an arrangement might require the renegotiation of GATT. But possibly not, since signatory countries are already allowed to impose quantitative restrictions—including quotas—if there are balance of payments difficulties. Or, if the Administration is willing, steps could be taken to extend the existing cotton textile arrangements to other textiles on a voluntary basis. And the LTA stipulates that a signatory country may take corrective action if any provision of the agreement is being frustrated. I think it's a fair claim that the excessive importation of blends and man-made fibers, as substitutes for cotton, does frustrate the cotton LTA's terms.

But even if the U.S. government can arrive at no suitable diplomatic conclusion with other nations, if it comes to it I think we should consider new ground rules for textile imports on a unilateral basis, by force of Congressional action.

In 1966, the U.S. textile trade deficit in dollars was $902 million. The total balance of payments deficit for the country was $1.4 billion. That means that the deficit of the textile trade amounted to almost two-thirds of the total U.S. balance of payments deficit. And the deficit between exports and imports is continually widening as a result of the increase in imports of yarn, fabrics and garments from abroad.

The textile industry doesn't stand as an isolated operation. It consumes the products of other industries. It buys their goods and services. In one way or another, directly or indirectly, the fate of textiles affects the chemicals, synthetic, fiber, transportation, oil, machinery suppliers, electrical and dozens

of other industries. The employees of the textile industry spend money for groceries, automobiles, houses, furniture, professional services, entertainment and countless other items. Clearly, what distresses textiles affects unfavorably the whole country.

And what affects us all becomes the concern of us all. None of us in a business close to textiles can hold aloof from its problems anymore than textiles can hold aloof from the problems of other related industries.

The fact is, we need an adjustment of textile import regulations. All textile imports—cotton, wool and man-made fibers—should be regulated. We don't object to sharing the growth in our market with foreign manufacturers on some reasonable basis. But we do object to the prospect that they will take over our market to any substantial degree.

What can be done about it? Those of us in textiles and related enterprises are able to exercise our rights as American citizens, individual and corporate, to save ourselves from the serious economic consequences of current trends.

The study of the situation by the U.S. Tariff Commission just ordered by the President should be helpful, particularly if it covers trends and prospects—not just historical data. Their report is due by January 15, 1968—in time for action in an election year—a good omen!

We all know that the point of view I've expressed has a number of friends in the Congress, including some very close at hand. We have an obligation, I believe, to continue to bring to their attention, and to the attention of their associates who do not yet understand these problems, information on the textile situation as it develops.

We saw early in 1966, in connection with the tight demand pressures arising from the Vietnam procurement program, that intelligent and timely industry action can be effective. For an even more important cause, you must try again—speaking as one voice—and make yourselves heard in Washington.

SOVIET JEWRY

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the plight of Soviet Jewry disturbs us deeply.

Jews living in the Soviet Union yearn for religious and cultural identity—for the opportunity to give free expression to their faith—and adherence to the bonds of unity they cherish.

One of the most moving expressions of their hopes and dreams comes at Simchat Torah, the Day of Rejoicing in the Law.

In recent years, worshippers overflow the Central Synagogue in Moscow. And after the solemn service ends, many thousands of Russian Jews pour into the streets outside the Synagogue. They dance and sing. They enjoy long hours of merriment together.

Can anyone doubt the depth of their despair—or the depth of their religious devotion?

As we again approach Simchat Torah, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks before the meeting of the leadership of the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry, held in Washington, D.C., on October 11, 1967, be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ABRAHAM RIBICOFF

By tradition the High Holidays are a period of spiritual accounting for people of the Jewish faith.

It is fitting that leaders of the Jewish community should gather at this time in Washington to discuss the plight of Soviet Jewry. For American Jews are concerned. So are enlightened people throughout the world.

They know that the High Holidays are a period of special significance for Jews in the Soviet Union. There, thousands—both the old and the young—fill those synagogues that are still allowed to function—the synagogues attended by relatively few during most of the year. For, thousands are taking this opportunity not only to pray, but also to show their Jewish identity—as they crowd the synagogues and overflow into the streets beyond.

It is especially tragic that many of the young who gather at the synagogues cannot participate in the service. For the Soviet Government has not permitted them to learn to read Hebrew characters.

This year the Holidays fall on the eve of an historic date—the fiftieth anniversary of Soviet rule. To celebrate this occasion, government officials have announced changes in Soviet life that will bring a higher standard of living and a more pleasant existence to millions of people throughout the land. Also, just last month, the Supreme Soviet announced a decision to restore the Tatar minority which was expelled from the Crimea after World War II. This is the latest step in the restoration of rights for a number of minorities which were persecuted during the reign of Stalin.

It has long been the hope of concerned people that on the eve of the October celebrations the Soviet government would take major steps to improve the lot of the Jewish minority—that their religious, social and cultural rights would be guaranteed.

Unfortunately this has not been done.

In fact, at the beginning of the Middle East crisis, the Soviet press launched a propaganda campaign that continues to spread the poison of anti-Semitism. Tales of a world Jewish plot—dating back to the dark ages—have been revived.

On the eve of Rosh Hashana, an article filled with slander and myth appeared in an official Moscow newspaper. The article attacks world Jewry, and specifically American Jewry. It equates Zionism with Nazism, and describes a world Jewish conspiracy in the service of an Imperial Octopus, the United States.

This is the latest in a series of articles which has appeared throughout the Soviet press. Even the God of Hebrews has not been overlooked. An article in a Ukrainian paper on September 6, 1967 insists that the Jewish religion has its origins in viciousness, and that the God of the Jews is angry and brutal.

So long as the Jews of the Soviet Union have no way to defend their right—so long as there is no cultural, religious or social framework within which they can live in accordance with their wishes—concerned people throughout the world have a moral responsibility to defend this minority. For they are deprived of those fundamental rights guaranteed to every national group by the Soviet constitution. These include the study of their language, the development of their culture, and contacts with Jewish life outside the Soviet Union. They include the religious life which other religions in the Soviet Union enjoy.

Until a better, a freer life is the way of the Soviet Jew's life—we will continue to protest and condemn the lot of Russian Jewry.

Until a better, a freer life is the way of the Soviet Jew's life—we must take every opportunity to discuss the plight of Soviet Jewry.

Surely the time is long overdue for the Soviet regime to remove the heavy burden that Stalin placed on Soviet Jews.

The true nature of a system of government expresses itself in the treatment of its people. If during the 50th year of its rule the Soviet government will bring to Russian Jews the freedom—the life they yearn for—surely this move will add to the over-all quotient of good will and cooperation in the world today. Never has it been needed more.

This is our call to the Soviet Union on the eve of its anniversary celebration.

URBAN-RURAL POPULATION IMBALANCE

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the problem of urban-rural population imbalance has prompted a variety of plans and programs to resolve this national dilemma.

From reviewing these proposals, one fact is clear. A blend of public support and private initiative will be necessary in order to intensively develop the industrial, recreational, and agricultural potential of the countryside and take pressure off our overcrowded cities.

We simply have too many people living on too little land in our cities and too few people living on too much land in our rural areas. This pileup of people in the urban areas has resulted in chronic unemployment, skyrocketing welfare payments, disintegrating families, massive slums and rising crime rates.

Meanwhile, many of our rural communities have suffered by the loss of promising young adults and already productive people to the false lure of better opportunity in the city.

The challenge we face is to develop our rural areas into attractive locations for building new industries and into attractive communities for raising new families. This will relieve the tension in our cities and revitalize our countryside so that local families can remain and city families who wish can move in.

Many communities, through aggressive leadership and tremendous local spirit, have already accomplished a great deal. One such example is the Congaree Iron & Steel Co., Inc., Columbia, S.C., which has grown from a seed of an idea 9 years ago to a flourishing business employing 400 people today.

The Congaree story is a stirring one. Throughout its development is woven the able assistance of the Small Business Administration and the local rural electric cooperative, which provided electricity after the private utility in the area had insisted on extremely unrealistic costs for the service.

I ask unanimous consent that a Milwaukee Journal article by Laurene C. Eklund, entitled "New Plan To Help Cities: Create More Rural Jobs," and an article by Congaree President W. F. Threatt, entitled "We Have Broken the Poverty Chain," published recently in the Rural Electrification magazine, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Sept. 24, 1967]

NEW PLAN TO HELP CITIES: CREATE MORE RURAL JOBS

(NOTE.—As the nation's major cities struggle with problems of crisis proportions in the improvement of living conditions, their

resources are strained and their troubles compounded by the continued high rate of influx of newcomers, white and Negro, from impoverished rural areas. While this is only one of many factors in the plight of the cities, some attention is being given to offering the rural poor alternatives to migration. Here is a report.)

(By Laurence C. Eklund)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Calls for a new national policy of "rural-urban balance" are being voiced by some Johnson administration officials as one means of easing the current agony of the cities. The most outspoken promoter of the policy—Agriculture Secretary Orville L. Freeman—used the phrase last month in a speech to the National League of Cities in Boston. "There is a growing awareness of this rural-urban imbalance, and a growing resolve, at least in rural areas, that it must be corrected and that the endless migration that is compounding your agony must be halted, even reversed," Freeman told the mayors.

Vice-President Hubert H. Humphrey sounded the same note last week in a speech at Greenville, S.C. Noting that "urban ghettos are full of people who could not make a decent living in rural areas" he called for building up job opportunities in small communities for people from surrounding rural areas.

REPORT THIS WEEK

Thomas S. Francis, federal co-chairman of the Upper Great Lakes Regional commission, also used the term recently in calling for measures to slow the migration from rural areas to cities and perhaps even to bring about an eventual reversal. He told the Upper Peninsula Committee for Area Progress at Menominee, Mich.:

"We know the tragic result of this march to the cities—discord, riots, fires and human isolation in the midst of almost incredible human congestion."

The "keep 'em down on the farm" effort was given a further boost last week by no less a personage than Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson on her midwest tour hailing the good rural life, on visits to farms and communities in Wisconsin and five other states.

In his speeches, Rural Electrification Administrator Norman M. Clapp stresses federally assisted rural electrification as an essential key to balanced development of the nation. (Clapp is a native of Ellsworth, Wis., and was publisher of the Grant County Independent at Lancaster for 15 years before coming to Washington.)

The idea is to create more jobs in rural areas, especially among poverty stricken Negroes in the south, so as to slow down the mass exodus to the cities of from 500,000 to 600,000 jobless persons annually.

This is believed to be the theme of a report to be made to President Johnson Wednesday by his advisory committee on rural poverty, which has been studying the problem for a year.

Representing the midwest on the 25 member commission in preparing what has been called a "high voltage" report were Wilson King, a farmer of Rock Falls, Ill., and James Bonnen of the faculty of Michigan State University.

The commission is said to have concluded that while the migration to the cities cannot and should not be stopped it can be slowed down and rechanneled more intelligently.

The initial success of a steel joist company in Congaree, S.C., is being cited as a most dramatic manifestation of the type of revitalization that must take place throughout rural America if the rural-urban balance theme is to prove significant.

Founded nine years ago with the help of the small business administration and the rural electrification administration, the Congaree Iron & Steel Co. employs 400 persons, 85% of whom are Negroes, many of them illiterate.

On a recent visit to the project near Columbia, S.C., Secretary Freeman publicized the venture as "a picture book example of what needs to be done all over the nation."

"We have broken the poverty chain," Frank Threatt, the president of Congraee Iron & Steel, told the house rural development subcommittee here recently.

His testimony was an inspiring recital of how local initiative, a government program and a progressive rural electric co-operative transformed a poor black belt community into a bright pattern for the future.

Congaree, with its 85% Negro population, is the historical home of the Hampton Red Shirts, who were dedicated to running out the Negroes and white carpetbaggers shortly after the Civil war.

The Ku Klux Klan flourished there in the 1920s and 1930s and more recently a white citizens' council was started with the aim of fighting integration.

Extremists who controlled the council threatened officers and employes of the new company with violence because it hired Negroes, but the threats were ignored and now the council is out of existence.

"Our local purchases and salaries amount to two million dollars a year," Threatt told the obviously impressed members of the subcommittee, which is part of the house agriculture committee.

"Our schools are integrated. Our Negroes and whites live in peace with mutual respect for one another. The typical charge that Negroes are lazy and cannot be trained for highly skilled jobs has been disproved."

Threatt, himself a white man who had been impressed by the Negro troops he commanded in World War II and in Korea, recalled how Congaree's young Negro men left the community "in droves" for New York, Detroit, Chicago, Milwaukee and other large cities.

YOUNG PEOPLE RETURN

"We have reversed this trend and they are returning home to us," he testified. "We are luring our young people back home out of the ghettos of the north.

"We have every confidence we can set up similar operations near large cities in rural areas and duplicate the business we have at Congaree with minority groups."

Negro heads of family who were making $600 a year at the time the company was started now average slightly more than $3,400 a year, with some making more than $10,000 in supervisory positions.

Threatt said his community is a shining example of what the intelligent use of federal funds can do for a rural area.

He told how the Tri-County Electric Co-op provided electricity for several months at $1.50 a month after the South Carolina Electric & Gas Co. had demanded $3,500 in advance for a power line. The co-op's electric bill now exceeds $3,000 a month.

As an indication of the rising standard of living, the kilowatt-hour consumption of the employees' families has more than doubled since just before the steel company was formed. This reflects their buying of many electrical appliances and improved home lighting.

Threatt proposes to create 600 more jobs at Congaree by building a mill that would use 200,000 crushed automobiles a year as raw material.

Other rural communities, he told congress, can create a thousand or more good paying jobs if they are near a large city with a large minority population, can get power from a local co-op and have the same kind of working arrangement his company has with the REA and the SBA.

WE HAVE BROKEN THE POVERTY CHAIN

(NOTE.—The inspiring story of how local people, a government program and a progressive rural electric co-op transformed a poverty-wracked community into a bright pattern for the future.)

(By W. F. Threatt, president,[1] Congaree Iron & Steel Co., Inc., Columbia, S.C.)

Nineteen fifty-seven was not a very good year for starting a new, under-capitalized industry in Congaree, S.C. This was especially true if the business were located in a predominantly Negro rural area.

NEED FOR ELECTRIC POWER

Our first problem was to locate land that could be serviced with electricity. South Carolina Electric & Gas Company was the nearest utility. We contacted them, and after waiting two weeks a representative visited us. He could not give us an answer as to whether we could purchase power or not from SCE&G because it would be necessary to construct approximately 3,000 feet of power line to the property. Another three weeks passed before we received an answer. The answer was that we could get the power in four weeks by paying $3,500 in advance. Since this sum represented the bulk of our paid-in capital, at that time, we were discouraged.

RURAL ELECTRIC ASSISTANCE

A local board member of the Tri-County Electric Cooperative suggested we contact his manager, Herbert Norris, to see if he could help us.

This we did on Thursday of that week. The following Monday, the necessary lines had been constructed. The transformers were installed and we had power. The cost to us—absolutely nothing. Our first several power bills were a flat $1.50 per month, the minimum.

We hired ten unemployed Negro men from our community and started work installing a handful of second-hand equipment in an open field. When it rained, we stopped work and sat in our cars.

Our employees were illiterate or semi-illiterate. We did not have a building to house our operations. We were competing with the giants of the steel industry. They decided to destroy us early, for our nuisance value, by cut-throat competition. They almost succeeded. Suppliers were reluctant to ship us raw steel. They usually demanded, and got, cash in advance.

One week we nearly went under for lack of $500 to meet our payroll A good friend, who is now a director of our company, N. F. Megna, came to our rescue with a personal loan of $500.

From the outset we integrated our employees. We made no difference between Negro and white.

A RAY OF LIGHT

In 1958 we had the good fortune to meet a brilliant young attorney, Irvine F. Belser, Jr. He believed in us and what we were trying to do. He got us to incorporate and brought in new capital. Through Mr. Belser, we got our first bank loan from a sympathetic and helpful banker, Bonner Baxter, president of Commercial Bank and Trust Company of South Carolina.

With this new money we put a roof on our plant, hired 50 additional employees, and expanded our operations. Our Tri-County Electric Co-op was pulling out transformers and building heavier service every year. Our consumption of power increased proportionately.

---

[1] This testimony was presented by Mr. Threatt before the Rural Development Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee. It is an outstanding success story and proper follow-up of an article appearing on page 27 of the January 1967 issue of *Rural Electrification* magazine.

Business, employment and profits increased every year. However, we outran our capital structure again, and a series of financial crises occurred from 1960 through 1964.

ENTER THE SBA

During this period, we contacted the South Carolina director of the Small Business Administration, Howard M. McKenzie. He and his staff were watching our progress. In October 1965, we were granted an SBA Bank Participation loan of $466,667.

Demand for our product was still growing. We hired an additional 100 employees and put our plant to work around the clock. Before many months had passed it became imperative to find more space. Our employees were working almost elbow to elbow, machinery and men began breaking down from the strain and push necessary to maintain production.

The SBA was keeping a continuing watch over our progress. Charlie McKenzie, director of the 502 Program in the South Carolina office, investigated our needs and came up with a proposed solution.

TRI-COUNTY DEVELOPMENT COMPANY

Cost of the new plant was to be approximately $750,000, of which the SBA was authorized to loan up to $350,000 to the proposed development company. We could not raise the additional $400,000 in our community. The maximum we could raise was $80,000 among employees and friends in the community. At this time the Tri-County Electric Cooperative came to our rescue. Through their loan program for electrical equipment purchases, they participated with the SBA in lending another $300,000.

In less than six weeks the entire package was put together and we received a commitment to build.

Without the able assistance of Charlie McKenzie and Arthur Glick, who had taken over Howard McKenzie's job, we would have been lost.

We received the personal endorsement of Bernard L. Boutin, the National SBA Administrator and his staff.

On the REA staff, everyone from Norman M. Clapp, Administrator; Robert Long and Walter E. Fuller, assistants to the Administrator; Richard Hausler, Deputy Administrator; Noble Wrinkle, S. E. Regional Administrator; John Barringer, Lou Gittleman and Herbert Norris cut through red tape and expedited our application.

Our Congressional delegation—Senator Strom Thurmond, Senator Ernest F. Hollings, and Congressman Albert Watson—gave us undivided assistance when called upon. They opened many doors and expedited our project. Their advice and assistance cannot be measured.

In two months our new plant will be in complete operation. We are employing men as fast as we can train them. We now employ 400 people.

In our community, an economic and sociological miracle has taken place. Our sole purpose, at the outset, was to start a business and make money. What happened?

Two completely new schools and 27 classroom additions to existing schools have been constructed. The Head Start Programs, supervised by the Office of Economic Opportunity, are flourishing. Our children who had never seen inside plumbing, or had a physical examination, are now receiving these benefits.

Over 75 new homes have been bought or built by our employees. This could be tripled if we could overcome the resistance to making home loans to rural Negro people. We still need help in this area.

Three new filling stations, a bakery, a small shopping center, a new post office, a machine shop, two new laundries, two new churches, one new restaurant, a fish bait business, several small country stores are the result of our plant and its employment.

Our local tax base has increased five times over. Increased property values alone have more than tripled.

Our $1½-million payroll is the backbone of our community.

SOCIAL CHANGES

Our schools are integrated. Our community is 85% Negro and 15% white. We live in peace with mutual respect for one another. We cannot change a way of life that goes back 200 years, but we are making progress. Our biggest worry is the outside paid agitators who visit our Negro churches. They say we go too slow and haven't done enough. We fight them with facts.

Our people vote and we encourage voter registration. We cannot predict how they vote, but we advise when asked for assistance. Our great President Johnson grows in stature every day in our area. Our Congressional delegation represents all the people black and white.

FEDERAL CREDIT UNION

Our Federal Credit Union has 296 members and makes loans for everything from a washing machine to houses. We have almost eliminated the "loan sharks" that preyed on our employees.

Our young Negro men left the community in droves going into New York, Detroit, Philadelphia, Cincinnati, Los Angeles, Chicago, Washington, D.C. and other large cities.

We have reversed this trend and they are returning home. We have every confidence that we can set up similar operations near large cities, in rural areas, and duplicate the business we have here at Congaree, with American or Indian. This is provided we have the imaginative assistance in these areas that we have received from SBA and REA in our community. We challenge you to challenge us. You name the city and state.

THE FUTURE

We have broken the poverty chain in our area, but we still have a long way to go. In addition to a good job for a man, we must see that he has a decent home to live in, a school to educate his children, a hospital to treat his ills, an expanding job opportunity.

Last, but not least, we must make him regain his pride in being an American citizen, and not a second-class citizen. We measure our successes in inches and our losses in yards, but the inches are creeping up.

Many of our Negro employees earn over $10,000 a year. You can't get THEM to march, demonstrate and destroy property.

Unfortunately, we, the white minority in our area, still retain many of our old prejudices and we accept change slowly. The facts of life tell us that the only way to hold our Negroes in the gutter is to get in the gutter with them. We are too proud for this and elect instead to pull them up with us.

Time is our biggest enemy. We need time to change our thinking, but the radical elements in our society won't give us time. Consequently, we must hurry, and when we hurry we make mistakes.

CONCLUSION

We do not propose to speak for all Federal programs in our state. We can speak for the SBA and the REA. In the past few months, the SBA has made over $7,000,000 available for development companies similar to ours, through their 502 Program. REA has made power available to every man who requested it.

Our community is a shining example of what the intelligent use of Federal funds can do for a rural area. We hope that you will see fit to continue and expand the scope of these most worthwhile agencies. Time is short and this generation must hurry, even if we make mistakes.

ADDRESS BY DR. LELAND J. HAWORTH, DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, this past weekend I was honored to be present at the dedication of a new Physical Science Center at the University of South Carolina in Columbia. This center represents the culmination of years of planning and hard work dating back to my term as Governor of South Carolina.

However, the new center is far more than that: It is a milestone in the progress of the university. That the center is now a concrete reality is due in large part to the efforts of the university president, Thomas F. Jones. We in South Carolina deem ourselves fortunate to have a man like Dr. Jones heading our State's largest university. He is eminently qualified in that he combines the best qualities of a teacher and an administrator. Compassionately he deals with the problems which confront the young men and women at the university. His ideals instill in those around him great hope for the future. Yet at the same time he is a realist with the ability to implement as well as conceive.

The principal speaker at the dedication was another gentleman who played a very real part in making the dream a reality—Dr. Leland J. Haworth, Director of the National Science Foundation. In his remarks, Dr. Haworth pointed out not only the educational worth of the new center but also its relevance to the "regional, economic and social system of which it is a part". I commend Dr. Haworth on his statement and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF DR. LELAND J. HAWORTH, DIRECTOR, NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION, AT THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA DEDICATION OF THE PHYSICAL SCIENCE CENTER, COLUMBIA, S.C., OCTOBER 20, 1967

Senator Hollings, President Jones, ladies and gentlemen, when Dr. Jones invited me to join with you, in dedicating the Physical Sciences Center for the University of South Carolina, I was delighted to accept both for personal reasons and as a representative of the National Science Foundation. In my association with the Atomic Energy Commission from 1947 to 1963, my duties with the Brookhaven National Laboratory and later as Commissioner, gave me a close familiarity with the people and programs of the Savannah River installation of the AEC, but it was your Physical Sciences Center which finally gave me the chance to actually visit the University of South Carolina and to see at first hand your advances in science, education, and industry. As a representative of the National Science Foundation, I am happy to be able to convey our pleasure in having been able to play a part in transforming the Center from idea to reality. Let us hope that the future will bring us together on other special occasions like this.

There are many people in this audience, and some who are not so fortunate as to be present, who have added their "blood, sweat, and tears" to the bricks and mortar of this Center. They deserve our sincerest congratulations for what they wrought.

In the consultative process leading to the construction of this facility, Senator Hollings, who was then Governor of South Carolina, gave significant assistance. I know, too,

that Senator Thurmond is also extremely interested in the development of institutional capabilities in science in South Carolina and the Southeastern region of the United States.

At first, early in 1962, only a modest proposal for the renovation of the old chemistry building was made. However, after further consultation between the University and Foundation staff, it became clear that such an arrangement would not be permanently satisfactory because new facilities were already being developed for engineering and other sciences elsewhere on the campus. It is to the great credit of the staff involved that they were able to reconcile Federal grant requirements while still exercising local control and flexibility of action to permit the University to chart its own course and to take advantage of its special strengths. From their deliberations, it became clear that University needs would be better met, over the long term, by a comprehensive Physical Sciences Center which would accommodate chemistry, physics, a computer center, and a science-engineering library.

This new concept, formulated under Dr. Jones' guidance, was reviewed and evaluated by NSF staff and facilities consultants, and in August 1964 the NSF granted over one-half million dollars for the Physical Sciences Center. Fortunately, newly passed legislation in the 89th Congress enabled the Office of Education to add even larger grants to that of the Foundation. To these sums, the State contributed still more and the facility finally took the form we see today. The moral of his story is simply that it takes many people, working together, patiently and creatively, within the policy framework of constructive legislation, at both the State and Federal levels, to achieve real progress in science and education.

In admiring this Center, we should, however, not lose sight of its relevance to the total educational, regional, economic and social system of which it is a part. You have not merely constructed a building. Experience at other institutions has shown that we can expect that the strengthening of physical sciences at the University of South Carolina will bring valuable, sometimes pioneering, interdisciplinary activities with other departments on the campus. Also, we can anticipate that funds from other sources will be attracted, and that faculty recruitment will be enhanced—drawing staff from industry as well as traditional sources. Finally, we can anticipate that the students who will be attracted to apply for admission will have better training to begin with and come from higher quality schools. Already, we can see signs that these lessons from experience will be repeated at Carolina. Dr. Jones tells me that there has taken place a most gratifying buildup and improvement of the departmental staff. As a result, great progress has been made in chemistry and physics since the NSF site visits in 1962–63. Whereas the whole University awarded only six Ph.D's per year then, these two departments awarded over twice that many this summer. I am assured that the productivity of the chemistry and physics departments together will double again and exceed 25 doctoral graduates within two or three years.

As the capabilities of the University increase, it can make a commensurate contribution to the growth and progress of its State and the entire Southeastern region of the United States. We have come to recognize that regional growth and progress are linked closely to science and education. From such awareness has come the general concept and overall national policy that there must be an increase in the number of those universities and colleges where standards of excellence in scientific research and teaching are comparable with the best that prevail anywhere. This increase is needed so that the total national program in science and education can be improved and to assure that such institutions shall be present in every region of the land. We seek to achieve these purposes for reasons broader than the campus itself. Of course, the country needs the trained, skilled manpower and the knowledge which are the most visible outputs of a university. But the excellent university does more. It is a nucleus from which ideas radiate to influence community attitudes and values. The standards of truth and culture which it upholds set worthy examples for others who are outside the institution. At the same time, the charged atmosphere of the university attracts industry, economic development, and other desirable elements of society.

Our interest in the level of funding should not overshadow the kinds of programs through which available funds are allocated. The broad umbrella of promoting science and education covers many operational objectives, and varied and new programs must be devised to achieve these objectives. For example, this new Center helps to achieve the objectives of the Foundation's graduate science facility program. But since it is a permanent part of the University, it is evaluated on an institutional basis. This means that the environment for research and science education, the overall quality of the institution, and the aims, progress, and projected changes in the institution are major factors in support of new facilities.

Realizing that facilities are part of an institutional fabric, we can see that general institutional support by Government is a key portion of the total picture. Institutional development programs have been an important innovation in NSF programs. While many of you are aware of the activities of the Foundation, let me take a moment to give some background for the benefit of those not familiar with our work.

In its first 15 years, the Foundation vigorously pursued, as it does today, its main objectives of expanding scientific knowledge through support of basic research projects; the betterment of science education by granting fellowships, and traineeships, by providing funds for the equipment and facilities needed by academic institutions, and by a whole series of programs designed to assist improving the quality of education at every level through institutes for teachers at the pre-college institutes, curriculum development projects at every level, assistance to outstanding college and high school students who wish to take part in research programs, and so on. Our commitment to the objectives of basic research and education in science, together with the support of other Federal agencies, has contributed much to the flourishing state of American science. At the same time, our nation has formulated new goals of equality of educational opportunity. To meet such goals when faced with a growing enrollment, rising costs, and increased emphasis on the role of science and technology in solving the complex problems of our society, a new dimension of support was needed.

It became evident, a few years ago, that we not only had to strengthen science as such, and to maintain existing centers of excellence, but we needed to develop and improve the capability for research and education in the sciences at institutions not now among the foremost. To help meet these latter needs, a broader based, more comprehensive program of support for improvement of institutions was undertaken.

Improvement of institutional capabilities is carried out at several levels. The Foundation's University Science Development Program provides support on an institution-wide basis to a limited number of Ph. D. granting institutions which have substantial current strength and potential for planned progress. Our Departmental Science Development Program helps specific individual departments or areas of science in graduate level institutions which are not yet ready to move to the top rank on a university-wide basis. Finally, our College Science Improvement Program, which aids in the improvement at predominantly undergraduate level institutions, complements the two graduate level programs just mentioned, by extending the institutional science development concept across almost the full spectrum of higher education.

There isn't enough time to describe the details of each of these programs to you tonight. However, I think you might be interested to know that the program for University Science Development has, to date, made broad-gauged grants totaling over $100 million to 27 institutions in the past two years. Of these 27 institutions, 13 are located in the South and Southwestern parts of the United States. In addition five institutions including three in the South and Southwest, have been awarded a total of $3.5 million for projects of narrower scope, which grew out of more ambitious University Science Development proposals. The Departmental Science Development Program which started only last winter, has to date awarded about $5 million to assist single departments in eight widely-scattered institutions. The College Science Improvement Program, which also started last winter, has made broad-gauged awards totaling $2.5 to fifteen predominantly undergraduate colleges scattered around the nation.

About 40 percent of this money is for personnel, including faculty, graduate and undergraduate students, and technical and clerical personnel support. About one-third of the money is for equipment, including library books and periodicals, computer time and rental, travel, and various types of needed equipment. About one-fourth of the funds are for the renovation and new construction of facilities.

Programs of the type I have just described are in line with the policy of the President, announced in his memorandum of September 1965, to achieve broader institutional distribution of Federal funds to universities and colleges while maintaining strength at existing centers of excellence. Although NSF is unique in its across-the-board support for basic research and science education, it should be noted that a similar process is also taking place in the mission-oriented, science support of other Federal agencies. I think it most significant that during the period 1963–66 changes in the pattern of Federal funding showed a trend toward relatively greater Federal support of the developing institutions in the Southern and Western parts of the United States.

While emphasizing the importance of scientists and scientific institutions to the educational and intellectual life of a region and as a stimulus and aid to economic growth, we should keep in mind that other factors are also vital in a region's development. A region needs knowledgeable and dynamic local business, financial, and political leaders. It also needs resources in the form of the required raw materials, plant, capital, and skilled and dedicated managers and personnel.

The impressive growth of the Southeast shows that the fusion of all of these factors is taking place at an increasing rate in this region—here and now.

Like the ripples spreading out when a stone is dropped in water, one can identify many favorable effects from this new Physical Sciences Center to the University, to the State, and to the region of which it is a part. Although we have reason to be well satisfied with these prospcets, there is still much to be done to bring science into its own in this region. This Physical Sciences Center represents only one way to enhance science and education in a community. Many other approaches are open at both the individual and and the institutional level.

And, at the institutional level there are opportunities for both large and small academic institutions. In particular, I direct

the attention of those of you in the audience from liberal arts undergraduate colleges to on-going NSF programs such as the programs for college science improvement grants, science faculty summer research participation, equipment for undergraduate improvement, and science faculty institutes. These programs represent only a small sampling of the kinds of opportunities which exist for individuals, institutions, and other local groups to progress.

Federal participation in the higher learning process is not a passing fad. It has become a prominent, if not permanent, feature of our social landscape, and can, objectively, be described as a constructive partnership, benefiting both sides. The Government has need of the university's knowledge and creativity, and the university, if it is to respond, needs the counsel, cooperation and support of Government. How we satisfy these common needs and maintain the relationship is a continuing problem. I took the time, earlier in my remarks, to detail the events that led to the construction of this Center, because I think it an excellent example of how well open minds and mutual respect on the part of many parties, at various levels of Government and academia, can join forces for progress.

However excellent an example this Center provides, the Foundation does not pretend to have all the answers on how best to promote science and education in science. The Foundation uses appropriated funds as a public trust, and yet we try not to paralyze our scientific and academic partners in red tape because of the trust delegated to us. More important than the possible irritations of administration are the substantive questions of maximizing return on the public investment. The Foundation has a national mission which is maximized when it takes into account local and regional concerns. We try to meet bona fide needs which can result in the improvement of science, and we are interested in finding out about significant needs so that we can give them consideration. Obviously, people like you, and your counterparts in other areas, can bring a unique and useful perspective which can lead to many helpful suggestions. The Foundation welcomes your suggestions on how to meet the special needs of your school and your region.

There are some who suspect that a Government agency would reject suggestions that are not tried and true. Speaking for the Foundation, which is not young enough to know everything, I prefer to follow the philosophy that it is better to ask some of the questions than to know all the answers. I think that we are flexible enough to foster our national purpose by meeting individual needs of the parts of our nation.

I want to invite each of you to visit the Foundation if you have occasion to be in Washington so that we can get better acquainted and explore joint problems. We may in our evaluation seem careful and traditional, but the facility we dedicate today is proof that we can think big together.

Up to this point, I have focused on the Government side of the coin. The other side of the coin is the increasing responsibility of individual academic institutions. The responsibility of an academic institution does not end when it receives more funding. There is need for an on-going, critical look at the real objectives of the institution and what, if any, plans it has developed to achieve its self-imposed objectives. Plans that are developed should avoid conventional projections of present trends and situations and aim at being imaginative ventures into unknown academic frontiers.

Personal and institutional self-evaluation is an inherent part of this examination of purpose and plan. Identifying areas of strength and weakness is not easy, and there is a human tendency to over-estimate the strengths and underestimate and perpetuate the weaknesses. It is the responsibility of the academic institutions to undertake this difficult task so that plans are based on a realistic assessment of its capabilities. In addition to these responsibilities, academic institutions should not separate education into small, individual cells. Instead an interdisciplinary treatment of problems should be fostered. We want to be sure that we don't splinter our available resources or fragment the educational experience of your students.

This facility, which brings together physics, chemistry, engineering, and the computing sciences, illustrates the points on academic responsibility that I have been making. Planning for this facility not only called for a proposed expenditure of money, but it also represented innovative planning which reflected a realistic assessment of University capabilities and a bringing together of interrelated disciplines.

This has been a long day, and there are more festivities to come. I look forward to them with eager anticipation. As a starter, I'm told that I will be lodged in your resplendent Women's Dormitory tonight—with my wife who has accompanied me. With such pleasant prospects awaiting us, let me conclude by noting that the ingredients for scientific, educational, and economic progress exist in the Southeastern United States. In many ways the ingredients present here are equal to the challenge ahead, as shown by the trends in your rate of academic and industrial growth. I am sure that the Physical Sciences Center and the students and faculty who are to use it will help the University contribute even more to the welfare of this area. I will watch with great interest the promising development of science and education in South Carolina and the region of which it is a part. Let me wish you well in the use of these new facilities and in the endeavors they will support.

THE PLIGHT OF THE JEWISH MINORITY IN RUSSIA

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, in 2 weeks the 50th anniversary of the Soviet Union will be celebrated. It is therefore an especially propitious occasion to call to world attention once again the plight of the Jewish minority in Russia.

Earlier this month a National Leadership Conference on Soviet Jewry was held here in Washington. Some 25 major Jewish organizations are pooling their moral leadership resources to bring into as sharp a focus as possible the spotlight of worldwide attention on the way in which basic human rights are denied to Jews in the Soviet Union.

Today, the eve of the Jewish holiday "Simchat Torah," has been chosen as a day for special emphasis on this problem and well it should be. For the past 3 years this holiday has brought to the Russian synagogues an outpouring of thousands of Soviet Jewish youth. This year it will undoubtedly happen again even though, by so doing, these young people run the serious risk of close identification with a minority which is suffering a denial of religious, social and cultural rights which should be enjoyed by all.

I therefore consider it a privilege to join with a number of my colleagues in speaking out on this issue today. We again call upon the Soviet Government to reexamine its policy toward its Jewish minority. Instead of the stepped-up program of Jewish vilification now so prevalent in the Russian mass media, we hope to see them use the occasion of their 50th anniversary year to institute a program which will bring to their Jewish citizens the same rights and privileges enjoyed by other minorities in the Soviet Union.

THE CONTRIBUTION OF NORTH CAROLINA JAYCEES TO THE PROGRAM OF THE PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, one of North Carolina's most alert young businessmen, Jim Melvin, of Greensboro, N.C., who is State chairman of the North Carolina Jaycees, has made an outstanding report in respect to the participation of the North Carolina Jaycees in the people-to-people program of the Partners of the Alliance. This report was published in the September 1967 issue of the official Jaycee magazine, Action.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this report be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

THE NORTH CAROLINA PROGRAM

(By Jim Melvin)

With the support and interest of 37 Jaycee chapters throughout North Carolina and countless hundreds of other non-affiliated persons, the first year of the North Carolina Partners—"People to People"—can be termed a great success. Even though in operation just short of one full year, the North Carolina Partners group has been able to sponsor 60 individual projects ranging all the way from starting boy scout troops, home sanitation projects, water projects, school projects, hospital projects, private enterprise projects, to, last, but far from least, a visit by two North Carolina doctors. The more than 50 individual stories involved with this operation are just too many to publish. However, following are a few cases just to give some idea as to what has already happened in Bolivia as a result of the activities of the North Carolina Jaycees.

The Plymouth Jaycees joined forces with the Greensboro Service League and a local scout troop in Greensboro to provide tableware for the 50 some children in the Milk Drop Orphanage who up to now had been taking turns eating their meals with a limited amount of silverware. Similar joint sponsorship by other groups provided linen, mattresses and mattress covers for this same orphanage.

The Rocky Mount Jaycees have been able to make it possible for the people of El Paso to have water in their village, whereas, up to this time they had to walk several hundred yards to obtain water. This was truly a great moment in the lives of these people which could not have been possible without the help of the Rocky Mount Jaycees.

A nine-square block area in one of the poorest sections of Cochabamba has been cleaned up, thanks to the Burlington Jaycees and their home sanitation project. Also in Cochabamba, they now have a water system thanks to the help of the Goldsboro Jaycees. The people of this village held a big Sunday celebration for the completion of their work and dedicated their new public facility.

These are several free enterprise projects well under way such as the one sponsored by the Lexington Jaycees where they put 38 ladies in the laundry business, and the High Point Jaycees sponsored a sewing business by providing sewing machines.

The Hickory Jaycees joined forces with

Forest City's Jaycees and a church group to provide a set of surgical instruments that were desperately needed by the hospital.

A wonderful group of Wilmington Jaycettes sold cookbooks which produced enough funds to build a dormitory for the Ismael Montes School.

The Matthews Jaycees (some 35 strong) helped build the Buena Vista Rural School and made it possible for more than 50 children to go to school who before had not had this kind of opportunity.

The Salisbury Jaycees bought themselves an oxen, and thus allowed a lot of spring plowing to be done 3,000 miles from Salisbury.

The Asheboro Jaycees turned their "Christmas tree sales" into sewing projects.

The Thomasville Jaycees and the Greensboro Jaycees picked up paper and turned it into projects for their new Bolivian friends.

Of course, there were many non-Jaycee organizations who wholeheartedly supported the "People to People" program. The students at Grimsley High School in Greensboro by selling themselves as slave labor, raking yards, baby sitting, and washing cars raised over $980. This money was sent to Bolivia and in turn used to build the Tablas Monte Bridge which linked a community to the main road that for centuries had been separated by a deep gorge.

The Greensboro Dental Society made available one complete set of dental equipment and made it possible for more than 2,000 children to have free dental checks and toothbrushes.

A scout troop in Greensboro raised money to start a corresponding scout troop in Cochabamba by providing scout hats, handbooks and miscellaneous equipment.

The first year of operation was climaxed by two Greensboro doctors donating one month of their time to go to Bolivia to work and assist the Bolivian people. More than $10,000 worth of drugs alone were donated and taken down by these two men—Dr. Collins Mahaffee, M.D., and Dr. Charles Sims, Veterinarian. Two complete sets of new medical equipment were donated and taken down by these men to be left in Bolivia on their return. Miscellaneous hospital equipment with a value in excess of $5,000 was sent down by air express to be put in use by our medical team. This is certainly a fitting way to end the first year's operation.

In summary, more than $15,000 worth of money, $5,000 worth of equipment and $10,000 worth of drugs have been sent to Bolivia. This figure does not include transportation of the doctors and equipment which was considerable. The grand total would be in excess of $30,000. However large these figures seem, they are merely a drop in the bucket toward solving the many problems of our South American friends.

This project is certainly bringing to life our Jaycee creed which states that "Service to Humanity is the Best Work of Life."

MISS ANNABEL A. GARVEY

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I note with sorrow the passing of Miss Annabel A. Garvey, a member of a most historic and noted family in Kansas.

Miss Garvey, who died in Topeka on September 26, was the granddaughter of two prominent and famous Kansans—Edward C. K. Garvey, one of eight members of the original town company that founded our Kansas capital, Topeka; and Col. W. D. Alexander who served with distinction in the early Kansas Legislature and was an intimate friend of President Abraham Lincoln.

In addition, Miss Garvey's great uncle, Cyrus K. Holliday, was Topeka's first mayor and the president of the Atchison, Topeka, & Santa Fe Railroad. He was also one of our State's early pioneering attorneys.

Edward C. K. Garvey, as well as being one of the founders of our State capital, published what is believed to be the first newspaper printed in Kansas, the Kansas Freeman. Much of Kansas history concerns the rugged determination of men like Mr. Garvey to make Kansas a free State and to rid our then young Nation of slavery.

Evidence of the pioneering spirit of the Garvey family is still present in Kansas today as Mr. Garvey's first home, a substantial masonry structure called Garvey Retreat still stands west of Lecompton, Kans.

Miss Annabel Garvey carried on the proud tradition of her family and of her State. She was a professor of English at Kansas State University, served overseas with the YMCA in World War I, and later was an aide to the U.S. Trade Commission in Turkey. She was most active in the Kansas Author's Club and the Legion of American Penwomen and Quill Society.

Although I note her passing with sorrow, I am sure Miss Garvey and her family's tradition and proud spirit will continue to serve as examples for Kansans today. The rich heritage she and her family worked so hard for and achieved so well is one all Kansans look to with pride.

Mr. President, in these modern times of complex and pressing problems in virtually every segment of our Nation's society, perhaps we all should take time to reflect upon the lessons of the past. I am sure if we would approach today's problems with the same honest enthusiasm, rugged determination, and religious conviction that served our pioneer families, we can continue the job of shaping our Nation's destiny with honor and pride.

Let us hope the tradition we are building today serves our children as well as the proud tradition left by Miss Annabel A. Garvey and her historic Kansas family.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Miss Garvey's obituary as printed in the Topeka Daily Capital and a brief article from an early edition of the Sacramento Record-Union concerning her grandfather and President Lincoln be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Topeka Daily Capital, Sept. 29, 1967]

RITES SET FOR CITY FOUNDER'S RELATIVE

Funeral services for the granddaughter of one of Topeka's founders will be at 11 a.m. today in Penwell-Gabel chapel. She was Annabel Alexander Garvey, 77, who died in a Topeka retirement home Tuesday.

Edward C. K. Garvey, one of eight members of the original town company and brother-in-law of Topeka's first mayor and first president of the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Co., Cyrus K. Holliday, was an early-day attorney.

He also published what is believed to be the first newspaper printed in Kansas, the Kansas Freeman. Garvey built a substantial masonry home west of Lecompton in 1854, with walls two feet thick, which still is standing, and called it Garvey's Retreat.

Miss Garvey's grandfather, on her mother's side, was Col. W. D. Alexander who served in the Legislature.

Educated at Wellesley and the University of Kansas, Miss Garvey was a professor of English at Kansas State University and active in the Kansas Authors Club, the League of American Penwomen and Quill Society. She served overseas with the YMCA in World War I and, later, as an aide to the U.S. Trade Commission in Constantinople.

She is survived by a brother, Maj. Willis Garvey, Washington, D.C. Two cousins, W. Alex Spencer, formerly of Topeka and now of Washington, and William N. Garvey, Greenbrae, Calif., will attend the funeral.

[From the Sacramento Record-Union, Aug. 15, 1902]

A LINCOLN STORY

King Edward VII is credited with the saying that it is vastly easier to live up to the obligations of a play King than to those of a real one; and the same thought, with a slightly different turn, was once expressed by President Lincoln. In 1862 Colonel Alexander of Topeka, who was an intimate friend of the President, visited him at Washington, and found him in a greatly depressed state of mind.

"This being President isn't all it is cracked up to be, is it, Mr. Lincoln?" inquired Colonel Alexander.

"No," said Lincoln, his eyes twinkling momentarily. "I feel sometimes like the Irishman, who, after being ridden on a rail, said, 'Begorry, if it wasn't for the honor av th' thing, I'd rather walk!' "—London Spectator.

CONTINUING PLIGHT OF SOVIET JEWRY

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, on the eve of Simchat Torah, the Jewish holiday which celebrates the completion of the annual reading of the Torah, I feel it appropriate that I join with many of my colleagues in commenting on the continuing plight of Soviet Jewry. Falling as it does just 2 weeks before the 50th anniversary of the Soviet revolution, it is a particularly appropriate time to examine the status and condition of this ethnic and religious minority in the Soviet Union.

In theory, ideology, and constitutional law, the Soviet Union encourages nationalities to identify with their particular group through cultural and educational institutions, and through activities in their own language. This does not, however, hold true for Soviet Jews, who rank 11th in numbers out of 108 U.S.S.R. nationality groups. There is no longer a national Jewish theater, a Jewish publishing house, or book-distributing agency. There are no schools or classes teaching Yiddish, Hebrew, or Jewish culture, history, or literature.

The U.S.S.R. is ideologically committed to atheism. However, while the Communist Party preaches antireligious principles, the State is supposed to accord freedom of religious worship, and, in fact, preaches the equality of religious groups in the Nation.

These principles of freedom of religion have not been granted to the Jews in the same manner in which they are granted to the other organized religious groups in the Soviet Union. Jews may not publish devotional literature or periodicals.

They may not produce essential devotional articles and are barred from having a central or coordinating structure.

Officially, the Soviet Union condemns and even legislates against discrimination on religious, national, or social grounds. Yet it indulges in anti-Semitism in official and unofficial acts. While anti-Semitism has declined since the Stalin era, the 3 million Jews in the Soviet Union still suffer seriously from discrimination.

They are attacked in antireligious propaganda. They have been used as scapegoats in a campaign against "economic crimes." They have been denied equal opportunities in religious and cultural pursuits and are excluded from many high offices in government. Rabbis have been denied travel visas to attend international Jewish conventions and Jews who wish to emigrate to join families or seek opportunity in new lands have been denied permits.

While we all recognize that every country has, and is experiencing, problems in making its constitutional guarantees and stated ideologies every day realities, I feel that it is evident that a sincere effort is being made in that direction. I would like to take this opportunity to call on the Soviet Union to join in that effort—to reevaluate its policies toward its Jewish citizens and take steps to eradicate discriminations against them.

A LETTER FROM VIETNAM

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, much has been written and said about Vietnam, but I wish to add a few more comments explaining why we are there and why we must support President Johnson in these hard, terrible days.

In my hand, I have excerpts from a letter written by a young American fightingman from Missouri who is serving in Vietnam. The letter is addressed to Secretary of State Rusk and expresses clearly why we are in Vietnam.

After reading about some of the disgraceful actions of so-called war protesters during the recent weekend, it is heart warming to read the story of our young men who are in Vietnam fighting for Asian freedom and American freedom.

Listen to the tone and patriotism of this letter:

> As you well know most of the GI's over here, of which there numbers over four hundred thousand, are between the ages of eighteen and twenty-five. I'm in that group. These people are Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives of all types of families. Yet I've never talked to a single GI over here and I probably never will who says "get out of Vietnam." We are fighting for the freedom of these people, as we once fought for our own . . .

There is a lesson for all of us in this letter from a young serviceman in Vietnam.

Let us support our President. Let us support our fightingmen. Let us support America.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD excerpts from this letter from a U.S. Air Force man stationed in Vietnam.

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

> As you well know most of the GIs over here, of which there numbers over four hundred thousand, are between the ages of eighteen and twenty-five. I'm in that group. These people are Democrats and Republicans, liberals, and conservatives of all types of families. Yet I've never talked to a single GI over here and I probably never will, who says "get out of Vietnam."
>
> We are fighting for the freedom of these people, as we once fought for our own. Of these thousands of young Americans over here we all take pride in fighting for the principles that made our country the greatest on earth. When our grandchildren read about Vietnam in history lessons we will be proud to tell them that we were part of that lesson. We will take our place in history with the Americans who fought for freedom in the Revolutionary War, both World Wars, and in Korea.
>
> We are not the only young Americans who feel as we do. There are thousands more in the States who share our feelings. The people in Washington are doing their best for their country, just as we do it over here.
>
> Not all young Americans, in fact not even a majority of us, sit in college classrooms, major in Political Science, and see fit to protest that which our government does. Not all young Americans share a room with the opposite sex and call it the new freedom in sex; not all young Americans attend LSD parties and park Volkswagens on the grass; and not all young Americans protest a war for freedom.
>
> We are proud to be here fighting for America; millions back home are proud of us, and the morale over here has never been higher!
>
> We all respect and admire our Administration and we know the feeling is mutual.

WE SHOULD SPEAK OUT IN OPPOSITION TO DISCRIMINATORY POLICIES IN THE SOVIET UNION AGAINST ITS JEWISH CITIZENRY

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I join with other Senators in expressing deep concern over the plight of Jewish citizens of the Soviet Union and in urging officials of our State Department to call upon officials of the Soviet Government to reexamine discriminatory policies. We in the United States should not remain silent when our voices can help bring justice to people denied justice.

In May 1945, we thought we saw the end of nazism; that it was dead and buried forever. Nazism and fascism are by no means dead. They have perhaps been driven underground, but they have not been eliminated. Anti-Semitism is not a disease peculiar to any one nation. It is a world problem; a deadly sickness that varies in degree from country to country.

In the Soviet Union, Jews are today the victims of what can only be described as cultural genocide. They are without political representation, denied community organization, and almost without religious or cultural rights. The prospects for Soviet Jewry are dire and gloomy. A once flourishing and rich cultural tradition is being extinguished. Discrimination is rampant. Attacks on Judaism in official antireligious propaganda have been virulent and clearly anti-Semitic.

Unlike other recognized religious bodies in the Soviet Union, Jews are not permitted any semblance of a central or coordinating structure. They are not permitted to publish periodicals and devotional literature including prayer books and Bibles. They cannot maintain formal relationships with coreligionists abroad. Other religious groups in the Soviet Union do maintain such contacts.

There is only one seminary for the Jews of the Soviet Union, and it is not functioning. Therefore, there are no replacements for the handful of aging rabbis and other religious functionaries. In 1956 there were 450 synagogues in the Soviet Union. Today there are fewer than 70. If only half of the Jews in the Soviet Union desired to attend worship services, this means one synagogue for every 22,000 congregants.

There are strict and discriminatory quotas against young citizens of the Jewish faith, or of Jewish parentage, who are seeking a higher education and improved employment status. By isolating and atomizing the Jewish community; by forcing Jews to live in fear and insecurity, the Soviet Government is dooming the Jewish community to cultural and spiritual extinction.

Mr. President, Soviet ideology officially condemns anti-Semitism. There are laws against incitement of hatred on religious, national, and social grounds. The Soviet Union officially proclaims equality for all minority groups. The Soviet Union is one of the two most powerful nations in the world. It holds a special responsibility for the example it sets for other nations in its treatment of its minority peoples. Few nations are perfect in that regard, including our own. The world has not been slow to remind us of our shortcomings. It is to the great credit of our form of government and to our way of life that we have listened and are taking steps to narrow the gap between the promise and performance of America.

Mr. President, as they celebrate the 50th anniversary of their revolution, leaders of the Soviet Union should reexamine those policies which bear an ugly resemblance to policies which prevailed under oppressive czars. I join with Senators and with other men of good will everywhere in calling upon them to end discrimination against Jewry in the Soviet Union.

I also urge officials of our State Department to use diplomatic channels more vigorously to impress upon the leaders of the Soviet Union the grave concern of the U.S. Government on this problem, and to encourage the Voice of America to broadcast regular programs aimed at Soviet Jews, so these people will know that they are not alone, not forsaken nor forgotten by the rest of mankind. America must do its share to provide them with hope.

SENATOR SCOTT CASTS DECIDING VOTE ON CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am extremely pleased to be able to report that a perfected version of the civil rights protection bill (H.R. 2516) was adopted by a vote 8 to 7 in the Judiciary Committee today.

I was contacted in Oxford, England, at

4 a.m. yesterday morning by the White House and the Justice Department and asked to return to Washington for this crucial vote. Arrangements were made to get me aboard a military cargo plane which was scheduled to depart for Washington. I arrived at Andrews Air Force Base in Maryland at 7:30 p.m. last night. I will return to Oxford shortly to resume the lecture series I had begun on American government and politics at Oxford University.

This important civil rights bill, supported by members of both parties, on which my vote proved to be decisive, provides heavy penalties for acts of violence or intimidation against citizens exercising their constitutional rights. It is intended to strengthen the Federal Government's capability to meet the problem of civil rights violence, an area of uncertain jurisdiction in the past.

The bill is very similar to a measure sponsored by myself and several other Republican Senators in 1963, but which was not acted upon at that time.

The effectiveness of the bill had been diluted by amendments made in a judiciary subcommittee. That version was set aside, and a substitute version was agreed upon in today's 8-to-7 decision. The version which was approved is substantially the same as the House-passed bill, which was originally title 5 of the omnibus civil rights bill of 1967, of which I was a cosponsor.

This bipartisan action today by the majority of the members of the Senate Judiciary Committee is an important step forward in providing the protection which will make every citizen feel at ease in pursuing their legitimate interests free from threats and acts of violence. I have received many telegrams and letters urging my continued active support for this legislation, including those from Roy Wilkins, president of the NAACP, and Arlen Specter, district attorney of Philadelphia, as well as from labor unions, church groups, and a general cross-section of interested citizens throughout the country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that some of the wires I have received on this important measure be printed in the RECORD.

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

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
October 20, 1967.

Senator HUGH SCOTT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

The protections of title V of the Civil Rights Act of 1967 are desperately needed. The leadership conference on Civil Rights urges you to be present at the Senate Judiciary Committee meeting on Wednesday, October 25 and to vote for the Hart Substitute for H.R. 2516. If other titles of the Omnibus bill are offered as amendments, we urge you to vote to add them to the bill.

ROY WILKINS,
Chairman, Leadership Conference on Civil Rights.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
October 24, 1967.

Hon. HUGH SCOTT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Respectfully urge that you vote in favor of Senator Hart's substitute to the Civil Rights bill (H.R. 2516) pending before the Senate Judiciary Committee. This substitute would provide desperately needed protection for citizens who are exercising the constitutional rights. The legislation provides jail sentences and heavy fines for persons using threats of violence and other forms of harassment to prevent people from civil rights activity.

ARLEN SPECTER,
District Attorney of Philadelphia.

PITTSBURGH, PA.,
October 23, 1967.

Senator HUGH SCOTT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Counting on your support against Ervin bill in Judiciary on Wednesday and for original bill or even better Hart bill.

Rev. DONALD W. MCILVANE,
Religion and Race Council.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA.,
October 23, 1967.

Senator HUGH SCOTT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The kind of Civil Rights Bill the Nation and the world gets from this session of Congress depends on your presence and vote when the Senate Judiciary Committee meets Wednesday October 25th. Helpless Negroes of the South look to you for help by your presence and your vote at this very important committee meeting. You won't let us down, will you?

W. C. PATTON.

PITTSBURGH, PA.,
October 23, 1967.

Senator HUGH SCOTT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Know you will oppose Ervin bill before Judiciary Committee. Count on your support of House bill or Hart bill which is best of all.

BERG BROWN,
President, NAACP.

LEONIA, N. J.,
October 24, 1967.

Senator HUGH SCOTT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge you support House version of 2516. Oppose Ervin substitute in Judiciary Committee.

NANCY HAWKINS,
Legislative Chairman, Department of Christian Social Relations, Episcopal Diocese of Newark.

NEW ORLEANS, LA.,
October 24, 1967.

Hon. HUGH SCOTT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge you to support H.R. 2516 in its original form. Am opposed Senator Ervin's version of the bill.

JESSE W. COOK,
Member, Republican State Central Committee.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
October 24, 1967.

Senator HUGH SCOTT,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge attendance for full session Judiciary tomorrow. Urge your ardent support for Civil Rights bill.

COMMUNITY RELATIONS CONFERENCE OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA.

THE JEWISH MINORITY IN THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, on the eve of the Soviet Union's commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution, 3 million Russian Jews tomorrow will celebrate the Simchath Torah. It is particularly appropriate that we raise our voices with theirs at this time to decry the Communists' systematic and unceasing efforts to deny to Soviet Jews those most basic freedoms they so strongly desire.

While the Russian leaders remain deceptive in their practices, and continue their production and proliferation of arms and export war materials to trouble spots around the world, they should be directing their energies toward achieving progress in the area of religious toleration. Soviet law and Soviet leaders take the official position of allowing the free expression of religious beliefs. But, as the world is constantly reminded, in the ranks of Soviet officialdom, words are cheap.

The Communists have denied the Jews the establishment of Yiddish schools or classes, banned the Jewish State Theater of Moscow, closed the last remaining Jewish publishing house and nearly 300 synagogues in the last 10 years, and made it impossible for Jewish youth to enter into rabbinical training.

In the face of this pressure, there remains in the hearts of countless Jewish Russians an intense desire to keep alive their faith.

It is a conspicuous failing point of the Communist system—one about which they need to be reminded—that in half a century of rule they have been unable or unwilling to achieve in their country the equalities of the classless society promised by their theorists. That in this era of world progress in human understanding Russia should espouse revolution in the name of equality, while denying this very equality to its own citizens is a hypocrisy of which all should be much aware.

AAUW STATEMENT ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, the American Association of University Women, an organization of more than 175,000 women who have graduated from accredited colleges and universities, has long been noted for the care with which it examines and considers public issues before going on record in support of or in opposition to any proposal. One of the items which the AAUW has consistently favored during the past several years has been the adoption of Federal legislation which would extend meaningful protection of basic civil rights.

Recently Dr. Victoria Schuck, chairman of the Legislative Program Committee, and Gloria Peters, area representative in community problems, prepared the official statement of the American Association of University Women on S. 1026, the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1967, for submission to the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. Unfortunately, it was not possible to complete and secure approval of this testimony before the date when the hearing record of the subcommittee was closed. In view of these circumstances, and because the

stand taken by this distinguished organization on such an important issue should be available to Congress and the public, I ask unanimous consent that the brief statement of the AAUW in support of the civil rights bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN IN SUPPORT OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1967, S. 1026

The American Association of University Women is a voluntary organization with a membership of approximately 176,000 women who are graduates of accredited colleges and universities. We have active divisions in every state of the union and branches in every community where women who meet the qualifications of the organization wish to join together to promote common interests for the welfare of the community, of the state, and of the nation. Although we are brought together by a basic common interest in education—our own as well as a desire to see that every person has an opportunity to receive the best possible education he is capable of absorbing—our members' interests, expressed through their work in the Association, embrace every aspect of community life. And the community we live in today is a world community, in which our country is looked to as a leader—not only in the arms race, but in the race to establish equally for all men.

For many years, the Association's legislative program has included an item for support of the civil rights of individuals. This item has been consistently retained in the program year after year, and has been approved by members of our Association who live in the south and in the north—in the east and in the west; members from communities where minorities have traditionally not voted or served on juries; members who are not sure what the reaction of their own community will be when open housing becomes a reality. Nevertheless, we know that it is right and just that legislation be passed to insure the rights of all persons to participate effectively in their government and to enjoy the privilege of choosing where they will live. We have supported civil rights legislation in the past and we support the Civil Rights Act of 1967. We urge its enactment by Congress with all possible speed.

The Civil Rights Act of 1967 is designed to insure rights for minority groups that the majority of our citizens take for granted. And because they take them for granted and have never been denied the right to exercise them, the necessity for such legislation, especially on the federal level, is not apparent to them. Needed legislation often fails because of apathy.

Laws which will insure that juries, in both state and federal courts, are representative of the community from which they are chosen have become necessary. Our concern with civil rights in recent years began, in 1957, with the right to vote—the most basic of the rights relating to participation in government, and the right most in need of reaffirmation in our country. It is now time to turn our attention to juries and jury service. As was true with the right to vote, some states have not yet taken steps to assure the securing of juries which represent the entire community and which offer a real possibility of a fair trial to civil litigants and to persons accused of crimes who might otherwise not have this basic right afforded them. It is time for Congress to fill this gap in the interests of justice.

Another important element of the proposed legislation is the portion prohibiting interference with civil rights. Those of us who enjoy the rights and privileges of the majority would not tolerate any interference with those rights and privileges—but we have not succeeded in extending these rights and privileges to others without interference. A person who knows he has the legal right to vote or the legal right, or even just the moral right, to purchase property or obtain employment he is qualified to perform can still be intimidated, threatened, physically harmed, lied to, or otherwise prevented from exercising his rights—and he often is. Barriers other than legal barriers to the exercise of rights still exist and must be removed. A federal criminal law prohibiting interference seems not only a reasonable answer to this problem but a necessary adjunct to civil rights legislation.

Civil rights, in the past, have been defined only in terms of equal participation in specified governmental functions—voting, holding office, serving on juries, and similar matters. But the tragic events of the last few years in the nation's cities and towns—injuries and loss of life, damage to property, rioting, disorder—the discovery that 30,000,000 Americans live in poverty and that a large portion of them have little opportunity to reverse the vicious circle of poverty and dependency—have made us realize that denial of individual rights is even worse when we are denying men and women and children the right to participate equally in society. Segregated schools which serve nonwhite children are poor schools—this is a fact demonstrated over and over again by statistics and studies, and can hardly be denied anymore. Children educated in such schools do not attain the necessary degree of skill to get the good jobs, or any jobs, or to get into colleges, or to get into the unions which control access to many jobs. Segregated unions close the door to opportunity for many young people; segregated housing means that many who are not poor are forced to live on the fringes of poverty—that society accepts their skills and their contributions and their citizenship and sometimes their lives, but will not have them as neighbors.

Again, the states have been slow to end segregated patterns of living. The Civil Rights Act of 1967 will fill one of the gaps—that of discrimination in selling and renting homes.

Even among people who believe that civil rights belong to all and not just to the white majority, there are those who argue that protection of these rights, by enacting laws and enforcing them, should be left to the states. Still others argue that discrimination cannot be ended by the enactment of laws—that only in the hearts of men can the battle for equality be won. To answer these critics, we would point out, as has already been noted, that some states have taken the initiative in securing for all people their civil rights, but others lag far behind. And to those who believe that the enactment of laws does not change the hearts and minds of prejudiced or misinformed people, we can only agree that it does not. But even such people, for the most part, are reluctant to disobey the laws. Most reforms begin with the enactment of enlightened laws by a courageous legislative body. We can expect no less when we are dealing with the lives of so many Americans.

We urge enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1967, S 1026, as proposed by the Administration.

DR. VICTORIA SCHUCK,
Chairman, Legislative Program Committee.
GLORIA PETERS,
Area Representative in Community Problems.

JEWS IN RUSSIA

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, tomorrow is the Jewish holiday Simchath Torah.

In the Soviet Union, as elsewhere, Jews will attend celebrations at synagogues, but there will be an important difference.

In this country, for instance, Jews will not have to think twice about participating in this joyous celebration. The same cannot be said for the Jews in the Soviet Union. More to the point, it is a tribute to Soviet Jews that they still turn out to celebrate such holidays at all, for the Soviet Government has made quite clear that there is a great gap between its ideology that condemns anti-Semitism and its policies which discriminate against Jews.

It is fitting that we call attention to this gap at this time, not only because Soviet Jews tomorrow will celebrate a religious holiday in spite of government policies, but also because 2 weeks hence will mark the 50th anniversary of the Soviet revolution.

Mr. President, it seems to me that at a time when Moscow seeks to put its best foot forward to demonstrate the success of that revolution, men of all persuasions who condemn bigotry of any sort should take this opportunity to call public attention to the discrimination practices against Jews in Russia. We should do this not out of spite, but out of the hope that public exposure of a national disgrace might prompt some rethinking in the Kremlin, particularly when the Kremlin seeks to project an image of progress and peace.

As I understand the situation in Russia today, Judaist public periodicals and most other religious items cannot be published, Judaist devotional articles are not produced, and leaders of Judaism cannot have formal contacts with foreign leaders of Judaism as is permitted leaders of Protestant, Catholic, and Moslem groups.

Following the pattern of some other totalitarian societies, the U.S.S.R., according to the International Commission of Jurists, used Jews as scapegoats in a campaign to stamp out certain society-wide economic practices in the early 1960's.

Further Jews are admitted to higher educational opportunities on a quota basis, and Jews have been excluded from high state and Communist Party posts.

Yet, in spite of such opposition and threats, Russian Jews have turned out in large numbers to celebrate such holidays as Simchath Torah. I am confident Soviet Jews will do so again tomorrow, again offering men of all nations an example of devotion to religious liberty, a devotion which can be attacked by governments but cannot be destroyed.

MUTUAL FUNDS CONTRACTUAL PLANS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I would like to bring to the attention of the Senate an unprecedented action taken today by the Association of Mutual Fund Plan Sponsors. That association represents the segment of the mutual fund industry offering contractual plans with the so-called front end loads that have been the subject of a legislative proposal by the Securities and Exchange Commission and recent hearings by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee.

Earlier this year, the SEC recommended legislation which would completely abolish all contractual plans for the sale of mutual funds. These are plans whereby a purchaser of limited

means determines to follow a monthly purchase program through which he is able to accomplish an investment goal over a period of 10 to 12 years. One of the features of the plan is that an amount up to one-half of the total payment made by the purchaser during the first year may be absorbed by the salesman's commission.

On August 4, I spoke out against the far-reaching proposals which have been recommended by the SEC which in my opinion could undermine the mutual fund industry. At that time, I discussed the contractual plan and the risk that if a person canceled in the early stages of the plan he could lose as much as half of his first year's payments. I was strongly opposed, however, to the elimination of this widely used investment medium. Segments of the industry had taken steps to reduce the risk and I was confident that a plan could be developed to mitigate the possibility of loss on the part of the individual investor without destroying the industry.

I am pleased today to say that such a plan has been worked out by the industry which on its own initiative has voluntarily undertaken to provide full refunds for those purchasers of contractual plans who may decide that they want to withdraw from their investment program during the first 60 days after purchase. In addition, full refunds will be granted to those purchasers who during the first year of ownership encounter financial hardship.

I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the industry for making this very progressive step to overcome what many felt was an inequity in the system of mutual fund sales. Equally impressive to me is the fact that more than 95 percent of all contractual plan companies have agreed to participate voluntarily in the plan that the association has today incorporated into its code of ethical business conduct.

This is in the best spirit of industry self regulation and improvement, and I, for one, feel that the industry should be commended for its action.

I think it would also be appropriate for me to mention the part in this action that has been played by the chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, my distinguished colleague from Alabama.

Throughout the hearings, and in fact, even before the hearings, he expressed his preference for industry self-regulation over a legislative solution to any problems that the industry might have.

I am sure that this progressive posture which the industry has now adopted is due in large part to the urging of the chairman and that it is in the interest of the investing public.

Mr. President, I ask permission at this point to include in the RECORD a press release issued by the Association of Mutual Fund Plan Sponsors and a copy of a letter written by the association to the chairman detailing the plan which they have accepted.

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

PRESS RELEASE OF ASSOCIATION OF MUTUAL FUND PLAN SPONSORS, INC., WASHINGTON, D.C.

BAL HARBOUR, FLA.—The mutual fund industry today volunteered a unique refund plan in response to President Johnson's expression of concern for individuals who may be forced to withdraw from contractual plans at an early date.

In his Special Message on Consumer Protection early this year the President said of contractual planholders, "They may face a substantial loss if financial difficulties force them to withdraw from the plan at an early date."

Announcement of the industry's action was made here this morning by Mr. John H. Kostmayer, vice president of First Investors Corporation, speaking at the 19th Annual International Mutual Fund Dealers' Conference at the Americana Hotel.

Simultaneous announcement was made in New York by Mr. Rowland A. Robbins, chairman of First Investors Corporation and president of the Association of Mutual Fund Plan Sponsors, and in Kansas City by Mr. Cornelius Roach, vice president of Waddell & Reed and chairman of A.M.F.P.S.

Mr. Kostmayer stated that 95% of all contractual plan companies have voluntarily agreed to participate in the plan that A.M.F.P.S. has incorporated into its Code of Ethical Business Conduct.

Under the new plan, which has nothing like it anywhere in the financial field according to Mr. Kostmayer, a purchaser of a contractual plan (generally a monthly systematic investment program) may request as an absolute right a refund of the full amount of his first two payments within 60 days of commencing a plan. Within the first 12 months of a plan an individual who has been unemployed for 30 consecutive days, or through illness or injury has been unable to work for 30 consecutive days, or who has a dependent member of the family hospitalized for 30 consecutive days may request a refund of the full amount of sales charges he has paid and may redeem his shares at the net asset value.

Mr. Kostmayer pointed out that the refund in full during the first year of all sales charges eliminates the possibility of a "substantial loss" to the planholder as expressed by the President.

Announcement of the refund offer follows closely the completion yesterday of hearings by the House Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance on mutual fund legislation proposed by the Securities and Exchange Commission. Similar hearings were conducted in August by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. Kostmayer released at the Conference a copy of a letter to Senator John Sparkman, Chairman of the Senate Banking Committee, apprising him of the adoption of the refund plan by the Association of Mutual Fund Plan Sponsors and nearly all nonmember companies.

ASSOCIATION OF MUTUAL FUND PLAN SPONSORS, INC.,
New York, N.Y., October 24, 1967.

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

DEAR SENATOR SPARKMAN: In his Special Message on Consumer Protection early this year President Johnson referred to a situation that is and has been a matter of concern to those of us in the contractual plan industry when he said of planholders:

"They may face a substantial loss if financial difficulties force them to withdraw from the plan at an early date."

The SEC's proposed solution was a recommendation that Congress abolish contractual plans.

At the hearing before your Committee on Banking and Currency on August 1, 1967, you may recall saying to representatives of our industry:

"Finally, in the area of so-called contractual plans, we would like to have your reaction to the Commission's proposal for abolition of the front-end load and your views as to how the industry can best meet its responsibilities to those people whose investments in mutual funds are made through this medium."

I believe we made it abundantly clear to the Committee that we consider the SEC's proposal to be unreasonable, unnecessary and unfair to our industry and to the American public.

It is with a great sense of personal pleasure and of pride in our industry that I can report to you that the Association of Mutual Fund Plan Sponsors has voluntarily devised and incorporated into its Code of Ethical Business Conduct a refund plan to purchasers of contractual plans. In addition to the unanimous support of our members, the response from non-members has been such that we have approximately 95% of our industry agreeing to participate at this time. A few small non-member companies have not yet had time to respond.

Specifically this refund plan will include:

1. Refund as an absolute right within sixty days of purchase of the full amount of the first two payments, including the full amount of sales charge, and the net asset value of any additional payments made plus the full amount of the sales charge on such additional payments.

2. Refund within the first twelve months after purchase of the full amount of the sales charge if the planholder chooses to withdraw by reason of financial hardship caused by:

(a) disability as a result of injury or illness of the planholder which prevents him from engaging in gainful employment for thirty consecutive days;

(b) the illness or injury to a dependent member of the planholder's family which requires the hospitalization of such dependent member for a period of thirty consecutive days; or

(c) unemployment for thirty consecutive days of the planholder or the head of the household of the planholder.

The right of planholders to redeem shares at net asset value at any time has always been a characteristic of mutual funds, including contractual plans, and, of course, is included in this new refund plan.

I would like to take this opportunity, Senator, to express to you the sincere appreciation of the members of our Association for the guidance we have received from you, the Members of your Committee and from your Staff. With this assistance we feel we have been able to fulfill your request ". . . as to how the industry can best meet its responsibilities to those people whose investments in mutual funds are made through this medium" and to provide an industry response to the President's concern for the contractual planholder.

I am sure I speak for the entire contractual plan segment of the mutual fund industry when I say how much we appreciate the personal interest and the many courtesies we have received from you.

Very respectfully,

CORNELIUS ROACH,
Chairman.

ANTI-SEMITIC POLICIES OF THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, there is no better evidence of the continuing vitality of America's attachment to religious liberty than the deep and widespread concern expressed by Americans of all faiths over the anti-Semitic policies of the Soviet Union.

No person of conscience can or will ignore the continuing efforts of the Soviet Government to bring about the cultural annihilation of 3 million Jews within their own borders.

The systematic denial of equal rights to Soviet Jews by their Government has been condemned by unanimous vote of the Senate. But so long as that campaign continues Americans and all other lovers of freedom must raise their voices in protest, as I am privileged to do today.

COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM IN SOUTH DAKOTA DRAWS PRAISE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I have often felt that personal expressions of the participants in Neighborhood Youth Corps programs are as valuable as a report from the agency administering the program. Mrs. Carol Flanagan is a worker in the Southeastern South Dakota Community Action Agency, Inc., of Sioux Falls, S. Dak. This agency sponsored several neighborhood youth programs in southeastern South Dakota this summer and she has sent me various comments from both the young people and their parents.

These comments speak well for the worth of the program and from the documents sent to me, I have selected the following for inclusion in the RECORD. I, thus, ask unanimous consent that the letters be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

SALEM, S. DAK.,
August 20, 1967.

EVELYN LIND,
Salem, S. Dak.

DEAR MRS. LIND: I am writing in regard to the N.Y.C. program in our city. We have a son in it and he has done very well in saving for an education from his earnings.

His supervisors have trained him in many different phases of work which helped him to decide what kind of job he wanted. He will attend a technical college and take a short course in drafting or electronics.

I sincerely hope we can have this same program next year so that another boy or girl may have this wonderful opportunity.

A grateful parent,

MRS. BEN SCHEIER.

HUDSON PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 3,
Hudson, S. Dak., July 23, 1967.

SOUTHEASTERN SOUTH DAKOTA COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCY, INC.
Sioux Falls, S. Dak.:

In evaluating the NYC program this summer in Hudson, S. Dak., I have nothing but praise for the results we have had this summer. Not only for the employment opportunities they had, but also the change that has come over these young people we used this summer. I feel this is the first time in their lives they felt a sense of responsibility, and a noted change in their behavior has been observed. For the first time this summer we have not had any discipline problems with these kids, which we had the summers before. I think this is going to have an effect on their attitude toward school this coming year. I feel that a continued program of this sort will have profound effects in this community and in the school. I highly recommend continuing this program to help adjust some of these deprived kids, who don't seem to get the guidance and supervision anywhere else but in a program such as this.

DAVID J. GELLERMAN.

PARKER, S. DAK.,
August 1, 1967.

COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCY, INC.,
Sioux Falls, S. Dak.

DEAR SIRS: I would like to give you a special thanks for giving me a job under the Neighborhood Youth Program. Without your help I would have been unable to return to college this fall.

NYC is certainly a very good program. There are many, like myself, who needed jobs badly and you have given one to us. Without your help, we would have wasted the summer, thus ruining the chance to further our education.

I enjoy working under this program and have gained much valuable information in different fields. Also, let us not forget the newly found friendships that have grown out of working with others.

Again, I would like to express a sincere thank you for helping me to help myself.

Sincerely,

CATHY BUCKLIN.

VIBORG, S. DAK.,
July 23, 1967.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,
Sioux Falls, S. Dak.

DEAR SIR: Due to the recent federal grant from the O.E.O. the Viborg Recreation Program has afforded many opportunities for youth and adults in the entire Viborg area.

The recreation program consisting of games, crafts, and swimming lessons has been met with tremendous response—our classes are overflowing! It is thrilling to see unoccupied and troublesome youth and those from low income families taking part in meaningful activities which would not be available to them if it were not for this federal grant. Remedial math is proving to be a great help to youngsters who need special, individual help in this area. Older youth have been kept busy with High School Baseball, Jr. High Baseball, and Girls' Softball.

Many adults have taken a keen interest in the activities provided for them. They are gaining both from interpersonal relationships as well as learning new skills they could not otherwise afford. It is surprising to note the number of high school girls taking advantage of these adult classes. Perhaps more of the program could be aimed at this group in the future.

The college age assistants have proved to be excellent help in conducting this program. The fact that they come from low income families seems to make them more willing to work—they are eager, enthusiastic, and ambitious because their next year of school depends on this financial assistance.

As director and assistant director we have also gained as a result of our relationships with others. As the old adage says, "experience is the best teacher." Thank you for these many opportunities provided for us and our community.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. ROBERT SCHULTZ.

HURLEY, S. DAK.
July 19, 1967.

COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCY, INC.,
Sioux Falls, S. Dak.

DEAR MRS. FLANNAGAN: On behalf of myself and my co-workers here at Hurley School, I would like to thank you and all others connected with this program for the wonderful job opportunity it has given us.

We enjoy both the surroundings and the work, but most of all the satisfaction that by doing our best we are helping to improve our local community as well as our state, and indirectly our country.

This job has taught us the full meaning of responsibility, perseverance, and how to work with others and corporate our efforts for the most effective results. Perhaps most important to us, however, is the money we are earning. This money, in some cases, may be the determining factor in being able to obtain a higher education.

We sincerely hope that this youth work program will be continued to give other young people the same opportunity which we are so fortunate to have.

Sincerely yours,

SUSAN JENSEN.

MONTROSE INDEPENDENT SCHOOL,
DISTRICT NO. 1,
Montrose, S. Dak., July 27, 1967.

COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCY,
Sioux Falls, S. Dak.

To Whom It May Concern:

The Neighborhood Corps an agency under the Community Action Agency is certainly a worth while program. In our own community the eight people employed are learning some worth while skills; are finding the satisfaction of taking pride in their work; and are receiving sufficient remuneration so they should make an easy adjustment from this program to adult work.

If more people of a certain type (those of low incomes and also people who many times whose ambition is shattered because of welfare programs that require no work for service) could be helped to bridge the gap from teenage to grownup and whose initiative can be stimulated, we would have the most effective way of helping low income groups.

Not perfect results can be hoped for because some will still continue to be content with their meager existence deriving much help from public sources, but if a relatively high percentage can be inspired to rise up out of their condition, it will be money well spent.

I would urge its continuation during winter months for mainly girls and summer months for mainly boys, so their talents can better be geared to the needs of a community.

Sincerely yours,

B. J. GOTTSLEBEN,
Superintendent.

CANISTOTA, S. DAK.,
July 27, 1967.

COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCY, INC.,
Sioux Falls, S. Dak.

GENTLEMEN: Before I began working this summer, I didn't think I would get to go to college next fall. Now, after the summer is over I will have almost enough for my 1st semester. I am going to South Dakota State University, majoring in English. After college I plan to teach in high school.

Other than the money we earn, we also learn a lot. I've become such a "professional" painter and learned so many tips about maintenance that I spend most of my spare time doing this at home.

I think that you have a very worthwhile program and would like to see it be continued. Thank you very much.

Sincerely yours,

MARGARET TARRELL.

JEWS IN THE SOVIET UNION AND THEIR FATE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it has been the unenviable lot of the Jewish people to suffer injustices and iniquities in the hands of their fellow men for nearly 2,000 years. They suffered under the Romans in and out of their historic homeland, and then were barred from their beloved Jerusalem almost 20 centuries ago. This brought about their mass dispersion to other parts of the Roman Empire. But in their new abodes in nearly all parts of the then known world, they did not escape the oppressive hand of the Government of Rome. Their lot did not change for the better when the Roman Empire went to pieces and new feudal states came into existence in

Europe during the Middle Ages. In nearly all European countries they were regarded as outcasts and treated as such, giving rise to ghettos in many large communities in numerous countries.

In recent times the vast majority of European Jews were to be found in East European countries—including Rumania—and in the European parts of czarist Russia. They were numerous also in the Baltic countries. At the outbreak of the First World War millions of Jews, constituting perhaps more than half of the world's total Jewish population at that time, were to be found in the area extending from the northeastern shores of the Black Sea all the way north to the Baltic area, the east-west line of the area extending from the west of Moscow to East Prussia, including most of Poland, the Ukraine, parts of Austria and Hungary.

Late in the 19th century their status as citizens of these countries was often precarious; their loyalty to the regimes under which they lived was questioned, and their well-being, not to say their security, was threatened. This was particularly true in many parts of czarist Russia where the Jews were subjected to pogroms. At times the Russian authorities seemed to have a share in these outrages, and allowed the perpetrators of these criminal acts to escape punishment.

Thus for decades there seemed to be no safe haven for Jews in czarist Russia, and their sympathizers in the West could not help the Jews there in any effective way. But when the czarist regime in Russia was overthrown, it was fervently hoped that their misery and suffering had come to an end, and that they would be enjoying a new equality and freedom in the classless society that was being heralded in the new Soviet state.

The Jews naturally welcomed the revolutionary changes and anxiously looked forward to a new day in the Soviet Union. But it was not long before they saw the slow and gradual rise of anti-Semitism in this classless state. While the Soviet Government spread propaganda to the effect that it had disposed of such czarist tactics and had introduced ethnic equality among its national minorities, the ugly head of anti-Semitism could be seen in many spheres of official and unofficial activity. By the late 1920's the Government's failure to combat anti-Semitism became apparent, but as a sop to its critics it proclaimed as an area of Jewish settlement a strip of land on the Manchurian border in Siberia. By 1934 the Jews there numbered some 15,000 in a compact area; then it was named Birobidzhan and declared an autonomous Jewish province. During the next several decades its Jewish population grew to about 165,000. But even in their own autonomous province their activity and communal work were restricted.

Many Jews had migrated to Birobidzhan in the fond hope of creating and maintaining a Jewish cultural center. After several decades these Jews ruefully admitted that their expectations and cherished hopes could not be realized. They were not permitted to have Jewish names for their communities—except one, named Zimmernanski. They were allowed—until 1961—to publish only one newspaper in Yiddish and only as a supplement to a Russian daily. In schools the language was—and still is—Russian and no instruction in Yiddish or Jewish culture is offered. On three different occasions—1935, 1947, and 1955—Birobidzhan postmarks were both in Russian and Yiddish, but now not even the name Jewish autonomous oblast—province—appears on postmarks. There has been very little information on Birobidzhan in recent years, but it is known that many of its Jewish settlers, having found their activity restricted there, have drifted back to metropolitan centers of the western Soviet Union. Even in these centers, such as Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, and other cities, the Jews have felt unsure of their status; officially and otherwise they are being regarded, and sometimes treated, as second-class citizens.

In recent months anti-Semitism has increased, as the result of Israel's victory over the Arabs. In government circles there seems to be a deep undercurrent of feeling that associates the Jews of the Soviet Union with Zionism in Israel. This in itself has tended to feed anti-Semitism in many parts of the Soviet Union. Thus some 3,000,000 Jews are experiencing in the Soviet Union something which they never dreamed would be possible in a so-called classless, cosmopolitan state. They are enduring injustices and iniquities, and are praying for their delivery from bigotry in the Soviet Union.

THE AUTOMOBILE AND AIR POLLUTION

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, on January 6 of this year the Secretary of Commerce, in cooperation with eight other Federal departments and agencies, established a Panel on Electrically Powered Vehicles under the Commerce Technical Advisory Board, a group which has carried out a number of important transportation studies for the Government. The Panel was commissioned to study the technical feasibility of unconventional propulsion systems for vehicles in the context of the national concern over air pollution. The report of this study group has just become available and I would like to present the following comments about their work.

First, this effort is an example of the ability of various sectors of our society to effectively interact in the formulation of important public policy on pressing national problems. This type of meaningful interchange between the academic, industrial, and Government sectors is important to the strength of our political and economic system if we are to cope with new problems in reasonable ways and if we are to be assured that our new technology will benefit the public good.

The recommendations contained in the Panel report, entitled, "The Automobile and Air Pollution—A Program for Progress, Part I," cover a wide range of activities from Government organization to national goals. Several of the recommendations appear to be especially significant. One of the most important conclusions of the Panel is their proposal that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare develop and promptly implement an expanded program to establish quantitative information regarding the effects of air pollution upon health and welfare. This recommendation represents the core of the Air Quality Act of 1967, passed earlier this year by the Senate. The Panel has reinforced our conclusions that one of the most important information gaps in the attack on air pollution is determining the effects of contamination on health, property, and the quality of life.

Commenting on the current program for establishing standards for automotive emissions, the Panel concludes that better than 80 percent reduction in total emissions from new vehicles can be achieved by or before 1975, with further substantial reductions possible by 1980 or thereafter. To my knowledge, this is the first projection of emission reduction feasibility which has included a variety of academic and industrial viewpoints, including the automotive and oil industries. This finding will be a useful bench mark for discussion and planning for future control of automotive emissions.

The Panel has singled out lead in the atmosphere as a problem which demands immediate action. To date there has been no attempt to establish standards for the regulation of this particular emission from automobiles. The Panel concludes that growing levels of lead in the atmosphere are increasing the risk to human health and recommends that, since the margin between current body burdens of lead and toxic levels is small, the Nation should begin to control this contaminant and at the same time undertake an intensive research effort to determine the long-range impact of atmospheric lead on all population groups. This is a subject of continuing concern to the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution.

After a careful examination of the current system for setting exhaust emission standards, the Panel recommends that the criteria for the development of these standards should be changed from one of concentration of pollutant in the exhaust to the use of the total mass of specific pollutant emitted under an appropriate driving cycle. Such a procedure would insure equality with respect to contributions to pollution regardless of the power or size of vehicles. This is a meaningful recommendation to which the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should give serious consideration.

The Panel also recommends that effective local inspection mechanisms to enforce vehicle emissions standards should be encourage by the use of Federal matching grants for training, equipment, and operation. Authorization for such a program is included in the Air Quality Act of 1967. I am pleased that the Panel specifically endorses this necessary part of a national plan for air pollution control.

The Panel report suggests the establishment of a $60 million, 5-year, Federal program to support innovative develop-

ments useful in the establishment of future emissions standards by carrying out work on new energy sources, vehicular propulsion systems, emission control devices, and special and general purpose vehicles. The report states that the intent of this recommendation is not to put the Federal Government into the business of building vehicles, but to allow the Government to collect the best possible information with respect to a wide variety of alternatives for pollution reduction.

In addition to this program, the Panel also recommends that the Federal Government incorporate low emission performance criteria as factors in the purchase of vehicles for Government requirements. This concept may be an appropriate role for Government in creating initiatives for private industry to create, develop, and use innovative concepts for pollution reduction. It is apparent that there is no individual consumer incentive sufficient to create demand for vehicles which have advanced pollution control concepts. But collective public action, and incentives created by the Government through such actions as imaginative use of procurement policies could be an important factor in advancing the technology of air pollution control.

In summary I want to congratulate the Panel, especially its chairman, Richard S. Morse, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, for this excellent statement on an important national problem. The report is thoughtful and balanced and I am sure it will be an important contribution in the continuation of our efforts to bring about clean air for our citizens.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the summary of findings of the Panel be printed in the RECORD.

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

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

I. THE RELATION OF AUTOMOTIVE EMISSIONS TO THE NATION'S AIR POLLUTION PROBLEM

1. Air pollution presents a serious threat of increasing significance to the health and welfare of this country and all industrialized areas of the world. Without prompt and effective action to control this contamination of the atmosphere, living conditions within and around the cities of the Nation will continue to deteriorate. Automotive vehicle emissions, namely carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons, oxides of nitrogen, and lead compounds, are a principal contributor to this problem.

2. Emissions from automotive vehicles are largely responsible for the formation of photochemical smog in Los Angeles and some other areas, and vehicles are the principal source of carbon monoxide in the atmosphere. In addition to these known, specific effects, vehicle emissions combine with emissions from other sources, in ways and to an extent unknown, to contribute to general air pollution.

3. While there is evidence establishing ill effects from aggregate air pollution, there is an urgent need for more extensive information regarding the significance of specific and combined air pollutants on public health.

4. Population increase and urbanization trends require an overall national strategy for the control of all forms of air pollution and the early and effective implementation of emission standards to meet air quality goals. Local, state, and Federal agencies responsible for urban transportation systems have given inadequate consideration to pollution implications in the development of transportation systems.

5. The magnitude of expected future need for urban-suburban personal transportation requires the early development of virtually non-polluting transportation systems. The use of mass transportation systems can be a factor in the reduction of air pollution.

II. TECHNOLOGY AND THE CONTROL OF AIR POLLUTION

1. On the basis of current technology, it will be commercially feasible during the next decade to reduce exhaust emissions from new gasoline internal combustion engines to values at least as low as:

Hydrocarbons—50 parts per million (900 ppm)[1]

Carbon monoxide—.5% (3.5%)

Oxides of nitrogen—250 parts per million (1500 ppm)

2. During the next decade, in the normal course of events, no significant reduction in total air pollution will be achieved through the introduction of unconventional low-polluting vehicles into the current population of approximately 90 million vehicles.

(a) The state of technology does not permit the current development of an economically feasible electric car except for special-purpose, limited-range use.

(b) Current research activities indicate that significant technical advances may be expected in the development of improved electric energy storage and conversion devices. The time anticipated for the development and commercialization of such devices will not allow their use in a significant number of vehicles in the next decade. Any acceleration of this technology to make earlier commercialization possible will be helpful in controlling urban air pollution.

(c) Gas turbines are reasonable alternatives to internal combustion engines in the large sizes used in trucks, trains, and buses, but are not now economically feasible in the smaller units required for automobiles. Gas turbines produce low hydrocarbon and carbon monoxide emissions, and can be designed to yield low nitrogen oxide emissions.

(d) Hybrid power plants involving combinations of high energy devices and high power devices could have satisfactory performance, but their economic feasibility for private passenger automobiles has not been established.

3. Vehicles using external combustion engines for propulsion, such as the piston-type steam engine of advanced design, potentially offer a satisfactory alternative to the present automobile and should have very low pollution and noise characteristics.

4. Diesel engines in trucks and buses emit highly undesirable smoke and odor, in addition to other pollutants. Smoke can be controlled now with proper maintenance and operation and the odor problem can probably be solved with adequate research.

5. Adequate energy sources are available at least for the remainder of this century to meet the vehicle transportation requirements of the country regardless of the type of power plant that may be used.

6. Over the next thirty years, the introduction and widespread use of any currently proposed propulsion systems will not be restricted by the supply of materials, with the possible exception of those which require large amounts of cadmium, platinum group metals, or silver.

III. THE ROLE OF INDUSTRY

1. There has been inadequate incentive for an individual automotive manufacturer to apply pollution control technology to the automobile in advance of its competitors.

2. There has been inadequate incentive for an individual fuel producer to introduce products with improved pollution characteristics in advance of its competitors.

3. The automotive and petroleum industries clearly recognize that Government has the primary responsibility to determine the effects of pollution and to establish realistic air quality goals and nationwide standards for automotive emissions.

4. The effective reduction of air pollution requires cooperation among automotive manufacturers, fuel producers, and the government at Federal, state, and local levels, as well as a clear understanding by all of their roles and responsibilities.

5. Apprehension with respect to anti-trust activity, and uncertainty concerning Federal regulations may continue to delay cooperative research activities and the implementation of technical programs of potential public benefit.

6. To meet competitive standards of reliability and economy in a mass-produced product, substantial time is required for the design, testing, and manufacturing of new automotive components. Under normal conditions significant innovations require three to five years for introduction into the automotive production cycle.

IV. THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT

1. It is clearly established that Government has primary responsibility for research and the collection and dissemination of data relating to the effects of air pollution upon health and welfare and for the promulgation of realistic and effective national standards for air quality.

2. Vehicles meeting Federal standards for 1968, and California standards for 1970, will represent substantial progress toward control of automobile-generated air pollution, but additional controls will be required in the future.

3. The development of novel components and related automotive systems has been expedited through the use of Federal funds to support research and development in selected scientific areas.

4. The use of air pollution characteristics as essential criteria in the vehicle procurement process of Federal, state, and local governments could be a useful stimulant to the development and demonstration of low polluting vehicles.

5. Current automotive air pollution control devices are vulnerable to progressive degradation and alteration, and periodic inspection and adjustment are essential. The organizations, procedures and personnel for implementing this phase of a national program are not available.

6. State and local government agencies, with a few notable exceptions, particularly in the State of California, have not recognized the importance of the automotive air pollution problem.

7. Authority and responsibility for air pollution research and control activities have not been established at an organizational level within the Federal Government consistent with the magnitude and importance of this problem.

The Panel makes the following recommendations to the Federal Government as a Program for Progress in the control of air pollution:

Recommendation 1: The national goal for air quality should be the achievement of an atmosphere with no significant detectable adverse effect from air pollution on health, welfare, and the quality of life.

Recommendation 2: The Environmental Science Services Administration of the Department of Commerce should establish a research program to determine the effects of air pollution on atmospheric processes.

Recommendation 3: The Department of

[1] Estimated levels for uncontrolled vehicles.

Health, Education, and Welfare should develop and promptly implement an expanded program to establish quantitative information regarding the effects of air pollution upon health and welfare of the population.

Recommendation 4: The Federal Government should continue to establish standards for all harmful automotive emissions, and realistic timetables for the achievement of such standards.

Recommendation 5: The Federal Government should immediately establish standards for the lead content in gasoline which will prevent any further increase in the total quantity of lead emitted to the atmosphere. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should begin an intensive study of the long-term health effects of lead in the atmosphere to determine requirements for future action.

Recommendation 6: The Federal Government should set standards for emissions, including smoke and odor, for gasoline and diesel powered trucks and buses.

Recommendation 7: The Federal Government should increase its support for mass transportation research, development, and demonstration programs related to the reduction of air pollution.

Recommendation 8: All Government standards concerning vehicle emissions should be developed in terms of the total mass of specific pollutants emitted under an appropriate driving cycle, rather than as the percent of pollutant in the exhaust.

Recommendation 9: The creation of effective local inspection mechanisms to enforce vehicle emission standards should be encouraged by the use of Federal matching grants for training, equipment, and operation.

Recommendation 10: The Federal Government should develop cooperative mechanisms to accelerate worldwide interchange of information relating to air pollution, its effects, and control.

Recommendation 11: The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should establish primary operating responsibility for the air pollution control program at the highest possible organizational level.

Recommendation 12: The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare should establish a Technical Advisory Board reporting to the Secretary to assist in the development of plans, programs and research activities and to more effectively use the resources of the scientific and industrial communities.

Recommendation 13: A mechanism for coordination of all Federal activities relating to air pollution should be established as a continuing function at a high level in the Executive Branch.

Recommendation 14: The Federal Government should initiate a five-year program, in total amount of approximately 60 million dollars, to support innovative developments useful in the establishment of future emission standards, in the following areas: (a) energy sources for vehicles, (b) vehicular propulsion systems, (c) emission control devices, (d) special purpose urban cars, (e) general purpose vehicles.

Recommendation 15: Federal, state, and local governments should incorporate low emission performance criteria as factors in the purchase of vehicles for their requirements.

Recommendation 16: The National Science Foundation should review its basic research and educational programs in atmospheric physics, electrochemistry and other scientific and engineering disciplines relating to the air pollution problem and ensure that such activities are receiving adequate support.

PERSECUTION OF THE JEWS IN THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the world has long been plagued by the attempts of men and of nations to deprive other men of their fundamental rights. When I speak of fundamental rights, I am referring to freedom of speech, right of privacy, freedom of religion, and freedom of assembly. These are inherent rights of men, and no government can justify a policy which reduces or destroys them. Among these rights none is more important than that of religion.

Our Nation has been built on the concept of equal and full rights for all. Most other nations have not been as concerned for the rights of their citizens. I firmly believe, however, that all nations are morally bound to grant to their citizens at least those rights which I have referred to as being fundamental. Furthermore, these rights must be enjoyed by all citizens; no one can be excluded.

Those nations which deprive citizens of these rights cannot say that it is an internal matter and of no concern to the rest of the world. There can be no justifiable internal policy of deprivation of these fundamental freedoms. When these freedoms are denied, all mankind is involved. All mankind is injured. All mankind is dutybound to protest.

It is significant that man's inherent freedoms, especially the freedom of religion, be discussed today. This is the eve of Simchath Torah, a Jewish holy day. This is the time when the reading of the Torah is completed and then begun again. It is the time when, as they have for the past 3 years, many thousands of Russian Jews will fill the few synagogues and spill into the streets to show their devotion to Judaism. And this, despite the fact that the Soviet Union consicously strives to eliminate both Jewish cultural and religious practices.

These gatherings demonstrate the dedication of the Russian Jews to Judaism even though they are deprived of the right to fully follow the teachings and practices of their religion. They also are discriminated against in other levels of endeavor.

One of the great attributes of Judaism is devotion to law. The Torah has been the symbol of Jewish life. The ironical fact in Russia is that it is through the violation of existing Soviet law that the Jews are being denied freedom of religion. Jews hold the law in high respect. If the civil laws in Russia were held in equally high respect by her officials, there would be no problem for the Jews. Theoretically, Russian law allows all men to practice their religion freely and encourages all nationalities to develop their cultural and national heritage. Jews are not allowed freedom in either respect. Jews in Russia are truly second class citizens.

In 1965, I supported Senate Concurrent Resolution 17 which condemned the Soviet Union for its persecution of Jews. I did not at that time, nor do I now, consider a statement such as this to be an infringement of the right of a nation to govern its internal affairs. The right to practice the religion of one's choice is a right of all men. When some are denied this right, wherever it may occur, it is our duty to speak out in protest.

Today the Soviet Union is one of the most powerful nations in the world. We are constantly being told of the great new gains Soviet scientists are making. Russia has advanced in technology but apparently not in understanding. She strives to further the laws of science but ignores the laws and rights of man. There is no possible justification for the subordinating of inherent human rights in striving for technical gains. There is no possible justification for the subordinating of inherent human rights at all.

Mr. President, I am proud to have the opportunity to add my strong protest to this discriminatory and unjustified practice, not only in Russia, but in all nations wherever basic freedoms are denied.

THE WAXTER CENTER FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the people of the city of Baltimore will be asked on November 7 to approve a referendum proposal for the establishment of the Waxter Center for Senior Citizens.

At a rally held in the Baltimore War Memorial Building last Sunday, speakers with both local and national perspective made compelling statements in support of the proposed center.

They also said in unmistakable terms that the center could well be a model for other community efforts elsewhere in the Nation.

Mr. President, I am proud of the leadership of those who have worked for years on behalf of the center. And I am convinced that no more appropriate monument could be conceived to honor the late Judge Thomas J. S. Waxter, who served so well as director of the Baltimore Department of Public Welfare and also as director of the State department of public welfare. Judge Waxter worked long and hard to provide health care and other services for all. The Waxter Center would be a logical extension of his philosophy and his dedication.

For the guidance of other community leaders elsewhere, I will now submit for the RECORD four statements made at Sunday's rally:

Mayor Theodore R. McKeldin—honored at age 67 during the rally as the outstanding senior citizen of Baltimore—told in his speech of the community spirit that led to the campaign for the center.

Senator WALTER F. MONDALE of Minnesota, long a champion of the needs of older citizens, spoke of the value of the Waxter Center as an example to the Nation.

A Federal official, Commissioner William D. Bechill of the Administration on Aging, told of the significance of the center as a potential forerunner of similar projects elsewhere.

And Dr. Robert Butler, research psychiatrist and gerontologist at the Washington School of Psychiatry, gave a vivid description of the medical and psychiatric implications of the center for the health of senior citizens.

To all who will vote on November 7, and to all contemplating similar action in other cities, the speeches will be of direct interest and assistance, and I ask

unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF MAYOR THEODORE R. MCKELDIN, AT THE WAXTER CENTER RALLY, WAR MEMORIAL BUILDING, BALTIMORE, MD., OCTOBER 22, 1967

The Waxter Center envisioned for Baltimore epitomizes the spirit of a true humanitarian.

Thomas Waxter had a vision given to few men. He knew that caring was not enough—one had to work and dare to fight and persevere, to achieve any measure of success in truly helping others.

And his entire life was devoted to helping others. An eminent lawyer who was a graduate of Yale Law School, he founded the Legal Aid Bureau in Baltimore, and he also helped to modernize our juvenile court.

He was interested in the youth of our City. He always felt that it was important to get a good beginning in life in order to get the fullness of life in one's later years. And he was of course passionately interested in the problems of the aged. He always strove to make life happy for people in their later years and as the director of welfare, the first program he instituted was the old age assistance program.

Indeed, Thomas Waxter was interested in all phases of humanity. He was the first one responsible for a commission on the problems of youth as well as a commission on problems of the aged. In addition to his concern for youth and for the aged, for over three decades he carried on a tireless crusade to improve the lot of the unskilled, the minorities, the afflicted and the downtrodden.

Director of the Baltimore Department of Public Welfare for eighteen years and the State Department of Public Welfare up until the time of his death, Thomas Waxter was also a fighter in the field of medical aid for the indigent. In fact, the present Baltimore City Hospital is a living monument to his efforts to provide total medical care for the acutely ill and for the chronically ill patients.

So great has been the influence of Thomas Waxter on these around him that I can truthfully say that it was he who to a great extent stimulated my social consciousness. When I first became Mayor, he took me to every institution for children and old people in the city and impressed upon me by his dedication and by his instruction the vast importance of the need for increasing our efforts in behalf of those who are in need of help. His vision has truly been one of the foundations on which Baltimore has been built in this century, and just as Peabody, Pratt and Hopkins have meant so much to the cultural development of our City, Thomas Waxter has played the same vital role in the social development of Baltimore.

In one field especially, Thomas Waxter's influence has been monumental. Through his enthusiasm for this cause and under his inspired tutelage, Baltimore has emerged as the country's headquarters in research into the problems of the aged. It is only proper therefore that a center to be built for our senior citizens with a most unique approach to their problems be named after this man. The Waxter Center will have as its core a concept I find especially promising—the idea that various disciplines and departments work together for the same purpose. The juxtaposition of the well and the aged sick and the training and research activities that will be conducted in the center are forward-looking concepts which will certainly point the way for the rest of the country. With its enlightened programming, its highly skilled professional people and creative leadership, the Waxter Center will combine the functions of a health and activity center, a rehabilitation unit and a demonstration project. Not only will the center serve our present day aged, but it will also provide a forum for studying the problems of the aged in toto rather than in fragmentized portions.

The Waxter Center is a superb concept from a medical, humanitarian and financial point of view. It is the answer to those who view the present situation of caring for the aged as colossally complex with no answer in sight. I believe that the Waxter Center would truly be one of the best ways to demonstrate such a solution, and I cannot urge strongly enough that all Baltimoreans vigorously support this loan on the November 7 ballot.

There is no more fitting memorial to Thomas Waxter than in the creation of this center, for in its daily rescuing of many lives from unhappiness and illness and in its provision for greatly alleviating such pains for our future aged, the Waxter Center will be a vibrant remainder of the inextinguishable sympathy, the inexhaustible love Thomas Waxter had for all humanity.

But even more importantly, as Thomas Waxter himself would have said, this Center will help to make the later years of all of us truly those golden years that the Almighty meant them to be. Old age, to the unlearned, is winter; to the learned, it is harvest time. The Waxter Center—through research, through treatment and through care—will, I am certain, be the forerunner of many similar centers across the country.

The nationally distinguished speakers we have here today, each of whom I welcome to Baltimore, attest by their presence to the importance of this Center. They, too, realize that the Waxter Center will help open our later years into a joyous time of life.

NEW IDEAS ABOUT OLDER AMERICANS

(Address by Hon. WALTER F. MONDALE, at the Public Rally for the Waxter Center for Senior Citizens, War Memorial Building, Baltimore, October 22, 1967)

First I want to thank you for inviting me to be with you today. You have made me an honorary participant in a great effort for a great purpose, and I am proud to be with you as you prepare to make referendum day a victory day for the people of Baltimore.

It will be a victory for *all* the people, those who are elderly today and also those yet to come.

And it will be a victory for leaders who—in other metropolitan centers and in smaller communities—see the need for innovation and hard work on behalf of older Americans throughout the nation.

You are setting an example here.

You are saying that a great city, rich as it is and as busy as it is, loses much if it loses touch with its elders.

You are saying the communities *must* experiment if they are to cope with all the changes that occur as the nation's population past age 65 goes to 19 million and beyond.

And you are declaring—in terms that speak the loudest—that the people of this city are willing to put up the resources and the personal commitment needed to make your center a success.

The Waxter Center in the heart of your downtown will tell the nation what kind of people you have here in Baltimore. You are expressing new ideas about older Americans in your plans for your center, and I want to talk to you about the need for just such fresh thinking and innovation.

I mentioned a statistic—19 million persons past age 65—a little while ago. That is an impressive number, but it is just a very small part of the total story about the nation's elderly and what is happening to them in retirement.

I am beginning to learn a great deal more about that subject since I became chairman, earlier this year, of the Subcommittee on Retirement and the Individual. That Subcommittee is one of the study units of the Senate Special Committee on Aging and it already has conducted hearings in Washington and in Ann Arbor, Michigan.

With each statement I heard at each hearing, I became more convinced that we here in this nation are in the midst of a retirement revolution involving significant and far-reaching changes in both the nature and dimensions of retirement as an institution and as a force for good or bad in the lives of each individual in our nation.

You here have already begun to prepare for many of the changes that will accompany this revolution. But too many other Americans still have not yet realized that both the number of retired individuals and the number of years they live in retirement have been increasing and will continue to increase in the years ahead. Automation, technology, and other forces are intensifying the pressure for earlier retirement, while Medicare and continuing medical advances are not only stretching life expectancy but producing greater youthfulness at ages we now regard as advanced.

Thus we are approaching a point where the average person will be spending nearly as much time in retirement as he now spends on the job and where nearly half of his life will be spent off the job.

Dr. Juanita Kreps, Professor of Economics at Duke University, gave testimony at our first hearing which dramatically illustrates some of the revolutionary and exciting choices which we will be able to make in the years ahead.

She points out that assuming no change in our present work system—that is, a 40-hour week and a 49-week work year—that our Gross National Product at projected rates of growth would be over $1.5 trillion by 1985, or about two and a third times its present level. This would mean that despite population increases, per capita GNP would rise from $3,181 to $5,802—an increase of 80%.

She then points out that if we were to decide to hold per capita GNP constant at $3,181 and take this growth in productivity in the form of leisure time, we would be able to reduce the work-week to 22 hours, or we would be able to reduce the work-year to 27 weeks, or we could lower retirement age to 38 years, or we would be able to keep half of the total labor force in retraining.

We will not, I am sure, use this fabulous economic growth in any single way alone, but rather in a combination of ways involving shorter work-week, shorter work-year, retraining, and earlier retirement. But I think it is most important that we realize that this revolution is here and is coming on at a rapid rate, and that we realize the options open to us and try to plan reasonably and logically so that we make decisions which will enrich the lives of all of us.

Accompanying this economic miracle is a medical miracle which was most dramatically illustrated by Dr. August Kinzel. Based on the rate of anticipated progress in biology, he predicted that by 1980 the man of 65 to 75 years of age who has availed himself of what is offered will have the health and vigor of a man 45 to 55 years of age and that he would retain much of this vigor until he dies when, like the old one horse shay, he will fall apart all at once. Dr. Kinzel also went out on a limb to predict in 100 to 200 years, we would be able to prolong life indefinitely with death occurring only by accident.

I'm not too sure how desirable immortality might be, but we don't have to worry about it anyway. We do, however, have to concern ourselves with the ramifications of constantly improving health in retirement and new medical and biological break-throughs.

As I noted in my statement opening our hearings in June, these trends and changes present us with new challenges and pose the

question as to how ready we are for the retirement revolution.

The hearings made it abundantly clear that we are not ready in several areas.

We are certainly not ready in terms of income. Virtually every single witness emphasized the inadequacy of present income levels and the need to increase them significantly.

Nor are we ready in terms of our attitudes. Our attitudes toward retirement are showing their age—they are based on a time when a man of 60 or 65 really was an old man—and I think it is clear that we must work to revamp them.

And we are not ready in terms of understanding the subtle, yet profound, changes with which the individual must cope when he retires—voluntarily or otherwise—from his job in this work-oriented society of ours. There is a tendency to downgrade those who are no longer engaged in productive labor, and as a result, retirement to many becomes a time of being shunted aside and being made to feel useless, indeed, even worthless.

It is ironic, I think, that we refer to retirement as a problem. For through history, one of man's cherished dreams has been the elimination of heavy labor and perpetual toil. Now that industrialization and the rapid advance of technology are making this dream come true, we find ourselves feeling uncomfortable and uneasy and guilty about free time.

We find we don't know how to use our free time. We find that too much of our education is simply vocational training, education designed to prepare for a job. And one of the main points made by witnesses in our first hearing was the growing need for education for life off the job and acceptance of a philosophy that will enable us to bring about such education.

Another major point made by witnesses before the committee was the need for more educational opportunities, especially in mid-career. Secretary Gardner was most eloquent on the need for opportunities for the individual to return to school in order to renew himself, and other witnesses stressed the fact of educational obsolescence in our rapidly changing society.

And particularly important is the need to make the individual himself aware of this need. For one of the things with which I am most impressed is that there is little awareness of the impact that our economic and medical miracles are having on retirement. There is, in fact, a tendency to avoid thinking about retirement until it is upon us. Again, this goes to the heart of the problem, for failure to prepare for retirement is like allowing a child to grow to the age of 20 without schooling or training and then expecting him to be able to find a decent job and make a satisfactory adjustment in the work-a-day world.

We must, I believe, begin recognizing retirement for what it is: a separate and distinct phase of life which may last from 20 to 25 years before a person can be considered as entering old age. And we must realize that there is a great and growing need for earlier awareness and consideration of the realities of retirement, the explosion of leisure time, and the potentialities of the retirement revolution, so that those who are dissatisfied or bored with their present role will realize that they can change their lives and that they have a whole lifetime ahead of them when they retire.

What this all adds up to, I believe, is the need to institutionalize some sort of a mid-career pause. During this time, the individual could stop to take stock of his personal health and his social and job status, to determine what is important in his life, to reflect on where he has been and where he is going next, to consider a change in career, and to begin thinking about what he is going to do when he retires.

The problems of retirement are problems which reflect a serious lack of understanding, both on the part of society and the individual himself. And until we begin to understand the challenges and opportunities involved in earlier retirement, longer life, more free time and better health in old age, our efforts will go for naught.

Thus, I would hope we can elevate the nonmaterial needs of older people to the level of concern we have for their material needs. We have been able to make progress in the areas of health care, housing and income because we have been able to focus attention on the need and gain public acceptance for our goals. I would hope that we can now do the same with the problems of retirement adjustment fulfillment.

President Kennedy set forth our goal with this comment: "It is not enough to add new years to life; our objective must be to add new life to those years."

At this rally, during these final weeks before election day, you are doing your best to commit yourselves to the goal President Kennedy so well described.

It is not an easy goal to reach. We will have to do much hard thinking about older Americans before we get well on our way to that goal. And we will have to transform that thinking into action, as you here in Baltimore will do when you go to the polls next month. I wish you well, and I hope to visit your center soon after it opens its doors.

THE WAXTER CENTER IN NATIONAL FOCUS

(By William D. Bechill, Commissioner, Administration on Aging, Social and Rehabilitation Service, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare)

It is my pleasure to attend this public rally today at the invitation of the Citizens' Committee for the Waxter Center.

The Citizens' Committee under the able leadership of Mrs. Pearson Sunderland, Jr., General Chairman, and Mr. James W. Rouse, Honorary Chairman, have made a significant contribution through their many efforts to make the Waxter Center a reality. Behind the scenes aiding in these endeavors has been the Commission on Problems of the Aging with Mr. James C. Anderson as its Chairman and Mr. Franklyn C. Hochreiter, Executive Director.

I am here today in the dual role as Commissioner of the Administration on Aging and as a citizen of the State of Maryland. The proposed Waxter Center for Senior Citizens is indeed a bold new approach to the aspirations of your elder citizens. Likewise, the State of Maryland has pioneered and taken an aggressive role in meeting the needs of its older residents.

Maryland was among the first States to implement the Older Americans Act. Through the dynamic leadership of Senator Margaret Schweinhaut and the Director, Mr. Gerald Monsman, both of the Maryland Commission on Aging, 25 programs for older people have been established in the State of Maryland during the past 2 years. Four of these projects were begun in Baltimore City. One of these four in Baltimore City is the Metropolitan Senior Center.

The concept of the proposed Waxter Center for Senior Citizens embodies several of the objectives contained in the Older Americans Act. One, "the best possible physical and mental health which science can make available and without regard to economic status." The 80-bed nursing unit proposed for the Waxter Center underscores that objective. This rehabilitative unit adds a new dimension to what we have known in the past as the multipurpose senior center.

Two, "retirement in health, honor, dignity—after years of contribution to the economy." The gamut of activities and opportunities and options for older people to participate in an exciting program certainly lends meaning to retirement.

Three, "pursuit of meaningful activity within the widest range of civic, cultural, and recreational opportunities." The Waxter Center, already with considerable experience through its Metropolitan Senior Center program, has shown the way for meaningful and creative pursuit of unused time. It is important to note here the wide range of opportunities available to older people.

Four, "efficient community services which provide social assistance in a coordinated manner and which are readily available when needed." Trained staff will be on hand to assist older people, both residents and community people, with a variety of services *when* and *where* they are needed.

Five, "immediate benefit from proven research knowledge which can sustain and improve health and happiness." In addition to the many services and programs proposed at the Waxter Center, there shall also be opportunities for research and new ideas which may prove helpful to programs in other parts of the country. The Administration on Aging, through its research and development office, is vitally interested in opportunities for testing results of different kinds of programs and services for older people, as well as encouraging new and innovative concepts and techniques for helping and assisting older people.

Another of our concerns is that of manpower and training resources. The Waxter Center could be a training center in addition to providing services, so that people interested in learning to help older people can be trained, at least in part, at the Waxter Center.

Six, "freedom, independence, and the free exercise of individual initiative in planning and managing their own lives." This, I believe, is the heart of the Waxter Center, and that is its philosophy. The concept is not of doing *for*, but rather helping *with* and *doing with* older people. Programs which are oriented in a direction other than that of self-determination cannot truly meet the needs that exist today in our society.

We estimate today that there are approximately 2,000 senior centers that are open 3 days or more per week throughout the country. Some of these centers have been operating for many years. Approximately 250 of these have been funded as a result of the passage of the Older Americans Act. We in the Administration on Aging feel that the proper direction is for these centers to become multipurpose in character. By multipurpose we mean providing many different kinds of services, activities, and opportunities for older people, including the objective of having a good time. The multipurpose senior center provides a wide and varied program, aimed towards specific and relevant objectives, and under the coordinated direction of trained personnel and volunteer leadership. Among its purposes are the development of meaningful and creative services and activities for individuals and groups; the discovery of opportunities for older people to perform community service; and the availability of information about community resources and plans relating to older people.

The multipurpose center, like the proposed Waxter Center for Senior Citizens, provides visible evidence of a community's concern for its older citizens.

The multipurpose senior center is a central location for services. Social institutions, in their effort to meet the changing needs of people, too often become complex and highly impersonal. Older people in need of these services find the normal channels a formidable maze, too difficult to negotiate. Frequently, older people choose to do without these needed services, rather than to run from agency to agency in utter frustration.

A multipurpose senior center can be a focal point, affording older people a place for their concerns and interests that is gen-

erally not available in any other type of community program.

The multipurpose senior center is totally committed to the older person, his needs, his aspirations, and his ideas.

The multipurpose senior center is a bridge to the community. Participating in the center is indeed participating in the community. Essentially, the senior center, through its program, helps the older person to feel that he can and should continue to contribute to his community and that he is a valued part of that community.

Your proposed Waxter Center for Senior Citizens goes beyond the concept of the multipurpose senior center. It sets forth a bold new approach which combines a multipurpose senior center with rehabilitative services. This, I believe, has considerable significance, not only for Baltimore City, but for the State and the Nation. The Waxter Center might well serve as a model from which others may learn and develop new programs and techniques for assisting our older citizens.

In conclusion I think the major strength of the proposed Waxter Center has been the overwhelming citizen support for this program and the many dedicated and hard-working people who have for the past several years endeavored to make this dream a reality. I hope that on November 7 your dreams will become a reality, so that older people locally and nationally can benefit from your endeavors. Thank you.

THE WAXTER CENTER'S ROLE IN REHABILITATION

(By Dr. Robert N. Butler, at the rally for the Waxter Center for Senior Citizens, War Memorial Building, Baltimore, Md., Oct. 22, 1967)

Thank you very much. I am honored to participate on this most important occasion.

How has it come about that our older people who were born into a great and expanding nation and who gave of themselves to their society and who may now have manifested the results of the naturally-occurring accumulation of personal problems and the environmental assaults of living—how does it come about that having experienced these multifarious events that our old people have been placed in a marginal position—personally, socially, and economically—in our society?

We are gathered today for a significant reason—to rally the interest and the understanding of an entire community—that of Baltimore—of its people of *all ages*, of *all generations*, to help meet the legitimate needs of older citizens—needs, one must emphasize, which the younger will themselves eventually have. It is a case, in fact, of all people doing something *for themselves*. Our society, our culture, may be evaluated in years ahead by the depth of our concern for all groups contained within it—regardless of race, religion, creed *and age*. *Each* of the groups within our society have specific problems and requirements—which must be acted upon in different ways but always with *imagination, respect, and compassion*.

It is refreshing to me that the Junior League and other groups outside of the aged are prime backers of the Waxter Center which is named after Judge Thomas J. S. Waxter in honor of his devotion to the medical care of the indigent. In addition, the Center is partly the dream of a young physician, Dr. Mason Lord, whose untimely death should not be forgotten on this Sunday. Physician-in-chief of Chronic and Community Medicine in the Baltimore City Hospitals, he visualized a complex in the center of the city—not ostracized in the outskirts—where it would house in-patient and out-patient activities, offer education, recreation and counseling. The 95,000 older citizens of Baltimore would be served. But it could be a model for other cities of the United States. Those of us in gerontology and geriatrics know that more *knowledge has been accumulated than is applied*—because society has not provided the financial and psychological support—to see what can be accomplished. The plans of the Waxter Center distills the best of present thinking. I hope the $3,000,000 loan will receive a positive vote on the referendum November 7.

I was asked to comment concerning the medical and psychiatric implications of the Waxter Center for the health of our senior citizens. Our old are becoming young—and will become younger—the more so when we provide better medical services for the aged, of whom an astonishingly high number are poor, over 5 million of our 19 million elderly are below the poverty line. There has been progress in the delivery of medical services but there have been disappointments. For instance, there have been minimal advances in the state mental hospital programs with respect to the aged in the 26 states where Medicaid has been established.

I wish to tell you briefly of our studies of healthy aging conducted at the National Institute of Mental Health, beginning in 1955. A group of us, representing various scientific and professional disciplines, studied healthy community-resident elderly—in an endeavor to find the ingredients in "successful aging" and to define the baseline of healthy aging, in order to better understand pathological deviations.

We measured over 600 characteristics in each of our subjects. We wanted to explore the consequences of the passages of time, of chronological aging, and to disentangle the latter from social adversity, medical disease and institutionalization. We need more such studies and we are presently engaged in a 12-year follow-up of our original group, whose average age in 1955 was 71.

Contrary to previous studies, usually done on samples of institutionalized or sick older people, we found what the Romans knew long ago—a sound mind in a sound body. Given health, older people remain vigorous and resourceful. One cannot blame mental slowness, senility, etc. on age alone. Comparatively few differences were demonstrated in the many functions tested in the medical and laboratory survey between the aged and the young. Serum albumin, a protein, was significantly lower in the aged, but not as a consequence of poor nutrition. Changes in protein metabolism may be significant in aging. We also discovered in contrast to previous studies, that the amount of blood which goes to the brain and the amount of oxygen used by it are not decreased with age but by disease, especially arteriosclerosis. By studying our volunteers over the years we have learned some of the elements which contribute to successful adaptation and to survival. These include significant involvement in the world of the living and the presence of significant personal relationships as well as the presence of physical health.

The future of aging is optimistic. Recently Fuson, *et al* of Duke University, for example, reported upon a drug cholestyramine, a resin that binds bile acids in the intestinal tract and reduces serum cholesterol and triglycerine levels. It would be foolish to imagine an ageless future—a medical conquest of the inevitable processes of aging. However, chemical, surgical and other advances will lead to the prevention and treatment of arteriosclerosis, which accounts for nearly ⅔ of our annual deaths, and a far greater toll in morbidity. Developments in the physiology of memory (RNA) and sleep are evolving. Future changes in our environment will favorably modify aging through reduction in a variety of assaults, ranging from noise to pollution.

Projections into the future are always fascinating. As child psychologists have found—first, the child conceives the future; then, the past and present. Futurity partially defines man and it is his fate. Our task is to use and expand the present, exploit in full measure the here-and-now. Such centers as the Waxter will address themselves to the here-and-now. I consider it to be particularly wise that the Waxter Center will offer services to both the well and the sick. Perhaps the well may be encouraged to help the sick, and perhaps the sick may be heartened by observing the possibilities for "successful aging" manifested by the well. I hope, too, that the Waxter Center will contribute to the future of aging.

Thirty-three million Americans will be alive and retired in the year 2000. What are we to do to facilitate healthy adaptation to retirement, which currently tends to lead to nonparticipation in the mainstream of human life.

Shouldn't we reform the rite of retirement? Should we find new and useful social roles for the retired? For instance, Senator Harrison Williams has proposed a National Community Senior Service Corps.

Should we also consider going to the foundation of the problem and revise retirement as presently practiced? Instead of "retirement" being condensed into one period of life, often in the presence of ill-health and restricted finances, in the concluding era of life, why not distribute work, education, and leisure (or retirement) throughout the entire life cycle. At present, we concentrate education, work and retirement into three distinct periods; early life, middle life, and old age. Should we visualize a future, following the models of the academic sabbatical system and the industrial training programs, to build in a system of recurrent periods of work interrupted by leisure or retirement, education and retraining. Such a revision in our practices would require redistribution of our financial practices of credit, of monies for education, of monies for retirement.

Vitalization of present retirement practices is more likely to be introduced long before a major revision in our social institutions. I return to the here-and-now.

In our time, retirement is occurring earlier, occupying an expanding portion of the life cycle, and affecting an enlarging segment of our population. Our society must avail itself of the significant human resource presented by our retired elderly with their accumulated knowledge and experience. The elderly themselves can help lead the way—pressing their needs—and not accepting the position in which they have been placed.

I very much hope the Waxter Center may be a stimulus to the contributions of older people and will not simply *serve* the elderly as if they were helpless. And I hope the Center may be the focus of research into the nature of aging and of the aged, of health as well as diseases, of adaptation as well as maladaptation.

The Waxter Center, then, can contribute to the maintenance of the healthy and to the care and treatment of the sick. It can stand as an example of an outstanding program to other cities throughout our nation. Finally, it has the opportunity of discovery—of uncovering new knowledge both fundamental to our understanding of aging and the elderly and to the practical solution of problems of the here and now.

ANTI-SEMITISM IN THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the blatant and persistent discrimination being sustained in the Soviet Union against the Jewish population.

I am well aware that this matter has been discussed in this body on a number of other occasions.

The important fact is that despite debate and despite the influence of world

public opinion, the serious plight of Soviet Jewry has not substantially improved.

Token measures have been taken by Soviet authorities in an attempt to soften foreign criticism. But in reality, the Communists have shown no real disposition publicly to curtail anti-Semitism.

Ironically, the Soviet Constitution ostensibly guarantees equal rights to all nationalities and religious sects. In fact, the Soviets have gone through the motions of passing laws specifically banning racial and religious discrimination.

But, in effect, the Kremlin prevents the Jewish nationality from practicing those rights granted by its own laws.

There are approximately 3 million Jews in Russia.

During the first three decades of the Soviet regime, anti-Semitism was not so apparent.

But after World War II, Stalin initiated a methodical campaign to destroy Jewish institutions, including publishing houses. Yiddish actors, writers, and other communal leaders were liquidated in the late 1940's.

The situation has not changed fundamentally today. The Soviet Government, reacting to opinion expressed throughout the world, has taken a few minor steps to counteract the more overt forms of its anti-Jewish policy.

All available evidence indicates a deliberate pattern of anti-Semitism continues in the Soviet Union which has not appreciably subsided since the days of Stalin. We cannot ignore the predicament of the Russian Jewish community which is today beset by the most difficult pressures.

In recognition of the objectives of the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry, I wish to assert my own deep concern about the problem of anti-semitism in the Soviet Union. I believe Americans of all races and creeds should be concerned.

I believe that our Government should, and I hope it will, pursue this matter with the Soviet Government through diplomatic channels.

TOWARD A COMPREHENSIVE NATIONAL ENERGY POLICY

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, last week, the Committee on Federal Utility and Power Law of the Federal Bar Association held its fall conference on the subject "Toward a Comprehensive National Energy Policy."

Two of the presentations made at that conference have been brought to my attention and, because they are thoughtful analyses of specific power policy questions, I believe they will be of interest to my colleagues.

The first statement is that of Federal Power Commission member Charles R. Ross. Commissioner Ross discussed the question "Is low-cost power too costly in other human values?" To those of us concerned with preservation development and enhancement of our environment, his remarks are particularly pointed.

The Commissioner raises specific questions regarding the consideration given to air, water, and land pollution in development of power sources. After noting that a committee of scientists in southern California has requested a delay of at least 1 year on nuclear construction to allow time for evaluation of effects of radiation and heated discharge water, he states:

> By asking these question now, all parties are hoping to avoid the unfavorable experiences of earlier period of power development which have left us the beneficiaries of too many smokestacks belching pollutants and streams devoid of fish and recreational development.

Commissioner Ross goes on to say:

> Because it is a general practice for public agencies to choose that alternative which is easily measured in convenient economic terms, we are bypassing those alternatives that are not easily valued because of their more esoteric qualities.

Mr. President, this is an important point particularly at a time when Congress is considering funds for continuation of planning on the Dickey-Lincoln School hydroelectric project in Maine. For a number of years prior to authorization of this project alternatives were considered which would have destroyed the Allagash, a river which is valued by conservationists for its wild state. The decision was made by the people of Maine that no dam should be built which would endanger the esoteric value of this wild river and therefore we were able to secure both an economic hydroelectric powersite and a preserved canoeway for recreationists.

The other presentation which I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues is that of Mr. Alex Radin, general manager of American Public Power Association, the national association of municipally owned electric utilities.

Mr. Radin has prepared an excellent summary of the role of public power in national power policy. He has indicated the dilemma which confronts small consumer-owned systems due to the trend toward concentration in the private power industry.

Mr. Radin calls for cooperative public and private construction of generation and transmission and states:

> An over-riding reason for facilitating joint action in the construction of nuclear power plants is to insure that smaller systems have an equal opportunity to take part in nuclear power development. As was pointed out by Congressman Moss, nuclear power is a technology which was initiated, fostered, and developed through use of Federal funds. It would be clearly contrary to the public interest to find that the result of this investment was to secure a de facto monopoly of the end product for a few large privately owned electric utilities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have these statements printed in the RECORD.

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

IS LOW COST POWER TOO COSTLY IN OTHER HUMAN VALUES?

(An address by Charles R. Ross, Commissioner, Federal Power Commission, at the Federal Bar Association, Committee on Federal Utility and Power Law, fall conference, Washington, D.C., October 16, 1967)

At the outset I'd like to state that it certainly is encouraging to me that someone on the planning committee decided that this conference found the question, "Is low cost power too costly in other human values?" an appropriate part of the conference theme, "Toward a Comprehensive National Energy Policy."

The public is demanding that industry and the government define their goals so the public can assure itself that its goals towards the "good life" are being promoted. Every day the newspaper reports the rise of a citizen's group or an individual to protest some decision by industry or a governmental agency that conflicts with the group's or the individual's concept of what is right. Increasingly, the courts are recognizing these outcries as legitimate legal claims. Industry and the governmental agencies are now being forced to take these citizen protests into account in their activities. As time goes on, I am sure that the public will expect that the industry and government will do more than just react to their more outspoken protests. In my opinion, the public has a right to question its institutions which do not respond in time affirmatively and at their own initiative to the public goals represented by these conflicts.

Because the protests received by any one agency or industry are illustrative of only a part of the total picture, I think it best to articulate what I believe is the general public goal being violated which generates the type and number of protests and interventions we are witnessing today. What people today want is a balancing of the environment; a feeling that their human needs for an invironment that is conducive to intellectual and artistic attainment and yet spiritually refreshing are not totally compromised by their natural desire for materialistic well-being. Throughout history, indeed, it has been those societies which were able to inspire and appreciate beauty and artistic expression (in addition to economic viability) that are recognized as contributing to the well-being of their citizens and to civilization.

Satisfying the desire for such a totally balanced environment is an awesome task for a decision-maker, whether he is in the government or in industry. To do his job, he must be aware of all the relevant inter-relationships between man and his environment. This is not easy, as one recent incident well illustrates. For example, a community decided to preserve its dwindling deer population by establishing a preserve. Without their usual, natural predators, and protected from hunters, however, the deer soon became overpopulated. As a result, most of the deer starved. Lack of foresight as to the total picture thus led to a most unhappy result. More sophisticated game managers today realize the futility of trying to preserve a single species apart from its total surroundings; only by simulating the balancing process of nature could the original goal say, of preserving the deer, be reached.

Just as single-directed attempts to save a certain species of animal can lead to unexpected results, a single-directed pursuit of some industrial goal can do likewise. We may be witnessing the genesis of this type of situation in the rapid building of nuclear plants by the electric industry. Although few plants are in actual service, the industry is obviously putting the bulk of its new generation in nuclear plants primarily because of the promise of attractive economic costs. Yet, there are others who are wondering aloud whether enough attention by the industry has focused on the side-effects of nuclear plants. The Los Angeles Chapter of the Federation of American Scientists recently called for a moratorium of at least one year on nuclear construction on the West Coast to allow time for statewide selection of sites and a thorough evaluation of the effects on marine ecology of radiation and heated discharge water from shoreline power plants. The Chapter particularly criticized the

method of selecting sites one at a time. That this group is not alone in its thoughts is illustrated by the problem faced by the group of utilities constructing an atomic plant on the Connecticut River. Actual construction has been delayed while various state and federal authorities have been attempting to determine the effects of the plant's operation on the atmosphere and the water temperature. By asking these questions now, all parties are hoping to avoid the unfavorable experiences of earlier periods of power development which have left us the beneficiaries of too many smokestacks belching pollutants and streams devoid of fish and recreational development.

The method of looking at the total environmental effect of any given project is called ecology. Greater use of this science enables man to maintain equilibrium between himself and nature. While philosophers have remarked on the value of a harmonious relationship between man and nature for centuries, it is only within recent history that the natural scientists have been able to show that man's physical health is a function of his environment. For example, experiments conducted on stress-filled rats, that is, rats in disharmony with their invironments, showed direct physiological effects including "swollen, drained adrenals, shrunken lymphatic tissue, the gastro-intestinal ulcers."[1] Not surprisingly, recent scientific studies have also noticed the marked incidences of diseases like ulcers in human urban dwellers.

While scientists have yet to pinpoint to a certainty the effects of environmental changes upon the genetic structure of man, the effects of certain changes upon the living habits of man are readily discernible. For example, you may have been as struck as I by a recent photo in a newspaper showing school children in Japan wearing face masks while playing in the schoolyard in order to protect them from the polluted air. As a member of the International Joint Commission, I recently attended a hearing on air pollution in the Sarnia industrial area. Particularly moving was the testimony of a young mother, Mrs. Norma Richards. When her child requested permission to come inside, Mrs. Richards was asked, "Why does the fresh air hurt?" So, it isn't hard to conceive of a time when all children will be forbidden to play outdoors, thus ending a pattern that has been in existence surely as long as the world has known the existence of children.

On a larger scale, let us consider the effects of a possible by-product of the excessive dumping of carbon dioxides into the earth's atmosphere. Some scientists claim this is warming the earth's atmosphere, with possible grave consequences for humans. As the temperatures rise and the atmosphere becomes increasingly unable to absorb further pollutants, it is possible that human beings will be unable to adapt under present living habits. We may have to retreat into glass domes, where life would necessarily be far more controlled than that of any walled town in medieval days. The examples are numerous—just imagine human life without trees, or without animal life or without a plentiful supply of water—or any combination of these.

Because the ramifications of a deteriorating environment are simply enormous for society, as we know it, it seems to me that our duty to future generations, at a minimum, should warrant a conservative attitude toward increasing the factors that disrupt our environmental balance.

However, we cannot simply halt all construction until definitive solutions are procured. So, how best can an agency or an industry proceed? I believe that a particular decision in the use of a unique or scarce natural resource should not irrevocably preclude other future options. John Krutilla of Resources for the Future has stated why it is so important to preserve future options today. Because it is general practice for public agencies to choose that alternative which is easily measured in convenient economic terms, we are by-passing those alternatives that are not easily valued because of their more esoteric qualities. For example, the present value of a swamp as an industrial site is more easily ascertained than the value of preserving that site for its unique contribution to the area's ecology.

Secondly, if we exhaust all our natural resources on the basis of existing economic considerations alone, Dr. Krutilla asks whether in due time we will have extinguished all other possible allocations of resources. That is, neither we nor our descendants will ever again have a choice about preserving bird life in that particular swamp.

We can and we should give weight to such values in today's decisions. One way of giving such weight is to permit the development of a resource in a manner which will not foreclose different uses of the same resource in the future. The Commission's decision in *Rumford Falls* represents a good example of my point. There the Commission was unable to predict the best use of a water resource for the future but did preserve for society the right to superimpose a different use when society finds such different use desirable.

We should be saving for future generations the opportunity to exercise their value judgments. The obligations to do at least this much for our posterity seems paramount, for once natural phenomena like glaciers, dodo birds and the Everglades are lost, they are irrevocably lost.

Where conflict is unavoidable—for example, if a site cannot be used both for white-water floats and power purposes, then it is critical that the loss of one or the other goal be fully ascertained before the choice is eliminated. To this end, legislation like Senator Neuberger's in the last session of Congress to determine the effects of overhead lines on property, community planning and public health—if conducted with an impartial and conscientious manner—should be most helpful to the industry's decision-making as well as governmental agencies. What such studies should reveal are the real costs of technology to society and, hopefully, ways to diminish detrimental effects if the choice to proceed with the technology is made.

Within the government, more than a conscious consideration of alternatives may be possible. Almost four years ago, I made a speech to the effect that "sooner or later, our nation is going to insist upon a Department of Natural Resources." Public hearings are being held, for the first time, on a bill introduced by Senator Moss to establish just such a department to halt what the Senator termed "a progressive deterioration of natural resources" in America. It seems that the "later" I spoke of is possibly imminent, and so far as I am concerned, the time has come for all of us to concentrate on the best method of achieving such a department. As a minimum, an essential part of any such department should be an environmental bureau that would provide guidance for the use of natural resources.

What is inescapable is that conflicts over the use of our nation's resources—air, water, landscape—are proliferating because of lack of planning and direction. Within the federal segment, "coordination" among the agencies ranges from a polite exchange of noncommital letters to outright hassles in court between two governmental agencies. While a Department of Natural Resources will not solve all these problems, its establishment could possibly do much to reduce conflicts among the various federal segments and provide a rational source of inspiration for natural resource development by the private, state and local interests. On the other hand, a place must be reserved within the decisional process for the expression of independent viewpoints by private organizations or individuals. No really satisfactory method has yet been found within the bureaucratic structure to give such expression the "full faith and credit" needed to expose each course of action to the fullest consideration necessary to reach the best decision.

I would like to note that the FPC's proposed reliability bill had recognized the necessity to consider land use and aesthetics, and specifically provides for their consideration by the Commission. Where there are responsible agencies to resolve such matters, the Commission would defer to their views unless inconsistent with the objectives of Part IV. Should this section become law, I am convinced that the FPC would have to seek the assistance of trained professionals, such as the landscape architect. Such assistance alone will not be enough. The Commissioners for their part will have to recognize that a greater number of appliances which provide increased leisure will be useless if there is such disharmony between man and his environment that man is unable to understand himself and his relationship to the universe.

Lewis Mumford has summed up what I've been saying in better words than I, and I'd like to quote them:

In this new ideology, quantity will not reign supreme: it must always be modified and justified by quality. Our object is no longer the one-sided domination of nature, but the creation of sympathetic associations and cooperations favorable to life and to vivid intercourse with nature on many levels besides the physical one. To this end, we will seek not the maximum quantity of energy or the maximum power of external control, but the right quantity of the right quality at the right time and the right place for the right purpose. It is in this context that whole men, rather than perfect machines, mutilated organisms and underdimensioned men, will flourish."

THE ROLE OF PUBLIC POWER IN A MODERN NATIONAL POWER POLICY

(By Alex Radin, general manager, American Public Power Association, Washington, D.C., for presentation to fall conference, Federal Bar Association, Committee on Federal Utility and Power Law, National Press Club, Washington, D.C., Oct. 16, 1967)

What is public power?

In considering the role of public power in a modern national power policy, we should first answer this question, What is public power? I make no apology for this question, since I have found that many well informed people in sophisticated audiences such as this are not entirely clear what we mean by public power.

First, chronologically and in numbers of systems, public power includes more than 2,000 local publicly owned electric utilities. The largest group of these systems consists of the more than 1,900 municipal electric utilities, operating in cities, towns and villages in 48 of the 50 states. Other types of local publicly owned systems include countrywide power agencies, such as public utility districts, which are most prevalent in the State of Washington; state power agencies, which were organized in several states in connection with development of water resources; and some irrigation districts which produce and distribute power. All of these are included among what we term the local publicly owned electric utilities.

Public power also includes the Federal power program: the Tennessee Valley Authority power system, largest in the U.S.; the Bureau of Reclamation's hydroelectric projects and transmission systems; the hydro projects of the Army Corps of Engineers; and the power marketing agencies of the Department

[1] *Future Environments of North America*, p. 348.

of the Interior. Of ever growing significance, too, is the Atomic Energy Commission's role in electric power, although thus far this role has been confined to the development of the technology of generating electric power from nuclear reactors; the Commission does not now generate or market electric power for resale.

Public power does not include the rural electric cooperatives, which are privately owned by their members. These rural electrics have been largely financed through loans by the Rural Electrification Administration of the Department of Agriculture, but they are not public agencies. These systems, however, have some similarities to the local publicly owned utilities, in that both types of systems are consumer-owned and share some common problems as well as similar goals.

Thus, public power as we define it consists of both local publicly owned electric utilities and Federal power. (Appendix A indicates the size of the public power segment of the utility industry, relative to other segments.) Along with the rural electric cooperatives and investor-owned power companies public power forms our pluralistic electric utility industry in which each segment plays a distinctive role. I want to review briefly with you the record of the local publicly owned systems, and the role which these systems have played thus far in our national power policy.

The record of local public power

Although the most numerous, the local public power systems are perhaps the least well known segment of the industry.

According to the latest available Federal Power Commission statistics, consumers served by their own local publicly owned electric systems enjoy on the average substantially lower rates than the average customer of a private power company. And because of lower rates, residential consumers of local public power systems use substantially more electricity. In 1965, the latest year for which the FPC figures have been published, the average residential consumer of a local publicly owned system used nearly half again as much electricity as the average company customer, yet the public system consumer paid 8.4% less for his greater usage. To look at it another way, the power companies' average residential revenue during the year was more than 56% higher per kilowatt-hour. (Appendix B shows the most recent figures available from the Federal Power Commission on comparative revenues, sales and expenses of local publicly owned utilities and privately owned companies.)

Perhaps the most important contribution which public power systems have made to the electric industry of the United States is to demonstrate that the demand for electricity is elastic; if the price is lowered, the demand will increase. This theory was perhaps best stated by the late Leland Olds, former chairman of the Federal Power Commission, who stated: "The new residential rate concept says, base your rates on your future business. Then your rates will be low because your costs will be low because your sales will be high because your rates will be low."

The best demonstration of this theory can be found in the Tennessee Valley and the Pacific Northwest, where average rates are lowest in the Nation and average consumption is highest. The application of this policy has provided ancillary benefits to consumers served by privately owned companies. The Tennessee Valley Authority publishes a map showing rising electric prices in concentric circles around the TVA area, indicating that low electric rates spread like ripples in a pond when the pebble of low rates is dropped somewhere in the Nation.

Spurred by lower rates, the local publicly owned electric utilities have been growing in a number of categories at a more rapid rate than the power companies over the past several years. (See Appendix C.)

Apart from generally lower rates, local publicly owned electric service offers other benefits. Because it is owned by the consumers, the local public power system can be more responsive to needs of the people and the community. The earnings are retained in the community, and in many smaller towns the municipal electric system is one of the larger local industries.

Local public ownership of electric service dates back to the beginnings of the industry. In 1882, the first year of central station service, four municipal electric systems were established. In the years that followed there were many others. Some of the early ones have been absorbed by larger utilities, but a number of municipal systems date back before the turn of the century.

Local public power, then, had its beginnings half a century before TVA was created, and, rather than being a product of the New Deal days, has basically been a product of local do-it-yourself initiative and pride. A look at the location of the Nation's more than 2,000 local public power systems shows a concentration in such states as Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska and Minnesota, each of which has more than 125 municipal power systems.

The motives in setting up municipal systems were simple—to obtain service, usually street lights initially; or lower rates; or more reliable electric service, or to obtain greater financial contributions to the local government. Today, there are several communities where establishment of a municipal electric system is being debated; and there are others where a municipal system is threatened with sale. The important point is that the people in these communities can exercise their right to choose how they are to be served. This choice offers an element of competition in an otherwise monopolistic industry.

The ability of the people of a community to choose between providing themselves with electric service through their own publicly owned utility or authorizing this service to be provided by a privately owned—and usually remotely controlled—business enterprise is a crucial defense against monopoly in an industry that is vital to American life. Yet it is by no means universally available. State laws vary widely, and in many states it is far easier to sell a municipal electric system than it is to establish one.

The record that has been achieved to date convinces me that the right of the people to choose between consumer ownership and investor ownership of their electric service ought to be a cornerstone of a truly comprehensive national power policy. Of course, the legal right to make this choice is rather meaningless unless conditions are such that people have a viable opportunity to exercise such a right. Thus, our national electric power policy should seek to maintain conditions which give the people a realistic opportunity to exercise this right of free choice; and, if the people in an area have already made such a choice, they should have an environment which makes it possible for them to continue to own and operate their electric system, if they so desire.

Trends in the electric utility industry

In considering the elements of a modern national power policy, we need to consider several trends which promise to alter sharply the industry as we see it today. One of these is the increased concentration of control of electric service.

The 100 largest systems in the United States account for about 89% of total electric utility generation. The majority of these systems are private companies. Although the number of consumer-owned systems has remained comparatively stable in recent years, the number of private power companies has steadily declined. Since 1945, for example, the number of companies has shrunk from slightly over 1,000 to slightly less than 500, mainly by acquisition and merger.

The trend to fewer—and larger—privately owned power companies is continuing. One of your speakers today, president Donald C. Cook of American Electric Power, last year predicted that "we shall see a shakedown to about a dozen or 15 integrated systems throughout the U.S.," perhaps, he said, in 50 years or maybe even sooner. News reports of merger plans in the past few months and even weeks suggest the movement to fewer power companies is accelerating.

At the same time, and perhaps spurring the consolidation of private power companies, we have witnessed the growth of what we might call giantism in power generating and transmission facilities. Over the past few years, the sizes of conventional thermal generating plants have been growing, to take advantage of the benefits of large scale. As unit size in kilowatts increases, unit costs per kilowatt-hour decrease. Now, the advent of nuclear power is placing an even greater premium on large size.

Since the beginning of last year, more than half of all new thermal generating capacity announced in the U.S. has been nuclear, and without attempting to appraise the many and changing estimates, it seems clear that an increasing proportion of new capacity and of total electric generating capacity will be nuclear in the years ahead. Growing nuclear capacity will place new emphasis on large size because of the high capital costs associated with these plants, due primarily to protective measures considered essential in handling nuclear fuel and higher fuel inventory. Stewart Brown, chief of the Federal Power Commission's Bureau of Power, last year pointed out that a nuclear plant of 1,000,000 kilowatts capacity is 20 times larger than a plant of 50,000 kilowatts, but the larger plant costs only seven times as much to build.

Associated with huge new generating facilities are large transmission lines capable of moving large blocks of power over long distances.

I hardly need to note that the trend to giantism has important implications for the generally small consumer-owned electric systems. In the National Power Survey, the Federal Power Commission classed as "small" systems with annual net energy requirements of less than 100 million kilowatt-hours. By this measure, only 171 of the more than 2,000 local publicly owned electric systems and only 65 of the more than 900 rural electric cooperatives were *not* classed as small. Clearly, most of the nation's 3,000 consumer-owned electric systems will not be able to undertake individually the large-scale generating and transmission facilities of an era of giantism.

If this is so, then what will be the role of the smaller consumer-owned systems in the nation's electric utility in the future? I see two significant factors that should be recognized in a national power policy.

First, there is the growing need for competition. As the private sector of the industry becomes concentrated in fewer and fewer companies, with larger and larger facilities, the threat of monopolistic domination looms larger than ever before. The Federal Power Commission's National Power Survey declared, "The industry's pluralistic institutional structure, while perhaps inhibiting coordinated operations, has proven a powerful competitive stimulus to management improvement and cost reduction." As the economic and physical concentration of the electric utility industry increases, the need for "a powerful competitive stimulus" will become even more urgent, but at the same time more difficult to achieve.

A second important factor is that the economies of large scale that are assuming such great importance in generation and transmission do not apply to the vital function of distribution. The small system can distribute energy fully as economically as the larger utility. In fact, the latest available Federal Power Commission statistics indicate that the local publicly owned electric

utilities have slightly lower distribution costs per kilowatt-hour than the generally larger privately owned power companies. Turning again to the Commission, we find this explanation: "Fundamental technological and operating factors make it necessary to distinguish between the distribution and production functions in evaluating the performance of small systems. The electric power industry is inherently capital intensive. There are large economies of scale in production—i.e., generation and transmission. Economies on the distribution side, however, are keyed to high usage per consumer and high consumer density per mile." And to this may I add that the figures which I cited earlier concerning the record of the local publicly owned electric utilities in providing more power to their consumers at lower cost demonstrates the leadership of these local public power systems in this basic area of electric service.

If smaller consumer-owned electric systems are to continue to provide benefits of an effective competitive stimulus in the electric utility industry, they must have access to the advantages of low-cost power supply. They can do this in at least two ways: (1) through purchase of bulk power supply from a utility system which is in a position to utilize large units; or (2) by joining with other utilities to share the cost and output of large plants. I shall explore these alternatives later in considering some of the specifics of a national power policy.

These trends I have been discussing have a variety of other policy implications. For example, the increasing concentration of control in the private sector of the industry gives new emphasis to the antitrust laws as related to the electric utilities.

Giantism in generation and transmission has new and little-explored monopoly aspects, but it also poses new geographical and physical problems. If we project present trends in the sizes of thermal generating plants, we can soon reach a point at which the number of possible sites with adequate cooling water is severely limited.

A. C. Monteith, at that time senior vice president of Westinghouse Electric Corp., told the World Power Conference in Tokyo last year that by the year 2000 some 200 new plant sites will be developed in the United States and suggested that some of these will be for installations of 10,000,000 kw or larger in size. Only five rivers in the United States will have sufficient water flow to support the cooling water requirements for a 10,000,000 kw plant, he said. If cooling towers or man-made lakes prove impractical to supply the water requirements for these huge plants, it is pos sible that most nuclear installations will be located near oceans and along the Great Lakes, with extra-high-voltage lines being used to move the power inland.

Intensifying this problem insofar as nuclear power is concerned is the fact that condensing water requirements for nuclear stations are as much as 50% greater than for fossil-fuel fired generating stations.

Commissioner Charles Ross of the Federal Power Commission has suggested that the public interest in nuclear power plant sites is analogous to that in hydro sites early in the century when a policy was established of withdrawing the land where such sites are located. He also has suggested that similar consideration be given to land for rights-of-way for EHV transmission lines.

Generating facilities and transmission lines of the sizes of the largest under construction and of those projected today not only challenge engineers and utilities, but they also require new thinking by those who would shape a comprehensive national power policy.

Goals of a national power policy

My answer to the question in the title of your session this afternoon—"Is There a Need for a Comprehensive National Electric Power Policy?"—is yes, although I believe it is quite apparent that such a policy cannot be feasibly included in a single Act of Congress. The broad scope of such a policy is apparent if we briefly look at some of the reasonable goals for a national power policy.

1. Reliability of Service. The Northeast Blackout of November, 1965, not only indicated the complexity of maintaining service on large interconnected systems, but it also assured that the public will insist that future power policies reflect a high priority for service reliability. The economic and social life of our country is too dependent on electric power to permit a recurrence of widespread blackouts, and it is not realistic to expect that the Federal government will stand idly by in such situations.

Although the desire of utilities to remain free of governmental control or intervention is understandable, it is also unrealistic, because the electric industry is too vital to the public interest and welfare. Furthermore, the electric industry is already subjected to some degree of governmental jurisdiction. The problem, in connection with reliability of service, is to find a means of exercising government's legitimate responsibilities without at the same time impinging on management initiative and judgment to such an extent that the industry will become stultified.

2. Low Cost of Power. Large scale generation and related technology produce tremendous savings. The National Power Survey estimated that these savings could be about $11-billion annually by 1980. The $11-billion question is: Who gets these savings? Will all or substantial portions of these savings be enjoyed by consumers?

The record of the various state regulatory commissions in requiring power companies to pass on savings to their customers is not encouraging. Sen. Lee Metcalf (D., Mont.) and his executive secretary, Vic Reinemer, have dramatically documented the shortcomings of state commissions in this regard in their book, "Overcharge." Their procedure is simple: if 6%—the traditional figure—represents a reasonable rate of return for regulated electric utilities, then earnings in excess of this figure are, in fact, an overcharge. They found that 106 power companies in the period 1956–62 had a total overcharge of $3.4-billion.

Public power has pioneered in demonstrating that there is a better way to make money in the electric utility business. It is simply to charge the lowest possible rates, thereby encouraging greater use, and ultimately creating greater revenues. But public power has no patent on this policy. A group of nine power companies surrounding the service area of the Tennessee Valley Authority have generally lower rates than companies farther away from the competitive influences of TVA's low rate schedules. Between 1937 and 1963, common stock earnings of these companies subjected to public power competition grew more than twice as fast as the earnings of all Classes A & B power companies.

The cost of electricity to the individual consumer is not just what he sees on his home light bill. The costs of kilowatt-hours are being reflected increasingly in the costs of goods and services, as new and expanded uses of electricity are made by business and industry. In some items, the price of electricity can be an important factor in the ability of American industry to compete with foreign manufactured products.

All of us have a growing stake in the cost of electricity, and a truly national power policy must strive to achieve the lowest possible rates.

3. Abundant Power. Assuring abundant power in an era of million-kilowatt generating units and 500,000-volt transmission lines poses new problems. Delays in bringing in new facilities of this magnitude can be more critical than with smaller sizes of equipment, as was demonstrated last June in the mid-Atlantic blackout that affected a 15,000-square-mile area. A modern power policy must provide for more precise planning and scheduling of construction than has been necessary previously.

4. Public Safety. The public safety problems associated with nuclear power installations are widely recognized and carefully regulated. Non-nuclear safety problems deserve more attention. These include air and water pollution from thermal plants, along with a variety of existing and possible electrical hazards resulting from the use of higher distribution voltages as well as EHV transmission.

5. Esthetic Considerations. The public is insisting with growing vigor that electric utilities' facilities be, if not more attractive, at least less obtrusive. And this public demand is coming at a time when electric generating and transmission equipment are becoming ever larger. A recent controversy concerning plans of a power company to build EHV transmission lines in the area of the Antietam battlefield in Maryland not only illustrated the high degree of public interest in esthetics but also brought into focus the problem of regulation of these lines. A modern power policy must recognize the demands of esthetics, while providing for orderly expansion of electric facilities. Orderly and equitable procedures for resolving conflicts in this area are needed.

At the local level, esthetic considerations are spurring the use of underground distribution lines to new residential developments and some conversion of older facilities. Generally good progress has been made in underground residential distribution, but undergrounding of transmission lines remains a goal of research. A national power policy should seek to encourage this research.

6. Conservation of Natural Resources. There has been a tragic deterioration in recent years in the relations between those who advocate orderly development of our river resources and conservationists—or perhaps more properly "preservationists"—who oppose any intrusion upon undeveloped areas.

It is my belief that the reaction that has set in against dam building in recent years is a kind of misplaced reaction against the uglification that has taken place in so many aspects of American life. Many of us are repelled by the manner in which home builders have bulldozed trees and other natural vegetation. We are offended by noxious fumes emitted from automobiles that choke our streets, and we are revolted by the pollution of our rivers.

But I wonder if those who regard themselves as conservationists are focusing on the really important issues in opposing dams that are located away from population centers, and that actually enhance the opportunity for mankind to enjoy nature.

The production of electricity by falling water is our only renewable energy source. Hydroelectric energy is especially valuable in providing more reliable electric service, as was pointed out by the FPC in connection with the Northeast blackout of November, 1965. Hydro projects will become increasingly valuable for storage of water, at a time when water supplies are becoming even more critical.

A national power policy should support continued orderly development of our water resources for many purposes. Here again, I believe, we must set a goal of providing some orderly, constructive method of resolving conflicts which may arise. (I submit that newspaper advertisements implying that proposed dams on the Colorado River would flood the Grand Canyon—or worse yet, one suggesting that they were comparable to flooding the Sistine Chapel—did not contribute to an equitable resolution of an admittedly difficult question.)

7. National Defense. With the nation's dependence on electricity so clearly evident, it is hardly necessary for me to elaborate on the

relationship of power and national defense. Abundant and reliable electric service is a foundation of our industrial might for war or peace, and, of course, low cost power influences the price we pay for our defense establishment. Defense considerations may, in some areas, call into question the desirability of the currently heavy emphasis on large generating units and extra-high voltage transmission lines.

8. *Freedom of Choice.* Earlier, in discussing the record of the local publicly owned electric utilities, I stressed the significance of the right of the people to choose whether to serve themselves through their own consumer-owned electric system or by delegating this function to others. This freedom of choice is the keystone of competition in our pluralistic electric utility industry. To be fully effective, this right to choose should be supported by an entitlement to adequate wholesale power supply at reasonable rates, and under reasonable conditions. Such a provision in a national power policy would represent a real commitment to competition in our electric service.

These then are some of the goals I urge for a comprehensive national power policy. Now I want to look at the future role of public power in a national power policy.

FUTURE ROLE OF PUBLIC POWER IN A NATIONAL POWER POLICY

Given the multiplicity of laws, agencies, institutions and problems having to do with the public sector of the electric industry, it seems apparent that, in the immediate future, at least, it is unrealistic to think in terms of a single policy affecting the public sector of the industry. There should, of course, be unity in the policy, but at the same time there will necessarily be many facets of this policy, including the following:

1. *Federal power program.* Until now, the Federal power program, with the exception of the Tennessee Valley Authority, has been oriented entirely toward development of hydroelectric resources and associated transmission facilities.

In recent years, however, the Federal power program has come under increasing attack from "conservationists" and other allied groups, as witness the delay or abandonment of Federal plans to build the Hualapai and Marble Canyon Dams on the Colorado River, River Bend Dam on the Potomac River, Rampart Canyon Dam on the Yukon River, and other projects.

Because the multi-purpose aspects of hydroelectric power projects have made these projects particularly susceptible to development by the Federal government or other public agencies, the private power companies have traditionally been opposed to public hydro development, and in recent years they, too, have stepped up their attacks on proposals for Federal hydro projects.

The fact that some of the best and most economical sites have already been developed also has served to restrict the role of the Federal government in hydro development in recent years. At this particular time, budgetary considerations stemming from the Viet Nam war likewise place effective ammunition in the hands of those who are opposed to Federal hydro projects.

Yet, in spite of these circumstances, there remains about 115.8-million kilowatts of undeveloped hydro resources, according to the most recent report of the Federal Power Commission on this subject. Thus, only about 26% of the Nation's hydro resources have been developed, to date.

A countervailing pressure for development of hydro resources which I believe will build up in the next decade or more is the increasing need for water supply for all purposes. A Senate Committee report has estimated that the total daily water demand for all purposes in the U. S. will reach 559 billion gallons a day by 1980, compared with only about 300 billion gallons per day in 1954.

Predictions of world food shortages within the next decade also will lead to renewed interest in the reclamation program which traditionally has provided a source of power for utilities.

Still another factor which will tend to increase interest in hydroelectric power is the value of hydro as "peaking" power and as a means of preventing or curtailing region-wide blackouts.

Although it is difficult at this time to assess which of the forces favoring or opposing Federal multi-purpose projects will prevail, I believe that the great need for conserving and storing water supplies for domestic and industrial purposes and for bringing new lands into cultivation will result in a resurgence of interest in the Federal hydro program within the next decade.

At best, however, the Federal program is likely to provide a relatively declining share of the increased power requirements of the local public agencies and rural electric cooperatives—the so-called "preference customers." It should be noted, too, that the increased emphasis on use of hydro power as peaking power diminishes the usefulness of such power to virtually all the preference customers except the relatively few larger ones which have substantial generation of their own.

Even so, I believe it is important that the Federal preference clause, which has been a matter of law since 1902, should be maintained as an integral part of the policy in the marketing of Federally produced power. The small local public agencies and rural electric cooperatives which of themselves are unable to build large generating stations will continue to find that Federal power is essential if they are to remain a competitive influence in America's pluralistic electric industry.

Adherence to the preference clause and recognition of the needs of the preference customers also should serve to make the Federal power marketing agencies more aware of the importance of designing means for the marketing of Federal peaking power in such a way that it will be of maximum usefulness to the small as well as large—and non-generating as well as generating—local public agencies and rural electric cooperatives.

The relatively declining importance of Federal hydro power raises important questions about the future role of such Federal power marketing agencies as Bonneville Power Administration, Southwestern Power Administration and Southeastern Power Administration.

As these agencies have less new power sources to market, they should not be relegated to a caretaker role, but instead should be used increasingly in power planning. The smallness of most local public agencies and rural electric cooperatives makes it obvious that they will have difficulty approaching power supply planning from a larger perspective than the needs of their individual utilities. Consequently, a Federal agency such as Bonneville Power Administration can be extremely helpful to the local public agencies and rural electric cooperatives in assisting in formulating region-wide plans for power supply.

If water supply needs become more critical, and if it seems unlikely that Congress will authorize diversions of water from one river basin to another, it is also possible that the Federal government will assume a more active role in building combination nuclear desalting and power stations.

In order to keep the cost of water from such plants at a competitive level, these plants will have to be so large that it is unlikely that a private firm or group of firms could undertake projects of this magnitude. Furthermore, the cost of public financing will be important in lowering the cost of both water and power. Should circumstances indicate the desirability of Federal construction of large combination power and desalting plants, the power from such plants should be disposed of in accordance with the traditional preference clause.

In view of the difficulties of the small local agencies in obtaining new sources of low cost wholesale power, combination nuclear facilities could be an important supplementary source of power for the local public agencies.

The building of such thermal plants also would tend to stabilize the share of total power capacity owned by the Federal government. At the present time, this share is declining, thus weakening the traditional role of the Federal power program as a "yardstick" and competitive influence on electric rates.

2. *Joint action of local public agencies.* In view of the technological trend toward larger and larger generating stations and the construction of extra-high voltage transmission lines, it is obvious that the smaller municipally owned electric systems can obtain the advantages of large-scale operation only by joint construction of facilities or by purchasing a portion of a large plant being built by others.

Recent years have shown considerable progress in this direction. A municipal power supply agency has been formed in the Missouri River Basin. In Colorado, five cities have created a non-profit corporation to carry out cooperative power supply programs, and similar organizations have been established in Arizona and Utah. Municipal electric systems in Massachusetts and North Carolina have banded together to obtain a common bulk power supply.

There are numerous other activities and approaches in other areas of the United States involving common efforts by municipal electric systems and rural electric cooperatives. In Vermont, representatives of both types of utility have set up a non-profit corporation for the purpose of importing Canadian hydroelectric power. Municipalities, co-ops, and public utility districts in the Pacific Northwest have formed a public power council to work out their future power supply needs as that region of the country moves into a mixed hydro-thermal generating pattern. In Texas, the Texas Municipal Power Pool consists of a dozen municipal systems plus the Brazos Electric Power Cooperative. A group of 15 municipal systems in Iowa incorporated their own co-op, and then joined an REA-financed G&T. In Kansas, a municipal system and a co-op installed two units in a common plant.

Joint action program also encompass efforts of consumer-owned systems and private power companies. For example, an organization called WEST, which includes public, co-op, and private membership, has been formed in the Southwest to plan large thermal stations in which participating utilities will hold a joint undivided interest and receive power proportionate to their share of the capital and operating costs. In the Pacific Northwest, discussions are being held concerning local public-private development of a major coal-fired generating station.

The concepts of joint action are as applicable to nuclear power as they are to fossil-fueled or hydro plants.

The Washington Public Power Supply System, a joint operating agency composed of 17 public utility districts and one municipality in the State of Washington, is currently operating the 860,000 kw Hanford steam plant, the output of which is shared with private power companies and marketed through the Bonneville Power Administration.

Another example is the agreement worked out between Consumers Public Power District in Nebraska and the Iowa Power & Light Company. Under this arrangement, CPPD will build a 800,000 kw nuclear plant,

production from which will be shared. The gains for the two participants: (a) by building a plant to meet the power requirements of both utilities, the increase in size greatly reduces the ultimate power cost; (b) interconnections that will be made as a result of the installation will greatly improve the stability, not only of the two utilities involved but others in the Midwest as well; and (c) as a public agency, CPPD can finance this plant with revenue bonds, providing a saving to IP&L, and because of IP&L's agreement to take one-half of the output of the plant and assume one-half the cost of operation for the life of the bonds, CPPD will enjoy a better credit rating and the cost of money will be lower.

In Los Angeles, the Department of Water and Power plans to provide power from its proposed Malibu project to serve the needs of satellite cities with municipal electric utilities, and Sacramento Municipal Utility District is working with PG&E on a mutually beneficial arrangement related to SMUD's proposed nuclear plant.

Following a decision by the Vermont Public Service Board that Vermont municipalities and co-ops must be allowed to participate in future stock issues of Vermont Yankee, a corporation formed by 10 New England private power companies to build a 540,000 kw atomic station, all of the State's electric distribution systems have been offered stock and proportionate shares of power from the project.

Although progress is being made in joint action of local public power systems, the procedure is not without serious problems. Perhaps the most difficult is that of transmission of power from jointly owned ventures to the participating municipalities and other local public power systems, particularly in cases where the local public agencies do not have extensive transmission of their own, and do not have access to a Federal transmission system.

The transmission problem arises because: (a) Some municipalities have legal limitations in building transmission facilities outside their corporate limits; and (b) the relatively small loads of many of the participating municipalities make it uneconomic to build new transmission facilities to serve their needs.

In many cases where local publicly owned utilities are planning to build facilities jointly, or desire to own a piece of a new generating station owned primarily by private power companies, it would be more feasible for the municipalities to receive their power over existing transmission lines owned by other entities, or to heavy up new lines which are to be built. It goes without saying, of course, that the municipalities are willing to pay a fair price for such transmission service.

Because the power companies in many if not most cases are unwilling to permit use of their lines for this purpose, the only recourse which the local publicly owned electric utilities may have to require wheeling by the power companies is to seek relief from the FPC. Yet, it is unclear at the present time whether FPC has authority to require wheeling of non-Federal power.

If a case indicates that such authority does not exist at the present time, then I believe that the Federal Power Act should be amended to require wheeling of power, so that transmission lines—like highways—become true "common carriers" or "contract carriers." Such authority would permit the most economical use of transmission lines, and also would be in harmony with our objective of best utilization of transmission line rights-of-way.

If we are to assume that a modern national power policy should provide an environment which will permit the continued healthy existence of local publicly owned electric systems as part of our pluralistic electric industry, then I believe that legislation such as I have discussed is a necessity.

The alternative, in this age of bigness, is to force all of the smaller utilities to become wholesale customers of the large private power companies, with the result that they would not only become captive, but any vestige of competition in the generation of electric power would be eliminated. I cannot believe that such a consequence would be in the national interest.

3. *Participation of public power in nuclear power program.* In a recent speech, Congressman John Moss of California pointed out that the Federal investment in research and development for civilian nuclear power alone already exceeds two billion dollars.

"Surely," he said, "here is a resource more truly belonging to the people even than falling water, for the water was always available, but atomic energy remained locked in the nucleus of matter until public effort showed us how to release and use it.

"If any resource ought to be subject to a public preference clause, if not to exclusive public use, it is atomic energy," he said.

Yet, he pointed out, the preference clause in the Atomic Energy Act is "weak and worthless."

"As a result of the present Federal atomic policy," he continued, "nuclear power is becoming a private monopoly."

Although some public agencies are involved in the construction of nuclear power plants, most local publicly-owned electric systems are not participating directly in the current nuclear power boom, and, under present conditions, have no prospect of doing so. The reasons for this fact are twofold: (a) the characteristics of nuclear power plants, and (b) the nature of local publicly-owned electric utilities.

One of the most important elements in nuclear power economics today is the impact of scale. In 1962, the average unit size for nuclear power plants was 72,000 kw; the average size of atomic generating units ordered in 1966 was 790,000 kw.

This scale-up is based on a very simple fact: as unit size in kilowatt increases, unit cost per kilowatt decreases. Although this basic proposition is equally applicable to all thermal plants, it has special significance in the case of nuclear stations, which are especially sensitive to capital costs, due primarily to protective measures considered essential in handling nuclear fuel and higher fuel inventory.

A second, and related, fact about nuclear power today is the role that utility ownership and relevant fixed charges play in determining the cost of power.

As an AEC study pointed out in 1965: "In the past and to a lesser extent today, nuclear power plants have shown a capital cost disadvantage. As long as this disadvantage exists, a low annual fixed charge rate is important for nuclear competitiveness, since a low rate tends to reduce the effect of a capital cost disadvantage."

Various studies indicate that the price of nuclear power from plants of similar size may be reduced by a range of 0.8 mills per kwh to 2 mills per kwh with application of fixed charges of consumer owned electric systems as opposed to the fixed charges of privately owned companies.

In considering these twin factors of size and fixed charges, it is interesting to note power production costs associated with nuclear units of approximately 1,100,000 kw proposed by TVA and Pacific Gas & Electric. TVA's estimated cost is 2.37 mills per kwh; the closest comparable reported figure for PG&E is 4.04 mills per kwh.

An analysis prepared by the Northwest Public Power Association reveals the magnitude of the potential savings available through application of the lower fixed charges of consumer owned systems to large nuclear power plants. Assuming a difference of 1 mill per kwh over the 35-year life of a 1,000,000 kw nuclear unit with a plant factor of 80% and an annual production of just over seven billion kilowatt-hours per year, the study showed that savings would amount to $245 million over the amortization period. Compounding the annual benefits at 5% resulted in a figure of $630 million.

Unfortunately for the local public power systems, most of which are quite small, studies indicate that the economies of scale apply to nuclear power stations as well as to conventional plants. In the immediate future, therefore, the construction of smaller nuclear stations by individual local public power systems is not economically feasible. Consequently, joint action or the ability to participate in ownership of plants constructed by others appear to be the most realistic opportunities for the smaller local public power systems to participate in nuclear power projects.

There are a number of public interest reasons for governmental policies designed to encourage joint action in the field of nuclear power, including reasonable opportunity for direct participation in particular plants by *all* utilities—large and small, public and private—in the affected area.

a. Because the economics of nuclear power plants dictate large units, atomic stations can be constructed by only a relatively few major utilities without recourse to cooperative arrangements with other systems. Thus, failure to foster joint action approaches would undoubtedly mean increased concentration of control of generation in the United States as the electric industry increasingly turns to nuclear power for power production.

b. Direct participation by all utilities in nuclear stations can be a definite factor in achieving the economic advantages of nuclear power because of the necessity to "build big." The following figures, developed by Roland A. Kampmeier, consulting engineer of Chattanooga, Tennessee, and formerly of TVA, give some idea of relative costs associated with size:

	Plant size			
	1,000 MW	250 MW	60 MW	15 MW
Relative costs:				
Investment per kw.-hr	1	1.3	1.7	2.2
Fuel cost per kw.-hr	1	1.2	1.5	2.5
Labor cost per kw.-hr	1	2.0	4.0	8.0
Total cost per kw.-hr	1	1.3	1.8	2.5

c. Because of certain characteristics of nuclear power, there are a finite number of locations in which atomic stations can be placed. Siting considerations—such as health and safety factors, requirements for land and water, problems of "thermal pollution" and limited transportability of pressure vessels—are considerably more restrictive than those currently associated with fossil-fueled plants. These considerations intensify the need for joint actions in building nuclear power stations.

d. Air pollution problems posed by fossil-fueled generation stations have created an incentive to move to nuclear power plants. The motivation is often as strong for small systems as for large, but the means of carrying out this solution in the former case may be totally dependent on joint action with one or more other utilities (due to the economies of scale) while a large system may be in a position to implement the "atomic answer" without aid from other systems.

An over-riding reason for facilitating joint action in the construction of nuclear power plants is to insure that smaller systems

have an equal opportunity to take part in nuclear power development. As was pointed out by Congressman Moss, nuclear power is a technology which was initiated, fostered, and developed through use of Federal funds. It would be clearly contrary to the public interest to find that the result of this investment was to secure a de facto monopoly of the end product for a few large privately owned electric utilities.

If the above reasons for implementing joint action in the construction and operation of nuclear power plants are valid, why does the concept pose a problem? The answer is two-fold:

a. Many private power companies, capable singly or in combination with other privately owned companies of building nuclear power plants, oppose participation by local publicly owned utilities, as was mentioned in the discussion above on joint action.

To the extent that private power companies aid publicly owned electric utilities in obtaining a low-cost source of power, the companies assert they are strengthening their competition. When limited to the confines of private power company interests, the argument is undoubtedly accurate. But in the context of the public interest in "competition by comparison", it is equally obvious that it fails. Furthermore, fundamental fairness dictates that publicly owned electric systems should not be denied reasonable opportunity to participate in the benefits of nuclear power in view of the massive public expenditure to achieve economic nuclear power.

Private power companies also allegedly fear that they will lose a source of revenue if present wholesale customers switch from power purchases to participation in a nuclear generating plant. Regardless of whether or not the fear is phantom, the fact of the matter is that even if every company wholesale customer in the country switched from purchase to joint generation through participation in a nuclear plant (a highly unlikely possibility), the companies would lose only 6.4% of present revenues, hardly a catastrophic decrease when it is remembered that this figure is about the same as the companies' annual rate of revenue growth for other customers.

Private power companies also like to charge that they are somehow unfairly bearing the burden of the unwelcome weight of local public power systems who seek a "free ride" on the coat tails of "free enterprise" solutions. Nothing could be further from the truth. Municipalities certainly expect to pay for what they get. What they seek is "equal" not "special" opportunity, and they fully expect to "put their money where their mouth is." Furthermore their participation in the building of nuclear power stations might make it possible to build larger stations than otherwise would be possible.

b. The second reason for difficulty in implementing the concept of joint action in the construction and operation of nuclear power plants is the Atomic Energy Commission.

The Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, states that it is the policy of the United States that the development, use, and control of atomic energy shall be directed so as to "make the maximum contribution to the general welfare," "improve the general welfare," "increase the standard of living," and "strengthen free competition in private enterprise." Nuclear matters are to be regulated "in the national interest." The Act also asserts that one of its purposes is to provide for "a program to encourage widespread participation in the development and utilization of atomic energy for peaceful purposes to the maximum extent consistent with the common defense and securtiy and with the health and safety of the public."

However, with respect to the licensing of nuclear power reactors, AEC has chosen to take a narrow view of its responsibilities as outlined in the declaration, findings, and purpose of the Act. AEC's regulatory staff has suggested that the Commission's licensing responsibilities under the Act are limited to questions involving protection of the health and safety of the public against radiological hazards and assurance of the common defense and security, and has opposed the intervention of municipalities who seek to participate in nuclear power plants proposed by private power companies, contending that the municipalities do not have an interest which is affected by such proceedings and that AEC cannot grant the relief sought.

Despite this general attitude on the part of the regulatory staff, one Commission licensing board has arrived at a contrary conclusion on procedure, allowing municipal intervention on the grounds of economic interest.

Furthermore, it is interesting to note that while AEC's regulatory staff has chosen to apply a restricted view to the participation question, in another area of atomic energy the Commission itself has found that the words of the Act give it a responsibility to study and foster participation and competition in the nuclear equipment manufacturing industry.

In addition to the procedural point involving intervention, AEC's present policy of licensing all nuclear power plants as "research and development" facilities has the effect of preventing the application of certain public protections which become operative only when "commercial" licenses are granted. In the case of "commercial" licenses, the applicant receives a non-exclusive license, the Attorney General is required to render and publish an opinion as to whether or not a proposed license would tend to create or maintain a situation inconsistent with the antitrust laws, written notice of the application must be submitted to regulatory agencies and to utilities within transmission distance of the plant, and, in the case of conflicting applications for a limited opportunity to construct a plant, preference is to be accorded to high-cost power areas and to public or cooperative bodies. To date, AEC has declined to make the statutory "finding of practical value" which would trigger "commercial" licensing.

Yet, there is an abundance of evidence that large light water reactors are of practical value for industrial and commercial purposes, and are "commercial" in every real sense of the word.

This fact is widely recognized. As long as three years ago an interdepartmental energy study published by the Office of Science and Technology asserted that: "Light-water reactors are developed to the point where they are being sold commercially, hence Government support of this reactor type is being phased out."

Many municipal electric systems believe that a reasonable chance on the part of all utilities to participate directly in the benefits of nuclear power plants would be materially enhanced by (a) AEC recognition of a statutory responsibility to encourage and support "equal opportunity" for consumer-owned systems in the licensing of atomic stations for joint use, and (b) a prompt finding by the Commission that large light water reactors have "practical value" and must be licensed as "commercial" plants.

If existing law is inadequate to insure full and fair participation by smaller electric systems, then Congressional consideration should be given to the strengthening of the Atomic Energy Act for the purpose of properly protecting the public interest in nuclear power. Nuclear power promises to become too important to the national welfare to permit it to become the private province of a handful of companies.

4. *Role of regulation.* With the increasing degree of interconnection among electric utilities, thereby bringing more and more private power companies under the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission, regulatory activity of FPC has assumed greatly increased importance to local public power systems in recent years.

Thus, nearly 1,000 local public power utilities now obtain all or part of their power from power companies subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission. Because most of these utilities are small and under today's conditions would not find it economical to generate their own power requirements unless they are able to build large facilities jointly or own a "piece" of a large facility, the very existence of many of these utilities will depend upon their ability to secure wholesale power at reasonable rates and under equitable terms.

The local public power systems consequently have a vital stake in the Federal Power Commission's responsibilities to regulate charges and contract conditions of jurisdictional companies which sell power to municipalities and other public agencies.

Local public power systems have found that the Federal Power Act represents an opportunity to obtain remedial relief from existing inequities in rate level, rate design, restrictive provisions, discrimination, and interconnection. Sometimes these complaints can be settled informally, with the Commission staff serving as mediator. In other situations, a formal proceeding is required. In either event, the ability of small systems to deal on equal terms with large wholesale suppliers has been materially enhanced. Here are a few examples of what has been accomplished through application of FPC jurisdiction:

1. The municipal utility of Shrewsbury, Massachusetts, had been served for years by a devious route which brought power to Shrewsbury via two affiliated power companies, both operating at the Shrewsbury substation. The city was forced to pay the higher rates of one of the companies, and went to the FPC for help in obtaining direct service from the company with the lower rate. FPC ruled with the city and ordered New England Power Company to serve the municipal utility at its lower rate. Savings to the city are estimated at more than $40,000 annually.

2. Six cities in Wisconsin filed a protest with FPC over a proposed rate increase by Wisconsin-Michigan Power Company. The company had filed new rates which would have increased the cities' wholesale costs from 13% to 30%. The cities appealed to FPC to reject the new rate schedule or to provide for hearings on the new rates, contending that their contracts with the company did not provide for such unilateral action. The Commission suspended the rate increase and called for hearings. After a full-scale case, the Commission ordered refunds of almost $500,000 to nine of the company's wholesale customers. The FPC also recommended a reduction of about $50,000 per year in the company's proposed new rate.

3. Georgia Power Company has for a number of years restricted its municipal customers from reselling power for industrial and commercial loads above certain sizes. FPC asked the company to show cause why such rate schedule provisions should be maintained, and a hearing was held. The Commission found that these limitations were "unjust, unreasonable and unduly discriminatory", and ordered them eliminated. It is not "normally consistent with the public interest for a wholesale supplier of electric power to restrict the manner in which its customer may resell the power," the Commission said.

4. A protest filed with FPC by North Attleboro, Mass, was settled when Massachusetts Electric agreed to withdraw an increase in wholesale charges of $38,800, covering an 18-month period.

5. Thirteen small municipal systems in Kansas, operating as a group through their state association, brought an informal complaint before the FPC staff charging that

rates charged by Western Light & Telephone Co. were unreasonably high. Subsequent negotiations with the company and FPC staff resulted in a rate reduction of about $40,000 annually.

6. The Village of Freeport, New York, sought an economically desirable pooling agreement with Long Island Lighting Co. which the company refused to grant, offering instead to buy the Freeport system. An informal complaint to the FPC yielded a satisfactory pooling agreement which insured the integrity of the Freeport system.

7. In Florida, a complaint filed with the FPC by 10 Florida cities against Florida Power Corporation stimulated a Commission investigation and a 10% reduction in wholesale power costs and estimated annual savings of in excess of $500,000. Similarly, the complaint of the City of Clewiston against Florida Power & Light Company, which had refused to provide direct service, acted as a spur to informal negotiations between Clewiston and its supplier which resulted in a rate reduction to Clewiston of 5.5 mills per kilowatt-hour.

During fiscal year 1966, the number of wholesale rate filings submitted to FPC reached the highest level in the Commission's history, exceeding even the 2,576 filed in the preceding fiscal year. A total of 2,649 rate filings were received and 2,798 were completed during fiscal year 1966. Rate reductions of more than $6,500,000 were accepted for filing. Rate increases accepted for filing amounted to only $56,000. Staff activity was responsible for a substantial portion of the reductions, following studies which indicated that lower rates were warranted. At the end of the 1966 fiscal year there were 34 rate studies in progress, of which 22 were full cost of service studies.

FPC regulation also is of increasing significance with respect to the ability of local public power systems to participate in power pooling plans. Two important cases now pending before the Commission—involving the Crisp County Power Commission of Cordele, Ga., and the City of Gainesville, Fla.—bring into focus the important question of the ability of smaller generating utilities to participate in power pools as equals, and with due recognition being given to the mutual advantages which both the smaller local public systems and the larger utilities receive from participation in power pools by the local public power systems.

The action of the FPC in the cases I have described makes it clear that a strong, vigorous FPC is an essential element if the present pluralistic character of the electric industry—with both large systems and small, both public and private—is to be preserved and enhanced.

5. *Strengthening of Federal Power Act.* Although the Federal Power Act is adequate for the regulation of wholesale rates charged by power companies to local public power systems, the Act should be modernized in some respects. For example, I have already indicated, in the discussion of "Joint Action" above, that it might be necessary to broaden the Act in order to assure wheeling rights for all utilities over high voltage lines. The following amendments also should be considered:

(a) *Power supply planning.* Most of the pools which have been established thus far limit membership to utilities which have their own generating capacity; and, in some cases, the pools have been reluctant to admit any public agency or rural electric cooperative, irrespective of whether or not the consumer owned utility has generating capacity.

The rationale for this policy is that the pools are concerned only with generation and transmission of power, and hence utilities which have distribution systems only do not have a legitimate role in connection with operation of the pools. The arbitrary exclusion of non-generating utilities strikes hardest at the municipally owned utilities and rural electric cooperatives, both of which groups consist largely of utilities which do not have generating capacities.

The exclusion of non-generating utilities from participating in power pools effectively shuts these utilities out from the planning of power facilities, despite the fact that some of these facilities might be built to furnish power requirements of distribution utilities. Thus, the distribution utilities become "captive" customers, with no real voice in the planning of power supplies for their region and for their own needs.

Although a distribution utility may be too small at one time to own generating facilities, unusual growth patterns or other factors might well make it feasible for such a utility to be engaged in generation in the future. The incentive for a utility which has been a wholesale purchaser of electricity to own generation lies in the fact that under existing regulatory practices, prices paid are reflective of total system costs of the seller, and no test of efficiency is applied. In other words, the buyer receives only indirectly the benefits of new, large generating plants. However, with direct participation in ownership of new plants, a publicly owned system can obtain the full benefits of advanced technology.

Yet, the exclusion of non-generating utilities from regional power supply planning limits the opportunity of these utilities to become generating utilities in the future, or to hold part ownership in new generating facilities.

The significance of participating in power planning pools was well stated last week in the Federal Power Commission Staff Brief on Exceptions filed by Commission Staff Counsel George F. Bruder on October 12, 1967 in Western Massachusetts Electric Co. (Project No. 1889) and The Connecticut Light and Power Company, The Hartford Electric Light Co. and Western Massachusetts Electric Co. (Project No. 2485).

Said Mr. Bruder: "In general, the business advantage to a utility—whether publicly owned or investor-owner—of participating in regional planning activities is that it is in a better position to know what opportunities are available to it and to propose a course of action which will serve its needs. To use a simple illustration, a utility which is privy to regional planning will usually have a better knowledge of where power might be bought and where it might be sold. Or if a utility knows of plans for an emerging regional grid, it will be able to propose change in the design and location of the lines to its advantage, and it can more efficiently develop its own transmission system and schedule the installation of generation. Suppose, for example, that a utility has a good site for a generating station. The decision as to what size plant to install at the site may depend in part on the proximity of extra high voltage lines. A utility which is not familiar with the plans for regional transmission is at an obvious disadvantage in making the judgment as to how large a plant it should build. (Conversely, of course, those planning the grid are handicapped if they do not know of the utility's plans for the site.) Illustrations of this sort could be spun out at great length. The point is that in an increasingly interconnected and interdependent electric industry, regional planning constantly grows more valuable to the individual utility."

One remedy for permitting all utilities to participate in regional power supply planning can be found in the proposed Electric Power Reliability Act, which provides for representation of all utilities—generating and non-generating—in the regional councils which would be formed pursuant to provisions of the Act. The provision of this portion of the Act for representation of the non-generating utilities in regional councils is a recognition of the legitimate role which these utilities should be accorded in regional power supply planning.

(b) *Reliability of service.* In citing the goals of a national power policy, I called attention to the need for assuring reliability of service. The widespread importance attached to this subject is indicated by the unanimous endorsement by the Federal Power Commission of the proposed Electric Power Reliability Act.

Pending completion of a comprehensive review of this bill which has been undertaken by a special committee and five subcommittees of the American Public Power Association, I would reserve further comment on this bill at this time.

However, as I indicated previously, I believe that it is unrealistic to assert that the Federal government should exercise no responsibility for reliability of electric service. The maintenance of reliable service is too important to our national welfare and national defense for the Federal government to remain aloof from this problem. It seems to me, therefore, that the question is not whether the Federal government should exercise any responsibility in this field, but rather the extent and nature of that responsibility.

Thus, any truly modern national power policy undoubtedly will make provision for assurance of reliable electric service.

Aside from the specific provisions covered by the Electric Power Reliability Act, the broadening of national power policy which I have already discussed would, I believe, assist materially in assuring more reliable electric service by permitting the publicly owned electric utilities to play a more viable role in the planning, construction and operation of electric facilities.

6. *Applicability of antitrust laws.* Technological trends and the attendant formation of power pools are placing in a new perspective the antitrust laws relating to electric utilities.

In addition to whatever application general antitrust laws may have, Congress has enacted several statutes containing antitrust provisions directly related to utility operation. For example, the Federal Power Act provides in Section 10(h) with respect to licensing of hydroelectric projects that "combinations, agreements, arrangements, or understandings, express or implied, to limit the output of electrical energy, to restrain trade, or to fix, maintain or increase prices for electrical energy or service are hereby prohibited." The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 provides specifically in Section 105 that nothing in the Act relieves any person from operation of Federal antitrust statutes, and permits suspension or revocation of a reactor license upon violation; the Atomic Energy Commission is required to report to the Attorney General information regarding possible violations of antitrust policies, and to seek a determination from the Attorney General as to whether or not proposed activities of an application for a commercial reactor license "tend to create or maintain a situation inconsistent with the antitrust laws."

With respect to Section 10(h) of the Federal Power Act cited above, an important development occurred last week in a landmark case now pending before the Federal Power Commission. The case, which I have cited earlier, involves the application of The Connecticut Light and Power Co., The Hartford Electric Light Co., and the Western Massachusetts Electric Co. for a license under Part I of the Federal Power Act for the proposed Northfield Mountain pumped storage development, Project No. 2485, on the Connecticut River, and the application of the Western Massachusetts Electric Co. to amend its license for the existing Turners Falls development, Project No. 1889, to authorize the raising of the Turners Falls reservoir so that it may be used as the lower pool of the pumped storage development.

The Municipal Electric Association of Massachusetts and the electric departments of the City of Chicopee, Town of Shrewsbury, and Town of Wakefield raised the issue as to whether the applicants are in compliance with Section 10(h). As stated by FPC staff counsel, the municipals claim "that applicants are party to the concerted exclusion of the municipals from various bulk power projects which are being developed or planned in New England. They argue that this exclusion is being accomplished, at least in part, by barring the municipals from the regional planning activities conducted under the auspices of the Electric Coordinating Council of New England."

I have already quoted the remarks of FPC staff counsel as to the importance of permitting the municipal systems to take part in regional planning activities. It is significant that FPC staff counsel, in Exceptions to the Examiner's decision, found that the Massachusetts municipals were denied participation in the planning activities of the New England electric power companies, and that such exclusion was detrimental to the interests of the municipals. The type of antitrust violation which the Massachusetts municipals appear to allege in these proceedings has been called a "bottleneck" agreement, according to FPC staff counsel.

The staff's proposal is that "the Commission grant the applications but make clear that it recognizes the existence of an improper exclusionary practice and that it expects applicants to take the necessary action either to terminate the practice or at least to free themselves of any further association with it."

Although it is to be hoped that the Commission will concur in the staff counsel's wholly commendable and statesmanlike recommendations, it should be noted that Section 10(h) of the Federal Power Act has limited applicability, in that it comes into play only in connection with the licensing of hydroelectric projects. Absent such a project in a region, the provision is not helpful to those utilities which are excluded from power pools.

Thus, it is heartening that Commissioner Ross of the Federal Power Commission stated last year at a legal seminar sponsored by the American Public Power Association: "Where a pool deliberately sets pooling terms that arbitrarily discriminate against small systems, without economic justification, then it is clear to me that the antitrust provisions against discrimination and restraint of trade should apply to the pool. Mergers of independent companies with discriminatory provisos against smaller companies in the area should likewise be scrutinized by the Federal Power Commission for antitrust implications before it gives approval to such a transaction."

The importance of antitrust laws in connection with a regulated industry such as the electric industry also has been pointed out by Donald F. Turner, Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice. In testimony presented on July 13, 1966 before the Senate Commerce Committee on S. 3136. Mr. Turner declared:

"The fact that an industry is regulated does not, in itself, show that the firms within the industry should be excepted from the application of the antitrust laws. Regulation and competition may both help to achieve efficiency and productivity. In industries with certain technical characteristics—such as the electric power industry—regulation may be both necessary and desirable to insure an efficient allocation of resources. But, competition may still play an important role in insuring that such industries operate efficiently. After all, where there is regulation and no competition, firms may become lazy, for they may feel that they are, in effect, guaranteed a profit. On the other hand, if regulated firms also face some competition, they may work harder to keep costs down, to improve the quality of their service, or to devote sufficient resources to research and innovation. Thus the antitrust laws apply to many regulated areas of the economy such as insurance, banking, communications, fuel and agriculture.

"At the present time the power industry is just beginning to feel the competitive spur. Many of the same technological advances that make pooling and interconnection possible also make possible new forms of competition. For example, a firm with surplus energy or extra generating capacity can attempt to sell and transport electricity to an area with a power deficit, and, in doing so, it may compete with other firms also having surplus energy or extra generating capacity to sell. Similiarly, companies may compete to exchange power with areas that have offsetting peak periods. Competition in the industry will probably become more, rather than less, important."

As the electric industry becomes larger and more complex, it is apparent that the antitrust laws, as a protection for the smaller utilities, will become of greater importance. The application—or lack of application—of these laws to the utility industry in the next few years may well indicate whether changes are needed to bring them into harmony with a modern national power policy.

The recommendations which I have submitted are based on the assumptions that (a) the pluralistic nature of our electric industry should be preserved, and (b) meaningful institutional competition should exist between the public and private sectors of the industry. Much of the success which has been achieved to date in America's electric industry can be attributed to these factors.

New situations, new technology, new trends in our national life, and new leaders demand new thinking and new relationships. The patterns that have existed in the past may no longer be appropriate or applicable to the conditions of today and tomorrow. Thus, old rivalries may cease, old conflicts may be settled, new relationships might be formed . . . and new conflicts may arise. Yet, in the evolution of our national power policy, I believe that we must adhere steadfastly to the pluralistic nature of the electric industry and to the desirability of vigorous competition between public and private power.

Although my orientation understandably is toward the public sector of the industry, I do not believe that the recommendations I have submitted today would be detrimental to the long-range interests of the privately owned power companies. To the contrary, experience has demonstrated that the private companies are perhaps healthiest where they have been in an environment of vigorous institutional competition with publicly owned electric utilities.

It must be recognized, however, that the forces of technology and economic strength in recent years have been leaning in the direction of the private companies, and positive steps will have to be taken by the national government—and by the publicly owned utilities themselves—if public power is to continue to flourish. I believe it is in the national interest that we take those steps. By doing so, public power, by its very nature as a public enterprise, can be of invaluable assistance in meeting many of the goals of a national power policy, such as increased reliability of service, availability of an abundance of low cost power, conservation of natural resources, regard for esthetic considerations, assisting in the national defense, and giving people a freedom of choice to provide their own electric service or to delegate this important responsibility to a private company.

APPENDIX A—ELECTRIC UTILITY INDUSTRY, 1965

ELECTRIC OPERATING REVENUES

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

	1965	Percent of industry
Local public systems	$2,295,185	13.4
Private power companies	13,400,050	78.1
REA borrowers	937,986	5.5
Federal Government	516,745	3.0

INSTALLED CAPACITY

[In thousands of kilowatts]

Local public systems	34,945	14.3
Private power companies	177,478	72.3
REA borrowers	2,800	1.1
Federal Government	30,133	12.3

NUMBER OF CUSTOMERS

Local public systems	9,260,052	14.0
Private power companies	51,248,586	77.6
REA borrowers	5,541,478	8.4
Federal Government (not applicable)	----------	--------

NET ELECTRIC PLANT INVESTMENT

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

Local public systems	$7,781,381	12.2
Private power companies	46,072,178	2.3
REA borrowers	3,575,868	75.6
Federal government	6,339,000	9.9

Source: Private company, local public and Federal power statistics projected from Federal Power Commission reports. Rural electric cooperative data is from Rural Electrification Administration.

APPENDIX B—LOCAL PUBLICLY OWNED ELECTRIC SYSTEMS AND PRIVATELY OWNED POWER COMPANIES PERFORMANCE COMPARISONS, 1965

	Average annual kilowatt-hour consumption		Average revenue per kilowatt-hour (cents)		Average annual bill	
	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public
Sales to residential consumers: 1965	4,618	6,634	2.39	1.53	$110.53	$101.26
Sales to commercial and industrial consumers: 1965	79,201	66,396	1.40	1.18	1,109.26	783.93

EXPENSE ITEMS, MANAGERIAL

	Accounting and collections per customer		Promotion and advertising per $100 revenue		Administrative and general per $100 revenue	
	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public
1965	$7.06	$6.15	$1.79	$1.14	$6.23	$5.80

	Production per kilowatt-hour sold (in mills)		Transmission per kilowatt-hour sold (in mills)		Distribution per customer	
	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public
1965	3.98	4.34	0.21	0.15	$17.48	$17.93

Source: All figures reproduced from, or derived from "Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States, 1965"; privately owned Federal Power Commission S-178, 1967; publicly owned, Federal Power Commission, March, 1967.

APPENDIX C

ELECTRIC OPERATING REVENUES

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

	1956	1965	Percentage gain 1956 through 1965
Local public systems	$1,020,336	$2,295,185	124.9
Private power companies	7,780,147	13,400,050	72.2
REA borrowers	471,929	937,986	98.8
Federal Government	340,488	516,745	51.8
INSTALLED CAPACITY			
[In thousands of kilowatts]			
Local public systems	11,777	34,945	196.7
Private power companies	90,826	177,478	95.4
REA borrowers	925	2,800	202.7
Federal Government	17,553	30,133	71.7
NUMBER OF CUSTOMERS			
Local public systems	7,070,000	9,260,052	31.0
Private power companies	42,800,467	51,248,586	19.7
REA borrowers	4,361,896	5,541,478	27.0
Federal Government (not applicable)			
NET ELECTRIC PLANT INVESTMENT			
Local public systems	$3,373,698	$7,781,381	130.6
Private power companies	26,524,408	46,072,178	73.7
REA borrowers	2,278,995	3,575,868	56.9
Federal Government	3,969,000	6,339,000	59.7

Source: Private company, local publicand Federal power statistics projected from Federal Power Commission reports. Rural electric cooperative data is from Rural Electrification Administration.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If there is no further morning business, morning business is closed.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 888) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] is recognized.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, we are under controlled time. How much time is allocated to each side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 13½ minutes. Each side has 13½ minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the pending amendment involves a very simple question for the Senate to decide. Under the existing situation the budget expenditures are estimated to be $136.5 billion. The proposed amendment provides that there will be a ceiling of $131.5 billion on expenditures in fiscal 1968, with the further proviso that the $5 billion obligational authority that is saved thereby will be rescinded. Thus the $5 billion which were appropriated would no longer be available but would automatically revert to the Federal Treasury.

We have before us this amendment which would result in a bona fide reduction in expenditures of at least $5 billion during the 1968 fiscal year.

I call to the attention of the Senate the fact that the adoption of this amendment will not disrupt the operations of our Government because, even with its adoption, there will still be available for spending among the various agencies approximately $4.5 to $5 billion more than the same agencies spent in fiscal 1967.

It would seem to me that under the circumstances the adoption of this reduction is the very least that the Congress or the Senate could do to demonstrate that we are concerned about these expenditures.

I mention further that there is nothing new about this amendment. This same amendment was before the Appropriations Committee. It was considered by the Appropriations Committee, but unfortunately it was rejected as a part of the resolution which is now before us.

This is identical to the amendment that was offered by Representative Bow and is exactly the same as was passed overwhelmingly by the House of Representatives.

As to the need for this amendment, let me review these facts briefly. As I pointed out yesterday, the 13 appropriations bills upon which we have acted thus far this year have been increased by the Senate by $4.055 billion over the amounts approved by the House, and the bills carried $3.175 billion more than was appropriated in 1967 for the same agencies involved thereunder.

In reality, the adoption of this pending amendment merely brings the appropriations of fiscal 1968 in line with the amounts allowed for the same agencies last year.

When the carryforward obligational authority is considered they would still have about $4.5 billion more spending money.

I recognize that an excellent argument can be made that this method is a shotgun approach, a meat-tax approach, and that the proper way to cut expenditures is for the Congress to cut them on a project-by-project basis when these programs and appropriation bills are before the Congress. I agree completely with that reasoning. It was for that reason that while we were considering those appropriation bills I made that effort, and we had 21 rollcall votes, the purpose of which was to reduce the appropriations as they were recommended by the Senate committee. Every one of those 21 efforts failed. The only amendments to appropriation bills that were approved by the Senate on rollcall votes were amendments adding appropriations. The amendments to reduce the appropriations were all rejected.

Had those 21 efforts been successful they would have resulted in a reduction of $4.467 billion and would have achieved practically the same result we are trying to reach now by the pending amendment. But we were unsuccessful in those efforts. So the Senate has no choice now, if we want to cut expenditures, except to adopt an amendment of this nature at this time.

On the other hand, if the Senate wants to continue with these expenditures it should reject this amendment, and by so doing the Senate will have approved spending about $10 billion over and above what was provided last year. By our votes here we will determine to a large extent the size and the urgency of a tax increase proposal which may very well be considered before we adjourn in this session. I think the very least the Senate can do is to adopt this amendment to reduce this year's expenses by $5 billion.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am surprised at the fact that my distinguished friend from Delaware, in view of his many positions of the past, and in view of the fact that he sits on the other side of the aisle, is now taking the position which he has just stated to the Senate.

I do not know how many times we have all heard the Senator from Delaware complain of the fact that the executive department was, in his view, trespassing upon the precincts of the legislative department; and gaining more power at the expense of the legislative department. Yet the distinguished Senator now asks us to give very great additional power to the Executive, in the coming year, to do things which can be better done here, and which are being better done here.

I say again, I am surprised at the source from which this suggestion comes, because it is a suggestion to reduce legislative power and greatly increase executive power, and to dump our problems

into the lap of the Executive with certain rather general instructions stating that he should make reductions in accord with those general instructions, but with the admission that there must be many transfers, and that many objectives will be hurt in the process to a very large degree.

Mr. President, during the last few minutes I have had compiled, and completed except for further reductions accomplished this morning, the reductions from the appropriations budget which have been accomplished by the Appropriations Committee and by the actions of the two Houses of Congress during this session.

Mr. President, I have been predicting for a good long time that when all appropriation bills are enacted we would find that we had cut appropriations $5 billion. I find now that I have been too conservative in my expectations and predictions, because, as compiled by the chief clerk of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, the reductions already accomplished, or viewed as a certainty, amout to $4,832,000,000, without two additional reductions that were made this morning in the conference committees on the space bill and the independent offices bill. Those two additional reductions increase the total of reductions, Mr. President, to well over $5 billion.

To say that we have no confidence in our own work, no confidence in our own associates, no confidence in the institution of which we are a part, whether we regard it as the Senate or the Congress, and to say that somebody else can do it better, after we finish all of our appropriation work, when we have already shown an actual reduction of more than $5 billion in the appropriations budget, is, I think, the wrong thing for us to do; and I am greatly disappointed that my distinguished friend from Delaware suggests such a thing, because it is so apparent that Congress is making substantial reductions in accord with what the times require—and they do require very great economy.

Mr. President, I shall not place this list in the RECORD at this time, because we are making certain changes on it to reflect the additional reductions made this morning in the conference committees on the space bill and the independent offices bill, which, as I have already stated, will bring the total of reductions to well above the $5 billion figure.

Mr. President, in closing, I just wish to say that I hope the Senate does not vote a vote of no confidence in itself and its institutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, as ranking Republican member of the Appropriations Committee, I find it especially difficult not to agree with my friend from Delaware and support his amendment.

The amendment, in my view, would give additional and massive authority to the President of the United States, as if he did not already have plenty. He could make cuts in some items which I think would not be justified, at least in the minds of most Members of Congress, and perhaps make unjustified increases in others. His power of transferability is already very great.

I believe this is a matter of authority on expenditures that Congress should keep in its own hands. We have not been as frugal as we might have been here in the Senate, particularly in appropriating and saving money. I agree with the objective of the House of Representatives, and believe that we may have to go along with them in some of their provisions in this resolution in conference; but I hope and believe that something more specific and effective can be worked out in conference if this particular amendment is not adopted.

I shall support the Mundt amendment, which is a specific one; but I believe we shall be in a far better position if we reject the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, how much time does the Senator from Arizona have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware. This proposal would place an absolute ceiling on Federal expenditures for the current fiscal year—with the exception of spending for the Department of Defense. It would do this, moreover, regardless of the amounts which we, the Congress, enact into law through the appropriations process. Your Appropriations Committee considers carefully each request brought before it. Agency witnesses are questioned closely and at length. Finally, recommendations are prepared for the consideration of the Senate—and these recommendations represent the best informed judgment of your fellow Senators who have heard all the relevant facts presented.

The amendment now before the Senate would undo this careful work—not only for the bills which have been enacted earlier but for those not even considered yet. It would substitute instead a sweeping meat-ax approach.

But it would do more. It would transfer to the President the power to determine which spending would be curtailed to stay within the ceiling. His judgment, not ours, would prevail. I cannot believe that the Senate of the United States would wish to pass to the executive branch the congressional power of the purse.

But even aside from these fundamental considerations—the separation of powers and the proven value of the appropriations process—there are three very practical problems associated with a limitation on total expenditures:

First, an expenditure limitation locks the door after the horse has gone. The Congress provides appropriations which grant the administration power to enter into contracts or obligate money. Expenditures are simply the process of paying off those contracts and honoring those obligations. You cannot control expenditures alone. You must control the initial contracts or obligations. An expenditure ceiling does not face this fact—it is like trying to stopper the mouth of the hose after turning the water on at the spigot.

Second, an expenditure limitation makes no allowance for uncontrollable changes in expenditures. The President would, of course, have to make an initial round of program reductions. But what then? Suppose later in the fiscal year, expenditures increased and the administration was powerless to stop them—in such locked-in progams as CCC price supports, veterans pensions, and medicaid, for example. These increases would immediately require even further cuts in other programs which could be controlled—aid to education, airway safety, and health research, for example. As a matter of fact, if substantial uncontrollable expenditure increases took place late enough in the fiscal year, some vital programs might well have to shut down completely to offset the increase and stay within the legal ceiling.

Third, an expenditure limitation would require a whole new and cumbersome set of controls. The entire Federal accounting system is set up to control at the point where contracts or commitments are made. Expenditures are simply an estimate of how rapidly checks will be written as work progresses, planes are delivered, States draw their grant authorizations, and so forth. But with a legal limit on expenditures, all the agencies would have to set up a whole new and wasteful management system to control those expenditures.

These are some practical problems which any limit on spending would bring in its wake. But let us also examine very carefully what our colleague's $5 billion expenditure reduction would mean for our Federal programs. Where could the President find cuts of this magnitude?

As I noted earlier, there are some things neither we nor the President can cut without changing basic law. Examples include veterans compensation and pensions, public assistance grants, the Government's matching share of medicare payments for the aged, and interest on the public debt.

He cannot cut the $15 billion of expenditures that are being paid out this year—and the year started nearly 4 months ago—to meet contracts and commitments made in prior years with funds we voted for that purpose.

With a war on, we cannot expect that the President will find much opportunity to cut spending for the national defense.

When all of these programs are subtracted from the total, only about $20 billion is left. The amendment before us would tell the President to cut $5 billion of that. Considering the normal timelag of expenditures behind obligations and the fact that the fiscal year is already nearly one-third gone, he would undoubtedly have to make program cuts—cuts in obligations—of around $10 billion.

It is hard to grasp the real meaning and impact of such massive reductions in Federal programs. None of us know where the detailed reductions would ac-

tually occur. But let me give one complete illustration—and one which is surely close to the mark. Let us assume that the President applies one uniform reduction to all grants; another uniform reduction to all loans, and so forth. What would such a cut really look like?

Mr. President, first, all new construction starts would be eliminated.

Second, every new contract for major ongoing construction work would be eliminated. Projects would be stopped in the early stages of completion for the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and other agencies.

Third, new loans would be cut 50 percent below totals planned for this year: loans to farmers for electrification, telephones, housing, and emergency needs; small businses loans; Fannie Mae mortgage purchases for low-cost housing and moderate-income urban renewal and cooperative housing; loans for veterans' housing, college housing, college students, and poor rural families.

Fourth, new grants to State and local governments would be cut by 30 percent: the elementary and secondary and higher education programs; Neighborhood Youth Corps and Headstart; school lunch, special milk, and food stamp programs; assistance to schools in federally affected areas; grants for maternal and child welfare, disease prevention, and other health programs; programs for model cities, urban transportation, the Department of Agriculture's Extension Service, water and waste disposal, and other grants.

Fifth, the SST would be canceled, and space programs would be cut by $1 billion below the budget—or about half a billion below the amounts now being considered by the Congress—thus slowing down the manned lunar landing program and crippling other space efforts.

Sixth, expenditures for all other controllable programs would be cut 15 percent: the food-for-peace program; veterans' medical care—some hospitals would be closed and some doctors, nurses, and other employees separated; atomic energy programs; research on cancer, heart disease, mental illness, and other areas; the Internal Revenue Service—many of the employees who review tax returns would be removed; operations of airways by the Federal Aviation Administration—this program would be reduced to its 1963 level despite an increase in air traffic of nearly 50 percent since that time; the FBI and other Justice Department programs; Interior programs for Indians, land management, fish and wildlife, and mineral resources; the Coast Guard; and a whole host of others, including agricultural research, weather and postal services, enforcement of labor standards, foreign relations, Treasury reporting and accounting, regulatory activities, basic research, and so on and on.

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

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

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. President, I am as much in favor of economy as is any Senator. But imposing a rigid ceiling on Federal expenditures is simply not the right way to save money. The right way is to rely on the tried and true appropriations process. I therefore urge the defeat of this amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Mississippi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Delaware for yielding to me.

I think that as a body the Senate should do something to meet the very serious and valid challenge that has been raised by the House of Representatives in its amendment. Whether the matter is wholly worked out now is not the entire issue.

I doubt that any amendment of this kind, or even the next amendment that is to be offered, would be suitable and on all fours in every way. But I think in view of the conditions of this mounting deficit, the difficulty that is going to be had in passing any kind of a tax bill, and, not the threat of inflation, but the actual inflation that has already started—which is the most cruel and unkindest tax of all—it is up to us to respond in some way rather than merely to go to conference singlehanded or ironclad in any position.

I think the House, by its recorded vote, is going to stand on some position of economy in conference.

I voted for this matter in the Appropriations Committee, and I am as guilty as anyone, or as the average one, in voting too much in appropriations not only this year but also last year and the year before. Do not say, however, that we cannot reduce the appropriations. We can do so if we make up our minds.

This year—due largely to the efforts of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and I am not claiming any credit for it—after a very careful perusal of the defense bill by the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from North Dakota, and others, there was a reduction made in the amount of $1.6 billion without touching topside or bottom the muscle or the bone that is necessary to have a sound, solid military program. We may have to increase the appropriations some in the supplemental bill next year, but not for the items that we cut out in that bill.

Congress can do these things, and Congress does have a part in such matters.

I hope that we will agree to the pending amendment or to the next amendment to be offered.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, for 11 years I have tried by my votes and arguments to reduce Federal spending, but I have failed woefully and painfully.

I have argued that the escape from Federal fiscal chaos and unbridled inflation required the stoppage of deficit operations. Those arguments fell upon deaf ears.

It was my opinion that in a period of prosperity, the moneys flowing into the Federal Treasury should be used in part to reduce the Federal debt. That argument fell upon deaf ears. Now, at the end of the 11th year, the cry is made that we should pass a 10-percent surtax in order to stop the damaging impact of inflation upon retired employees, ministers, doctors, and workers. The cry "stop inflation" is being heard throughout the Nation.

The time to have argued that point was during the past 11 years.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Ohio.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I tried to stop this threat. I voted on separate bills to reduce spending. I failed.

I realize that this is a sort of broadax chop in the appropriations, but I know of no other method to achieve what I believe has to be done to stop the fiscal disintegration of our country, the robbing of pensioners, the robbing of those who have bought U.S. bonds, and the robbing of all other thrifty people who believed in the American dollar and tried to save it.

I gladly support the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself the remaining 3 minutes.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia outlined a broad list of calamities that allegedly would fall upon this country if the pending amendment is agreed to. I disagree completely with his position that agreement to the pending amendment would result in such a calamity.

I point out that even if the pending amendment, which would reduce the projected ceiling for the next fiscal year by $5 billion, were agreed to, it would still mean that these same agencies would be able to spend $4.7 billion more than they spent last year. Is it a calamity for the Senate to consider the plight of the taxpayer?

I note that the Department of Labor this morning reports that the cost of living has risen 39 percent since 1959. That is inflation at an average of 5 percent per year. It is time we recognize that we can-

not continuously expand these spending programs without having a staggering tax increase and all the evils of inflation that go with it.

The suggestion has been made that the adoption of this amendment would be an expression of lack of confidence in the Senate. I do not interpret it that way, but frankly I will accept it. After all, the Senate up to this point has not reduced expenditures. Let us face it. On the contrary, by rollcall votes in the Senate, it has added $4,055 million to the appropriation bills over what was added in the House. Even the adoption of this amendment would only roll back to the House figures, and certainly the House is not un-American.

So far as conferring undue powers upon the President is concerned, certainly this procedure would confer upon him some powers; but we in Congress have failed thus far to adopt these amendments on a selective basis. Someone may argue that the efforts that were made to reduce the expenditures were poorly selected, poorly timed, and the wrong place. But no Member of the Senate has suggested any other place to cut the budget, so we must proceed on the premise that no Member of the Senate knew of a better place to approach the cut.

As an argument in favor of the pending amendment, I shall quote none other than the man in the White House.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In 1957 Congress was trying to reduce the appropriations under a preceding administration. The effort to reduce those appropriations was then led by the Senator from Texas, Mr. Lyndon Johnson, and I quote Senator Johnson's statement as it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 103, part 5, page 6973:

> Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. When the vote on that question is taken, every Member who wishes to vote for more money, for more jobs, for more Government-kept press services, for more assistants, can line up, on one side, and say, "Here we are—the spenders, and we are proud of it." Those on the other side can line up and can say, "Here we are, the cutters—and we are proud of it."

I am ready to vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. On this question, 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 Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] would each vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

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

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 48, as follows:

[No. 299 Leg.]

YEAS—39

Allott	Eastland	Murphy
Baker	Ervin	Nelson
Bennett	Fannin	Pearson
Boggs	Griffin	Percy
Byrd, Va.	Hansen	Prouty
Cannon	Hickenlooper	Proxmire
Carlson	Hollings	Russell
Church	Hruska	Spong
Cooper	Jordan, Idaho	Stennis
Cotton	Lausche	Symington
Curtis	McGovern	Talmadge
Dirksen	Morton	Thurmond
Dominick	Mundt	Williams, Del.

NAYS—48

Aiken	Hill	Mondale
Anderson	Holland	Monroney
Bartlett	Inouye	Montoya
Bayh	Jackson	Moss
Bible	Javits	Muskie
Burdick	Jordan, N.C.	Pastore
Byrd, W. Va.	Kennedy, Mass.	Pell
Case	Kennedy, N.Y.	Randolph
Clark	Long, Mo.	Ribicoff
Ellender	Long, La.	Scott
Fong	Magnuson	Smathers
Gore	Mansfield	Smith
Harris	McClellan	Tydings
Hart	McGee	Yarborough
Hartke	McIntyre	Young, N. Dak.
Hayden	Metcalf	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—13

Brewster	Hatfield	Sparkman
Brooke	Kuchel	Tower
Dodd	McCarthy	Williams, N.J.
Fulbright	Miller	
Gruening	Morse	

So the amendment of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware was rejected.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend until we have order. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, do I understand that the debate now begins on my amendment under controlled limitations?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct; there are 30 minutes allotted to each side.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I shall speak briefly in connection with my amendment before yielding to other Senators who desire to speak in support of the amendment.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, may we have order so we can hear the Senator?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I wish to point out that the economy bloc lost by a margin of nine votes on the amendment of the Senator from Dalaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], which increases my optimism and my hopefulness that the Senate will agree on a rollcall vote to the 5 percent cutback suggested in my amendment.

I know that some Senators who voted for the Williams amendment did so with reluctance because we felt that there are more systematic equitable and effective methods of achieving the desired objective. I also know that some Senators who voted against the Williams amendment will support my amendment. We therefore are now in the important area of trying to convince six or eight Senators to put the Senate on record in favor of some economy.

I wish first to read a statement from the morning newspaper that would tend to sharpen the issue. This article is a United Press International news release. The headline reads: "MILLS Says Committee Will Insist on Cuts." The first paragraph of the article reads:

> Chairman Wilbur D. Mills (D-Ark.) predicted yesterday that House Ways and Means Committee will stand firm on its insistence that Federal spending be cut before it considers President Johnson's proposed 10 per cent surtax.

Mr. President, that is the lead paragraph in this news article. I ask unanimous consent that the entire article may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

MILLS SAYS COMMITTEE WILL INSIST ON CUTS

Chairman Wilbur D. Mills (D-Ark.) predicted yesterday that House Ways and Means Committee will stand firm on its insistence that Federal spending be cut before it considers President Johnson's proposed 10 per cent surtax.

He thus appeared to hold out little hope for enactment of the tax increase this year, although he declined to commit himself specifically.

Mills conceded at a news conference that tax reform holds high priority, but indicated there is no hope for immediate action. Proposals now being prepared by the staffs of his Committee, the Treasury Department and the Joint Economic Committee will probably not be ready for consideration before next year, he said.

But Mills said he understood that the recommendations will include "changes in the tax treatment of foundations," to cor-

rect abuses through which the mushrooming number of such organizations enjoy tax advantages while perpetuating family control of the estates.

He also expected that some change will be required in the tax-free status of church-operated business ventures.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I want to point out that Representative MILLS has said that over and over and over again. He is a very fine Member of the House of Representatives. His word is as good as his bond. He does not engage in loose talk. I know him well. He has said to Members of the Senate and House, "If you want to have tax consideration and if you want to put our fiscal house in balance, you have got to start by doing some effective economizing."

The House has responded to the challenge with a majority of 110 votes.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] was nine votes short on his effort. I sincerely hope that we can increase the vote in favor of the pending amendment sufficiently to put the Senate on record as being in favor of going to conference, not empty-handed and not to repudiate or to reject the economy drive by the House, but to associate itself with their earnest desire to work out a conference report which will cut back on Federal expenditures.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I am one of those Senators the Senator is speaking of. Reluctantly, I voted against the Williams amendment because it would give the President broad discretionary authority to wipe out some programs entirely if he wanted to.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct. I was also reluctant to vote for it, but I think the situation is so desperate that we are going to have to move in some direction. I do not want to discourage any rational economy efforts being made at this time.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The amendment of the Senator from South Dakota is more positive, and it spreads cuts across the board.

Mr. MUNDT. Correct.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. We will know exactly where it goes. Thus, I think it is a much better approach. We will have to work out something in conference. There will be enough leeway in conference and too, if the amendment is adopted it will indicate that some economies have been effected on the Senate side, too. It will make the discretionary authority more workable.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from North Dakota is precisely correct. One great advantage of the amendment is that it will open doors in the conference to all considerations for moving the budget downward and economizing, whereas if we simply reject the House, repudiate and scoff at it, send them a gratuitous insult, saying that we are not interested in economy, as we would do by approving just a simple continuing resolution, I doubt if we will have any effective conference at all.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Please explain to me what the Senator means by subsection (b), the authority of the President to place funds where he wants to, which is what I do not like about the resolution. I should like to vote for the first part of it, but I do not like the second part where I think we abdicate completely our authority and transfer that power to the President.

Mr. MUNDT. It is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, if the Senator will refer to the speech I made yesterday. I have added nothing whatsoever to existing Presidential power to transfer funds——

Mr. McCLELLAN. Then why not strike it out?

Mr. MUNDT. In the act of 1951. Now part of the Federal statute gave the President that authority. It will stay there until we repeal it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Then why not repeal it?

Mr. MUNDT. We utilize that device to give him some flexibility in determining whether he should cut some agency 2 percent, or another agency 5 percent, or 3 percent, instead of making it straight across the board at 5 percent.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Could he not cut it 50 percent?

Mr. MUNDT. Under present law, he can do anything he wants to with it. My amendment does not change present law in that respect.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Then why not strike it out?

Mr. MUNDT. Because it is in conformity with the law at present. We live with the law. We bring the first paragraph into conformity with existing law.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Then it would be in conformity if the other is not repealed.

Mr. MUNDT. It says, straight across the board. I said yesterday that I thought some day we should try to figure out how to rescind that authority granted in 1951. I doubt now, when our big problem is to try to find some way to economize, that this is a propitious time to pull back that authority which we have given to the President since 1951.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish the Senator would withdraw the amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. Well, it is in strict conformity with present law.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. As I read the distinguished Senator's amendment, it seems to me it would be the greatest grant of Presidential discretion which I have ever seen given to a President during my years in the Senate.

Is it not true that by the language of subsection (b), authorizing the President to reduce by at least 5 percent the line item appropriations, the President could reduce veterans benefits, pensions, and disability payment by 5 percent?

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is entirely wrong. Let me correct him there. These cuts have to be on items which are subject to administrative control. Veterans benefits are not. We cannot touch them. They cannot be reduced even by one-tenth of 1 percent.

Mr. MONRONEY. We have appropriated money for the Veterans' Administration consistently. I do not see how we can place any limitation on the authority we would be giving the President to reduce funds that would be going to that agency. That is a big appropriation, as the Senator knows, because he serves on the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. MUNDT. If the Senator will refer to lines 7 and 8 of the amendment, I want him to read them, because I realize, also, that other Senators have not been here when this was discussed in great depth on yesterday:

(Other than appropriations for military functions and those items determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget not to be subject to administrative control) . . .

Veterans' benefits are spelled out in the law. We cannot touch them—or interest on the national debt. In fact, he will find in the hearings a list of the expenditures which are controllable.

Mr. MONRONEY. On what page is that?

Mr. MUNDT. It is written here, on a mimeographed form. I hand it to the Senator.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator.

How would funds appropriated for public works projects be affected? Would we not be giving the President carte blanche power to reduce them to 1 percent of the funds which Congress has already authorized?

Mr. MUNDT. On that, I say to the Senator, as I stated to my good friend from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], they fall into two categories; first, where definite commitments are made we cannot cancel contracts; and, second, where we do not have authority to cut, they are subject to administrative control. Under present law the President can cut them out. In those cases, forget about the Mundt amendment. Live with the law as it was enacted in 1951. I put it all in the RECORD yesterday. The President has the authority now that we are talking about here. There is no change. The President has had that authority since 1951 in regard to contracts and slowing down projects and effectuating economies.

Mr. MONRONEY. But it is not right to reduce an appropriation down to 1 percent of the amount we have appropriated——

Mr. MUNDT. He has already at times reduced them down to zero under the authority we gave the President in 1951. My amendment does not expand the statutory authority he has had for 16 years.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the President has had that authority to do everything this amendment covers, why do anything in this regard, if he has all the power the Senator says he has?

I do not want to give the President of the United States, who is advocating the spending of billions of dollars for purposes with which I do not agree at all, the power to take away from my State the public improvements which will be a great asset to my State as well as to the Nation. I want to vote for economy but I do not want to vest in the President of the United States any arbitrary power, if he chooses to use it that way, to punish absolutely, to operate by Executive order, or whatever authority would be given him here, to reduce appropriations for projects to which I subscribe as being of

great benefit and which are now in progress of being constructed and should not be retarded simply so that the President could lay his hands on additional money to use for some of his wild schemes with which I do not agree at all. That is why I cannot vote for the pending amendment. I should like to support it, however.

Mr. MUNDT. We had the Senator in mind when we wrote this amendment. We protected him. The President cannot take money from projects to help out in the building up of other programs. He cannot use the money saved to increase any appropriation anywhere. Thus, the Senator can forget about that. That is spelled out in the law. There is no change. There it is. The Senator has suggested that we repeal it. Such a repeal has not been considered in the Appropriations Committee. It is subject to rescission. But, there it is in the law until and unless we repeal it. We have got to live with the law as it is. I am merely providing the pattern of transferability in keeping with the Federal statute as it now exists.

If we want economy, we will have to economize. We cannot begin, by this amendment, to bar the power the President has as spelled out in the law already on the books.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Does the Senator say to the Senate that the total effect of this amendment will be to effect a reduction only on $38 billion in appropriations?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. We will get that big a reduction. If we figure 5 percent against that figure, we will get a reduction of $1.9 billion.

Mr. MONRONEY. In other words this amendment will apply only to appropriations that are controllable, which amount to about $38 billion. Five percent of that would be a very small amount.

Mr. MUNDT. Perhaps the Senator should look at the hearings, instead of the memorandum he has in front of him.

Mr. MONRONEY. I have been looking at the memorandum. Where is it in the hearings?

Mr. MUNDT. For one thing, it is on page 29801 of the RECORD of yesterday. It is also in the hearings. Dr. Schultze, after painstaking effort on the part of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], put it in the hearings. It is in there. We are talking about $38 billion or $39 billion, and a 5-percent reduction against that, and retaining the law as it is, which bars the President from making any shifts in increases, would save the taxpayers $1.9 or $1.9½ billion.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] such time as he may need.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall vote for the Mundt amendment. This is not precisely having our way in this manner. This is a matter of coming to an agreement with the other body. The other body is headed, in my judgment, on a course which is averse to those of us who consider themselves liberals in both bodies, because, in my judgment, it would lead to a meat-ax cut, in programs to provide housing, in poverty programs, in aid to foreign nations, in education, and related programs. The President has shown his disposition, and nothing will come out of this continuing resolution unless we agree with the other body.

Unless we wish to encourage meat-ax cuts, in programs which I have described, and which has already been indicated in the other body, by taking 25 percent out of the poverty program, and cutting almost equivalent amounts in foreign aid, and various other cuts which would result in obtaining a $7-billion reduction, which is the other body's approach to this problem, we have to be for something affirmative.

We cannot let our conferees go into conference without affirmative action by the Senate. In my judgment, we can bargain much more by adoption of the Mundt amendment.

I hope by now the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has ascertained the facts involved in this amendment. The 5 percent applies to $38 billion. That is roughly a reduction of $1.9 billion which could be envisaged. I am willing to take my chances with that kind of reduction on a total of about $40 billion rather than have a mandatory and enforced reduction, on a meat-ax basis, on the order of $7 billion, materially crippling major programs.

The other point I wish to make is that the Congress, in my judgment, will be faced with a tax surcharge, a tax increase, dictated by the inflationary situation in the economy. As a member of the Joint Economic Committee and other economic committees, I think Members of the Senate have reason to believe that I know something of what I am talking about in the economic field.

I deeply believe we shall be faced with these decisions. A tax surcharge of 10 percent would mean a reduction of the deficit by about $7 billion. A deficit of $29 billion is completely unacceptable. In my judgment, a reasonably acceptable budget deficit under the circumstances is somewhere in the range of $14 billion to $15 billion.

In my judgment we must take three closely related steps to deal with the fiscal situation of this country today, before any tax increase is enacted.

First, the administration must reevaluate its spending priorities.

Second, in order to cut down on the deficit, we must bring about a reduction in expenditures. We have already reduced expenditures by reductions of $2.5 billion in appropriation bills. The Mundt amendment will bring about a reduction of another $2 billion. It is logical to expect that another $2 billion reduction will be made in the appropriation bills which remain to be considered. In two of those, I, myself, am a conferee.

For the remainder, I would urge the President to send to Congress his long-delayed message on tax reform and press hard for at least some realistic measures to close loopholes in our tax laws, for example, in the oil-depletion allowance, which is certainly not for the benefit of anybody but those in the oil business, and I urge him to think about the benefit received, amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars every year, by people who might otherwise buy railroad cars, airplanes, and other equipment, but who can rent them and thereby get a tax advantage. I refer to such high-cost capital goods as computers.

Those are the three things I recommend by which the American people can meet the inflationary situation which faces us. As everybody knows, I am not given to cutting or economizing necessarily per se, but in this instance the interests of the country call for accepting Senator MUNDT's approach as intelligent and reasonable in preference to the meat-ax approach of the other body. I am going to take what is the more promising approach for the things I believe in most.

The Senate has an opportunity to decide today what contribution it is willing to make in dealing with the $29-billion deficit facing the country at a time when the economy is operating at a relatively high level and the threat of inflation is looming ahead.

It is not easy for many of us to support any cuts in Federal programs, as many of these programs represent important answers to the principal social and economic problems facing millions of the American people. But unless we show the American people that we are willing to make some cuts—as proposed by the Mundt amendment—they will be justifiably angry at the Congress for even talking about a tax surcharge.

I am firmly convinced that once some cuts are effected in Federal spending and the President makes serious proposals to the Congress for some reform of our tax system, both the people and Congress will be ready to listen to the President's case for a tax surcharge, should conditions continue to warrant it.

The country is facing extremely difficult economic conditions today. Even if a tax surcharge were passed, the fiscal year 1968 budget will have the largest administrative budget deficit since World War II. Even with a tax increase, prices may rise as much as they did last year—which recorded the highest rise since 1957. Inflationary psychology is taking hold. Cost pressures are increasing with wage demands far exceeding the now defunct wage-price guidelines. The new settlement reached between Ford and the United Auto Workers—an estimated 7-percent-a-year increase in wages and benefits—confirms the seriousness of our situation. And interest rates are again heading toward the historic highs that were reached in 1966. Whether a tax surcharge will be enacted or not, high interest rates are going to be a fact of life at least for 1968, if not longer.

Clearly, the repeated and serious errors of judgment in the design and the execution of economic policy in 1966 have contributed to our present predicament. Our economy is in trouble and restoring balanced growth is bound to be a painful and prolonged exercise.

I support the Mundt amendment because I believe, under present circumstances, it is, in respect of appropriations, the best way out. At the same time, I reaffirm my belief that the Federal Government, in close cooperation with private enterprise and State and local government, must accept responsibility for remedying major national ills. I believe that even under present circumstances of

extreme fiscal stringency caused by Vietnam, these major national problems, including those involving our cities and the poor, must be dealt with effectively. I believe that if modest cuts are made across the board, and we begin to work on making our tax structure more equitable and give serious consideration to a modest tax increase effective some time early next year, we will have dealt with the country's fiscal situation in a responsible manner. Should the steps I outlined be taken, we would still be left with a budget deficit of close to $15 billion. I believe that considering the costs of the Vietnam war—$2 billion a month—this country could live with a deficit of that size, but a higher deficit under existing economic conditions is unacceptable.

Therefore, facing the facts of life, I shall vote to support the Mundt amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, may I inquire what distribution has been made of the time thus far consumed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota has 7 minutes remaining. The Senator from Arizona has 30 minutes remaining.

Mr. MUNDT. I would assume, then, that the Senator from Arizona would like to participate in this debate at this juncture.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Arizona, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, as I stated a while ago with reference to the Williams amendment, I am surprised indeed, by the source from which these proposals come. I have heard the distinguished Senator from South Dakota and the distinguished Senator from Delaware inveigh repeatedly on this floor and elsewhere against the giving of too great power to the Executive. I have heard them complain that the legislative department was surrendering too much of its power to the executive department. Yet now we find these two fine Senators the authors of proposals which would, if passed, surrender more power to the present President with reference to the expenditure of funds and with reference to the increase or decrease in expenditures than has been the case in any act that I know of that has ever been passed heretofore.

The Senator from South Dakota has referred to the act of 1951. I have gone back and reviewed that situation very carefully. The fact is that in 1951, in the middle of the Korean war, we did give to President Truman the authority to cut out $551 million, with certain instructions. It was a specific amount, which is not the case here at all. It was a much smaller amount than is involved here, and it was against a background completely different from what we have here; because, in that entire session of Congress, the reductions of the budget figures by the various committees and by the various acts totaled only $1.9 billion, compared to reductions already made in this session of more than $5 billion.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. Just a moment.

Mr. President, I have been predicting for some weeks that we would have reductions in the appropriations, from the budget recommendations, of more than $5 billion. Some have smiled; some have laughed at that prediction. But the fact is that right now we have exceeded that prediction, because we have cut more than $5 billion from the budget appropriations recommended by the administration.

I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Am I correct or incorrect in believing that the Senator from Florida unintentionally misspoke when he said we had already cut $5 billion? Is he not talking about the total of what we have cut and what additional amounts he hopes to cut?

Mr. HOLLAND. No; I am talking about what we have cut already, including two cuts made this morning by conference committees, and estimating the smallest figures possible for cuts in the three remaining bills.

Mr. MUNDT. Then the Senator is anticipating future actions.

Mr. HOLLAND. And we are figuring no cut for the supplemental bill, and have figured the cuts for the military construction bill and for the foreign aid bill at the lowest possible figures, based on the information that is before us.

Mr. MUNDT. Does not the fact remain——

Mr. HOLLAND. Considering those, the present cuts—and I am sure they will be well in excess of this figure when we get through—total $5,147 million.

I yield again.

Mr. MUNDT. I am not arguing what we may do. I am asking, is not the Senator incorrect to say that we have already made the cuts? He is hoping and anticipating; so am I. But will the Senator tell us what we have already cut?

Mr. HOLLAND. We have already cut $3,356,000,000, plus $315 million cut out this morning, which is $3,671,000,000. In addition to that, we have figured the cuts on the bills yet ahead at what seems to me to be the most reasonable figure possible; that is, the highest figure proposed by either House, or the highest figure in the authorization.

Mr. MUNDT. I am sure the Senator misspoke himself then. He said we have already cut $6 billion.

Mr. HOLLAND. We have already cut $3.671 billion, and the further cuts which are sure to be made, because they are the lowest cuts that can be made under the authorizations outstanding, will run that total to $5.147 billion.

I say to my friend, I think the cuts we are going to make in foreign aid are going to be bigger than we have figured here, because I think they will be bigger than the existing authorization permits. I think the cuts we will make in military construction will be bigger than we have figured here. But I am just stating that as of right now, we have an assurance of cutting $5.147 billion, and my prediction now is that the actual figure will be nearer $5.5 billion when we get through.

My distinguished friend probably does not know that we concluded this morning conferences on the space appropriations bill and on the independent offices, and raised the cuts already made and approved yesterday by both Houses by a total of an additional $315 million.

Mr. MUNDT. I am aware of that, and I heard the Senator say that. Of course, that is included in his calculations.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for his questioning. I ask for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. In behalf of the Senator from Arizona, I yield the Senator from Florida 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield such time as the Senator desires.

Mr. HOLLAND. The fact is that the distinguished Senator from South Dakota has already indicated, by his line of questioning, that he has no confidence in our ability to cut. His amendment is addressed to what will be the case after we get through appropriating. He has shown no confidence in what the Senate will do, what the House will do, or what Congress will do. The Senator from Florida expressed high confidence weeks ago—even the Director of the Budget questioned my recommendations and beliefs at the recent hearings, which were attended by the Senator from South Dakota. It has now been made clear that the Senator from Florida was conservative, because I then underestimated the actual cuts that are being made.

My own feeling, Mr. President, is that this proposal is a proposal to vote no confidence in the Senate, in the House of Representatives or in Congress in handling these matters, and, instead, to say that we cannot do the job, and that when we get through, notwithstanding the fact that we know what the economic condition is, we want the Executive to apply an additional 5-percent cut to all controllable items, which, as I have figured them here, would be about $1.9 billion.

I yield again.

Mr. MUNDT. If the Senator wishes to define this as a no-confidence vote, the Senator from South Dakota will accept that definition, and relate it to the situation, as he sees it, now confronting Congress and the country.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator wishes me to yield for a question, I will be happy to do so, but not for a speech. I am on controlled time.

Mr. MUNDT. Is this not then, really, a no-confidence vote on the theory that if we expect to save $6 billion against a $26-billion deficit, that such a saving is enough? That is the kind of no-confidence vote it is. We have done a little, but we have not done enough.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I think the Senator's amendment clearly shows no confidence in the Senate or the House of Representatives, because he plainly says:

Subsequent to the enactment into law during the first session of the 90th Congress of the appropriation bills for fiscal year 1968—

That is, after we have done the best we can—

the executive branch is directed, subject to subsection (b)—

Which is the transferability section—

to reduce by at least 5 percent each line item appropriation—

Which is controlled.

Mr. President, if that is not an expression of no confidence, an expression that he does not believe we are going to do our duty, that he does not believe we understand the economic situation, that he does not believe we would be able to take care of our people, I do not know what that amendment is.

Mr. President, I am especially distressed that this amendment comes from the distinguished Senator, because it strikes peculiarly at some of the very appropriations he has urged in the subcommittee which I head, and of which he is a distinguished member, or has been in the past, and in the full Appropriations Committee, and on the floor of the Senate time after time.

I refer back to the REA appropriations. Each year since I have been chairman of that subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota has tried to raise substantially the budget amount. He did the same thing this year. We did raise the amount to some extent. However, that item was reduced in conference, so that we are now back to the budget figure.

The point I make is that the Senate is now asked to reduce that budget recommended amount again by 5 percent.

I received from the Department of Agriculture a preliminary statement showing how it interpreted the reduction would apply.

The statement contains the items to which that 5-percent reduction would be directed. I do not have the time to read the entire list as I would like to do, but for REA loans, the reduction could amount to $58.9 million. I think the Senator would almost have a spasm were I to say that he is now suggesting a cut in the budget amount on REA appropriations of $58.9 million.

The Agriculture Subcommittee has been very greatly interested in the Farmers Home Administration loan programs. Again, the Senator from South Dakota frequently has wanted to exceed the budget amount, and he did so again this year. In the statement I have received from the Secretary of Agriculture, he states that this amount might be reduced by $45.6 million.

To my mind, the position now taken by the distinguished Senator is completely inconsistent with the stand of his party, which is not to surrender legislative power to the executive and with his own position taken time after time on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere, and it is entirely inconsistent with the position he has taken in the Appropriations Committee, not only heretofore, but also in this present year and in the passage of these particular bills. And I am referring now to the REA items and the Farmers Home Administration loan items in the agricultural appropriations bill.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Did I correctly understand the senior Senator from Florida to say that it would mean a reduction of $58.9 million in the REA loans?

Mr. HOLLAND. I have a statement from the Secretary of Agriculture in which he states that $58.9 million might be the cut in the REA loans and, on the Farmers Home Administration loans, it could be $45.6 million.

The Senator is forgetting, I think, that transferability is given, and he is forgetting that the duty will fall upon the executive branch, and that means largely upon the secretaries in the various departments, to decide where the reductions, as directed against all controllable items, will be applied.

When I see that the Secretary of Agriculture says that the crop insurance program will be subject to a cut of $5.9 million in funds, that makes me most anxious. And when I see that the REA loans will be subject to a cut of $58.9 million, it makes me anxious. And when I see that the Farmers Home Administration loans will be subjected to a cut of $45.6 million, it makes me anxious.

These possible reductions disturb me very much. The Senator from North Dakota has repeatedly shown his interest in all three programs. The Senator from South Dakota has done the same thing.

I call attention to the fact that if the Senators have not thought this matter through, now is the time to do so. The Senators are taking positions that are completely inconsistent with the positions they have taken on the floor of the Senate, in speeches they have made, and in committee. I hope that they will reconsider their position.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, $58.9 million would figure out to more than 20 percent of the loan authorization.

The Secretary can, of course, withhold all the funds if he wants to. The President of the United States last year held up some $40 million or $50 million, most of it until the last day.

The administration can rip up all of the appropriation, if they want to do so, and it can withhold this amount of money without the Mundt amendment.

Where the Secretary of Agriculture, however, gets the figure of $58.9 million is more than I can understand. This is being very unfair to the sponsors of the bill and to the farmers of this Nation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, all I can say is that the Secretary has given me that information, and I have put it where Senators may see it and realize that what they are being asked to vote for is something that may very seriously harm programs in which they are vitally interested.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield 5 additional minutes to the senior Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I am afraid that the wrong impression has been unconsciously given, and that the figures indicated by the senior Senator from Florida do not constitute the entire power that would be given under the pending amendment.

As I read the amendment, the President is directed to reduce by at least 5 percent each line item appropriation, other than the appropriations for military functions and items determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

So what we are voting on under the Mundt amendment is to give the power to the President to reduce not by 5 percent, but by as much as 100 percent the items outlined on page 29801 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The President can reduce the agricultural appropriation by $3,900,000,00 if he so desires. He can reduce the appropriations for the Corps of Engineers by $1,300,000,000 under the Mundt amendment. He can reduce the appropriation for Housing and Urban Redevelopment by $1,100,000,000. The President can reduce the appropriation for the Post Office by $585,000,000, over half a billion dollars.

Under the Mundt amendment the President would have the power to cut appropriations on certain items 100 percent.

The only way that I see to correct the situation would be to offer an amendment that the President must cut appropriations by 5 percent, but by no more than 10 percent. We should have some limitation, or we are empowering the President and his agencies to withhold or cut the entire amount of an appropriation. The Mundt amendment is unlimited with respect to the amount of reduction that can be made.

When we say that the President must cut appropriations by at least 5 percent, we are saying, in spite of all the arguments that have been made, that $1,600,000,000 of veterans' benefits are subject to reduction. The amount of the reduction will be at least 5 percent, or any amount more that the President might wish to make.

This constitutes a direction to the President, and I think the matter should be clarified so that there is some ceiling short of 100 percent that can be cut from the funds that Congress has allocated after many months of effort. The Senator has stated that $5 billion has been cut already from the President's budget.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oklahoma. The list placed in the RECORD by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is a list furnished by the Director of the Budget. That list shows that $1,600 million of the Veterans' Administration's appropriations are subject to the cut. That is, they are controlled.

The remainder of the Veterans' appropriations is not controlled. That means the items for retirement, for disability payments, and for pensions are not controlled. However, the $1,600 million item is controlled.

Mr. President, I have had a regular outpouring of protests from citizens in my State and from organizations including the American Legion, the Veterans of

Foreign Wars, the Disabled Army Veterans, and other groups who say:

"This is aimed at our hospital projects and our medical protection and all of the other things except uncontrollable items."

Those uncontrolled items are few, and I have already named them.

I do not see how my distinguished friends can urge the Senate to direct such a meat-ax approach to that huge sum, $1.6 billion in veterans' appropriations.

Mr. President, I hope they will recant, and I hope they will decide that they cannot go along with this approach.

As the Senator from Oklahoma knows, I suggested in committee that there be a ceiling put on the cuts that could be made. The Senator from Oklahoma has correctly stated the situation, that when this cut of at least 5 percent is made in every controllable item, then cuts can be made wherever the executive wants to make them. We all know how the executive branch feels toward certain of our most cherished objectives.

Mr. President, I hope that we shall defeat this amendment.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to state for the RECORD, without encumbering it with the actual wires themselves the list of wires which I have received from veterans and other organizations in connection with this matter. I ask unanimous consent that the entire list be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

1. Telegram from Ralph A. Johnson, State Adjutant, American Legion, Orlando, Florida.
2. Telegram from Francis J. Beaton, National Commander, Disabled American Veterans, Washington, D.C.
3. Telegram from Charles N. Girard, National Representative, Disabled American Veterans, assigned to VA Regional Hospitals, St. Petersburg, Florida.
4. Telegram from Vance M. Watson, Commander, Department of Florida, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Ocala, Florida.
5. Letter from Howard M. Duncanson, Senior Vice Commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of Florida, Hollywood, Florida.
6. Telegram from Melvin T. Dixon, State Service Officer, VA Regional Center, St. Petersburg, Florida.
7. Telegram from Thomas F. Kehoe, President, County Service Offices Association, St. Petersburg, Florida.
8. Telegram from Dr. William C. Ruffin, Jr., President, Florida Psychiatric Society, Gainesville, Florida.
9. Telegram from Dr. Hayden C. Nicholson, Vice President for Medical Affairs, University of Miami School of Medicine.
10. Telegram from Robert D. Partridge, Acting General Manager, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

Mr. HOLLAND. I also see my distinguished friend, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], in the Chamber.

I have had wires from the heads of various mental health and psychiatric groups, insisting that they not be subjected to this cut, and that the research which is protecting those groups not be subjected to this inhuman cut; and I certainly add my voice to that plea.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield, if my time permits.

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

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I suggest, in the interest of accuracy, that the Senator separate his list of wires with respect to those that deplore the House action and those that are directed against the Mundt amendment, because there is a difference in the wires received.

Mr. HOLLAND. There is some difference. Yet, the amount being shot at now happens to be the same, because our cut in the appropriations process is going to be over $5 billion, and the Senator's amendment requests an additional $2 billion cut, or $7 billion, and that is what they were aiming at in the House. So far as I am concerned, I see no substantial difference.

We are asking that mutilation be directed against certain of the appropriations which most of us hold very, very dear, particularly those of us who have served in the Armed Forces. I shall never be a party to applying such a huge cut against the Veterans' Administration program.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Under the House action, by a substantial majority, a $7 billion cut would be required. Under the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware, a $5 billion cut would be required.

Mr. HOLLAND. No.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Under the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota, about $2 billion would be cut. It seems to me that this is the lowest possible further cut we would want to make in the Senate, if we believe in economy.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, to the contrary, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, in his remarks of yesterday made it clear that he was shooting at a $7 billion cut—$5 billion from the committee and $2 billion in addition through his amendment. I ask unanimous consent, to save time, that three portions of his remarks in the RECORD of yesterday be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

EXCERPTS FROM SENATOR MUNDT'S REMARKS OF OCTOBER 24, 1967, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, PAGE 29808

The statistics are about as follows. The Congress has economized to the extent of about $2 billion on the appropriation bills which we have thus far enacted, which means that we have given the President about $2 billion less than he requested. That is an economy brought about by congressional action. On the remaining appropriation bills that are in conference or that have not yet been enacted, it is hoped we can save another $2 billion or perhaps $3 billion. This means that we expect to reduce the Presidential requests by a total effort of from $4 to $5 billion.

By this amendment we will slash back from controllable expenditures approximately another $2 billion. So we will wind up with a total congressional saving, if my amendmend is adopted, as against the budgetary requests of the President, of between $6 and $7 billion. That is almost the precise amount the President says he will get by taking it away from the taxpayers with a 10-percent surtax, if Congress makes it possible for him to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield time.

There should be some relevancy, some accuracy, in this debate.

The Senator from Florida has to know that his criticism is completely mistaken, when he says that my amendment would result in a $7 billion cut. The $2 billion has been cut. I wish I could claim credit for that, but I cannot. The $3, $4, or $5 billion he expects to be cut, if he cuts it, will be cut in the future. So neither can I claim credit for that.

My amendment deals with the residue which has not been cut, which is a maximum now of $1.9 billion; and any attempt to twist the semantics to make it appear that my amendment makes a greater cut falls into an arithmetical pitfall. It is wrong. You cannot argue with the multiplication table.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the Senator interpret the meaning of "to reduce by not less than 5 percent each line item other than appropriated for military functions and those items determined by the Bureau of the Budget?"

We have a list to which he referred; $38 billion is controllable, and the Senator is proposing to cut this amount by not less than 5 percent. It can go to 100 percent, if the President wishes. This is the greatest grant of power I have ever seen offered by a Senator on the floor during my service in the Senate.

Mr. MUNDT. Let me point this out. I am not going to repeat it another time, because if the Senator will not listen, he will not.

I have said that I have put this in conformity with the law written in 1951. It is the law. You cannot change that.

The Senator's repetition of "5 percent" reminds me of Abraham Lincoln's unlikely experience, when he spoke of a debate he was having in a courtroom:

Simply continuing to call the tail of a calf a leg is never going to prove that a calf has five legs.

The Senator's repetition of "at least 5 percent, at least 5 percent, at least 5 percent" will not change the law. Under the law and under my amendment he is not required to cut any specific line item in the slightest if he feels such a cut is unwise.

I yield to the Senator from Mississippi as much time as he requires.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. I do not wish to be selfish with the time.

Mr. President, I said a few minutes ago that this is not the best way to reduce appropriations. But it is the second best way. I believe it is the only way left this year to make these reductions, and

my overwhelming conviction is that we must move into this problem. We are facing a problem. It has a practical side.

There has been talk during the debate of cutting the appropriations for veterans' psychiatric wards. I do not believe that anyone—the President or Congress—will reduce money under this amendment for a psychiatric ward or any other need of a veteran. As I understand the figures, the reduction under this amendment could be no larger than $7 billion.

The Senator from Arkansas is very regular in his principles and what he stands for, but there still is an opportunity for him to reduce the programs he does not like in the bills that must come before the Senate. That is when a fight can be made with respect to them, and I know that he will fight them.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is difficult, from my observation here, to get any encouragement, because the people who voted for these programs now come in and vote for a reduction.

Mr. STENNIS. I believe the Senator will have an opportunity to reduce them, quite frankly. He will have his day in court.

Mr. President, we already are faced with a deficit of approximately $29 billion. The deficit is mounting, and now the war is costing approximately $2½ billion a month. This is causing inflation, which is now with us, resulting in rising prices for the middle income, the lower income, the so-called little families, the little people.

I understand that already this year we have had an estimated 3-percent rise in prices due to inflation; perhaps it will be 4 percent next year. That would mean a 7-percent increase in 2 years, if the figures are accurate. I do not know whether they are. It is estimated that within 10 years, even if the increase is only 2½ percent per year, we will have inflation of 25 percent, which cuts into the very bone and muscle of every dollar a person has to spend.

When are we going to make an effort to stop it? If not in this bill, when?

We will have a supplemental bill before us in a few days. A year ago a bill that was supposed to take care of only deficiencies contained an appropriation of over $5 billion. That is the so-called supplemental bill. It is only supposed to cover deficiencies. I do not know what the amount will be this year. The figures I have given do not include the military. I suppose the amount will be somewhat less, but it will be a large sum of money—on and on and on.

This January, we had a supplemental appropriation for the military program on facts that had been known for a long time. This January, it ran over $12 billion. The January before, it was $13 billion.

That is what drives me to the conclusion I have reached. I do not like the idea of delegating authority to the President on these items. Who does? However, we are up against a situation here where the legislative year is virtually over, and I submit that something has to be done.

Mr. President, this is a mild, modest, small deduction. Do not be frightened by some of the scary stories. What is being said about this amendment could be said against any amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Mississippi on the joint resolution.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. I did not know there was any further time available for debate.

Mr. President, I wish to emphasize that time has run out on Congress and more particularly time has run out on the Senate. I think we have to fill in this void, accept this challenge, go to conference with something positive on our side of the bill, and do the best we can to meet the situation with the House conferees. There is every reason to believe they would be reasonable about this matter; but until we show some kind of action on this side by a recorded vote I do not believe we are going to fulfill our responsibility, and I do not believe we are going to get much of a drive started to make these reductions. Many Senators, myself included, have voted for the appropriations that would now be cut. Perhaps we wish we could take back some of those votes.

Mr. President, I plead with the Senate not to go off on the sideline, but try to do something to meet this real problem.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the statement prepared for me by the Committee on Appropriations showing savings already accomplished and reasonably expected to be accomplished in the three remaining bills.

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

SUMMARY OF ACTION ON BUDGET ESTIMATES OF "APPROPRIATIONS" IN APPROPRIATION BILLS, FISCAL YEAR 1968, 90TH CONG., 1ST SESS., AS OF OCT. 25, 1967

(1)	Budget estimates considered by House (2)	Passed House (3)	Budget estimates considered by Senate (4)	Passed Senate (5)	Enacted or Senate conference amount (6)	Plus (+) or minus (−) latest action compared to budget (7)
Bills for fiscal 1968, passed Senate and House:						
Treasury-Post Office	$7,613,787,000	$7,499,230,000	$7,615,148,000	$7,555,167,000	$7,545,641,000	−$69,507,000
Interior	1,443,793,000	1,365,310,150	1,458,218,000	1,399,359,550	1,382,848,350	−75,369,650
Loan and contract authorizations	(30,700,000)	(16,200,000)	(30,700,000)	(16,200,000)	(16,200,000)	(−14,500,000)
Independent offices-HUD	10,804,642,700	10,013,178,782	10,820,513,700	10,514,830,900	[1] 10,139,473,900	−681,039,800
Contract authorization	(40,000,000)		(40,000,000)	(40,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(−30,000,000)
Labor-HEW	13,322,603,000	13,137,488,000	13,424,146,000	13,421,660,000	13,276,071,000	−148,075,000
State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary	2,342,942,000	2,194,026,500	2,347,803,195	2,186,105,500	2,169,012,500	−178,790,695
Legislative	231,311,132	228,089,952	276,005,210	275,885,804	275,699,035	−306,175
Agriculture	5,021,097,400	4,770,580,950	5,021,097,400	6,782,529,789	4,952,945,700	−68,151,700
Loan authorization	(859,600,000)	(859,600,000)	(859,600,000)	(909,000,000)	(859,600,000)	
Defense	71,584,000,000	70,295,200,000	71,584,000,000	70,132,320,000	69,936,620,000	−1,647,380,000
Transportation	1,718,618,772	1,530,198,372	1,718,618,772	1,651,407,272	1,581,905,772	−136,713,000
Public Works	4,867,813,000	4,622,922,000	4,867,813,000	4,776,064,000	[3] 4,712,813,000	−155,000,000
NASA	5,100,000,000	4,583,400,000	5,100,000,000	4,678,900,000	[4] 4,588,900,000	−511,100,000
Subtotal, 1968 bills, passed Senate and House	124,050,608,004	120,239,624,706	124,233,363,277	123,374,229,815	120,561,930,257	−3,671,433,020
Bills for fiscal 1968, not passed:						
Military construction	2,937,000,000	2,142,693,000	2,937,000,000		[5] 2,142,693,000	−794,307,000
Foreign assistance	3,818,736,000		3,818,736,000		[6] 3,137,113,000	−681,623,000
Supplemental (poverty, etc.)	2,284,949,000		2,284,949,000		[7] 2,284,949,000	
Federal payment and Federal loan appropriation, District of Columbia	113,099,000	113,099,000	113,099,000		[8] 113,099,000	
Subtotal, 1968 bills, not passed	9,153,784,000		9,153,784,000		7,677,854,000	−1,475,930,000
Grand total	133,204,392,004		133,387,147,277		128,239,784,257	−5,147,363,020

[1] Final conference figure.
[2] Assumes Senate position, which is $20,661,000 over amount considered as House position.
[3] Assumes Senate figure of $225,000,000 for water pollution, $22,000,000 over House position.
[4] Final conference figure.
[5] Assumes House-passed figure will prevail.
[6] Assumes Senate authorization figure for title I and budget estimate on other titles.
[7] Assumes entire amount of budget estimate will be approved.
[8] Assumes House-passed figure will prevail.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to read some of the words of the Senator from South Dakota which appear on page 29808 where he said:

This means that we expect to reduce the presidential requests by a total effort of from $4 billion to $5 billion—

Incidentally, as I have just shown that amount will be over $5 billion—

By this amendment we will slash back from controllable expenditures approximately another $2 billion. So we will wind up with a total congressional saving, if my amendment is adopted, as against the budgetary requests of the President, of between $6 billion and $7 billion.

It now appears the amount will be over $7 billion in view of the latest developments.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and it will be a brief quorum. I suggest it be taken out of our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I had requested an additional 5 minutes on the bill primarily to respond to my congenial and able friend from Florida. For some reason or other, he has elected to make me the target of his remarks for about 20 minutes. I do not object to that. That is the responsibility of one who wishes to offer to economize in this country; and those who do not believe in the economizing single you out. I asked for it, and I got it. However, if he thinks he is going to frighten me out of fighting for economy because maybe some project in South Dakota may have to bear the burden of a cut, he is wrong. That may be so south of the Mason and Dixon Line, but not in the West. We are prepared to accept our share.

Second, I am appalled at the scare tactics he applied. I am surprised at the scare tactics he employed. He tells us, "Don't do this or $50 million will be taken off REA." Five percent, my friends, of the REA appropriation, if he took the whole 5 percent suggested, would be $20 million. But you do not have to encourage this fellow in the White House if he decides to be against REA. He took off over $50 million 2 years ago and corrective action had to be taken by the Senate. We had to move to rescind his action and we did. We could again put it back on the first supplementary bill that comes along. There was reference also to the veterans appropriations. If the President were to do that, he would use a malicious meat ax to beat people on the head. I challenge him to do it and get by with it, if the Senator from Florida has so little confidence in his demonstrating good judgment.

I do not share that lack of confidence. I do not think the President would engage in that business. Of course, it would be possible to do so under the law of the land as it prevails today.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. According to the figures given us by the Bureau of the Budget $3.9 billion would be subject to cut, in the agriculture appropriations bill and 5 percent of that amount would be about $200 million.

I refuse to believe that the Secretary of Agriculture is so against REA that he would apply more than a fourth of the mandatory cut to REA, when the repayment is about 100 percent. I refuse to believe he is that poorly advised. I know he is a poor Secretary of Agriculture in some ways, but not that bad.

Mr. MUNDT. The Secretary of Agriculture was sort of the leading advocate of expenditures in his State. He finally lost out as Governor because his State had gone into debt.

He is now a part of the President's team. This could happen if one has no confidence in his President. Here is one Republican who says that he does not believe the President is going to act with that kind of malice. If he does we can correct it. I do not think he will but should he do so, we have our own weapons available to correct such intemperate actions.

I would like to point out further that the Senator from Florida suggested that it could be taken away from the veterans, and they paraded a lot of amputees and serious mental cases around and said that is where the President would take it out. I do not know what kind of cruel person these Senators think the President is to believe and predict he would take the big meat ax against them. But we could correct such action also in the first bill that comes along and we would, and Senators know that we would.

With respect to most of the wires that the Senator from Florida read into the RECORD to the effect "don't touch the Mundt amendment," some people do not want any cut. I have discovered that when people do not want any economies they are most anxious to find arguments to support the position of spending. They talk about the possibility the President might cut this off or that off and do a lot of things which no responsible man would do, and consequently destroy certain functions of government.

Mr. President, it simply gets down to this: Do we want to do something about economy? This is the least you can do. Or would you like to send conferees of the Senate over to the House of Representatives emptyhanded, just carrying a couple of bottles of red ink and saying "Show us the conference report—no cut." Or do you want to send a constructive proposal over so we will have the entire problem before us in conference and out of this resolve the most sensible, effective, and efficient method to produce reductions in spending?

If we slap the House in the face, if we say to the 110 majority that voted for some cuts, "You are wrong; we do not have to economize," we shall be following the philosophy of Harry Hopkins—"Spend, spend, spend; bring on your tax bill."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. I yield myself 5 more minutes on the bill.

It is important that we look at the situation rationally. It is easy to get excited; it is easy to get emotional. But this is, after all, a mathematical problem.

I am pleading now for five votes. The Williams of Delaware amendment was lost by nine votes. Since then, four Senators have announced themselves. They have come to me and said they will vote for my amendment. I need the other five votes. The country needs the other five. The taxpayers need the other five. With those five votes, we can switch the movement so that we can do something constructive and effective for economy.

I make the plea: Let us not repudiate the House. Let us not reject the House thrust toward economy. Let us take this 5-percent reduction amendment to the House. It will not be the final legislation. It will have to be discussed, analyzed, amended, and changed. It can be changed in any way we want to change it in the conference between the Senate and the House. But if we vote in favor of the amendment, we will join the House in one important declaration. The House has declared that it wants economy. The House has taken one approach. By agreeing to this amendment, we shall have declared that we want economy, and we offer another approach. Within those two directives, the resolution can come back to us for our consideration of any proposal resembling some economy, and we can look at it again.

We will have complete latitude to do anything but spend more money. We will have complete latitude in the conference to do anything to economize. This will open the door for a meaningful movement toward economy.

One final word: What are we going to do when the tax bill comes up? I wonder if any other Senators have said what I have said: That we are not going to vote for a tax bill unless something is done toward economy, unless we have done something to reduce expenditures. I have said that; I am standing on it. I am sure others have said the same.

We are confronted with a logjam. The House Committee on Ways and Means will not meet; the Senate Committee on Finance is not meeting on taxes. Congress says it will not tell the President where to cut. The President says he wants Congress to tell him where to cut. So we are stuck.

But while we delay, inflation marches forward steadily every day, imposing the most iniquitous tax of all on the people of our respective States, taking out of the households of America bits and pieces of coin every day.

We cannot close our eyes and say, "Go away. Let us delay this until November 15." How much smaller will the deficit be 2 weeks from now? It is time we faced up to the task of economizing. It is going to be a long conference, believe me, no matter what we do. We ought to provide some constructive guidelines.

We should say, "Mr. President, we will break the logjam. We will cooperate. We will go so far as to tell you how much money we want to save. We will name the places where you can save it; then you should proceed to reduce expenditures. We will give you flexibility, but we think you should cooperate." My amendment is cooperation. It is a step in advance.

I do not think our constituents are appealed to greatly by the fact that we say, "We stand on our own. Make the President cut first. He stands on his own." So why not cooperate?

I realize I am in a curious position as a Republican pleading the cause of Democrats, asking them to show some confidence in their President. But I have offered an amendment which I believe will do the right thing in being coopera-

tive with the President. Some Democrats ought to be making this speech. I think we ought to have some confidence in the President in this effort to economize. We know he is making monumental decisions every day, decisions of far greater importance to the country, perhaps, than we make here today. If we have no more confidence in him than that, I think we are in serious condition and the country is in serious peril.

I am like the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. I am glad we have effectuated some economies. I hope we will effectuate some more on our remaining appropriations bills. But I am disappointed that we are not doing better. I am proposing that we do more. I am proposing that we add an extra $2 billion to whatever amount we have saved and whatever we expect to save on the few remaining bills. Even then, when we are all finished, we will still be woefully short of meeting the challenge of a $26 billion or a $29 billion deficit and the President's persistent demands for more tax revenue.

We can ill-afford to brag about the dollars we have cut back from an inflated Presidential estimate. That is all we have done. Now we must reconcile ourselves to the facts. I urge that we do so. I urge all Senators to cast their votes in such a way as not to discourage this economy effort, not to reject it, but by an affirmative vote send to conference another workable approach to the problem of economy.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Budget Director, as I mentioned earlier, listed for the Appropriations Committee some 75 controllable programs of the Federal Government. The list was not complete, but it included the major items. As reflected in the printed hearings, the Director discussed the dollar level of these controllable programs. These are the agencies, the bureaus, and the individual programs which would be affected by the Mundt amendment.

As I mentioned earlier, it is impossible to tell where the cuts would be made because of the discretion given to the President. But I have made some rough calculations to see how a 5-percent cut would work out in dollar terms. And bear in mind that these are additional cuts. Before they would be made, the original budget request would already have been whittled down, step by step, by the department head, the Budget Bureau, the President, the House Appropriations Committee, and the full House, the Senate Appropriations Committee, and the full Senate.

Throughout these stages, experts with sharp pencils have been at work. The figure from which the following additional reductions would be taken can hardly have any real fat left. All of the following reductions would have the full, direct dollar impact on the programs themselves.

The list is a long one. I hesitate to impose on my colleagues a full reading of all of the items. But perhaps this is the only way to finally bring home to us the meaning of what we are considering here. One last thing to bear in mind—these are the dollar cuts required by the Mundt amendment.

Department of Agriculture: Food for peace, Public Law 480, $89 million; rural electrification loans, $22 million; Forest Service, $12 million; Agricultural Research Service, $12 million; school lunch, $10 million; food stamp, $10 million; special milk, $5 million; watershed protection projects, $4 million; Farmers Home Administration, water and waste disposal grants, $2 million; Farmers Home Administration, salaries and expenses, $3 million.

Department of Commerce: Economic development assistance, $20 million; weather and other environmental services, $9 million; Maritime Administration, ship construction, $7 million; Census, $3 million.

Corps of Engineers: General construction, $49 million; other, $17 million.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Office of Education, elementary and secondary educational activities, $84 million; Office of Education, higher educational activities, $59 million; Office of Education, school assistance in federally affected areas, $22 million; Office of Education, expansion and improvement of vocational education, $13 million; Public Health Service, National Institutes of Health and National Institute of Mental Health, $77 million; Public Health Service, construction of health educational facilities, $10 million; Public Health Service, health manpower education, $9 million; Public Health Service, other disease prevention and environmental control programs, $8 million; grants for maternal and child welfare, $12 million; hospital construction Hill-Burton, $15 million.

Department of Housing and Urban Development: Model cities program, $33 million; water and sewer grants, $8 million; housing for the elderly or handicapped, $4 million.

Department of the Interior: Bureau of Indian Affairs, $11 million; construction grants for waste treatment works, $10 million; land and water conservation, $6 million; fisheries and wildlife programs, $5 million; Bureau of Reclamation, construction and rehabilitation, $9 million; power marketing agencies, $8 million; water supply and water pollution control, $5 million.

Department of Justice: Federal Bureau of Investigation, $9 million; legal activities and administration, $5 million; Immigration and Naturalization Service, $4 million.

Department of Labor: Manpower development and training activities, $20 million; wage and labor standards, $2 million.

Post Office Department: Plant and equipment, $10 million; administration and regional operation, $5 million; Research development and engineering, $1 million.

Department of State: Administration of foreign affairs, $11 million; educational exchange, $3 million.

Department of Transportation: Coast Guard, $26 million; supersonic transport, $10 million; other Federal Aviation Administration, $34 million; Federal Highway Administration, $3 million.

Treasury Department: Internal Revenue Service, $35 million; Bureau of Customs, $4 million; Bureaus of Public Debt and Accounts, $5 million.

Economic Assistance—Agency for International Development: Loans and guarantee programs, $65 million; Vietnam supporting assistance, $28 million; grants and other, $39 million.

Atomic Energy Commission: Operating expenses, $109 million; plant and capital equipment, $24 million.

General Services Administration: Operation of public buildings, $13 million; repair, improvement and construction of public buildings, $8 million.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration: Research and development, $200 million; administrative operations, $30 million.

National Science Foundation: Salaries and expenses, $26 million.

Office of Economic Opportunity: Community action programs, $51 million; Job Corps, $15 million; work and training programs, $32 million.

U.S. Information Agency: Salaries and expenses, $9 million; radio facilities, $1 million.

Veterans' Administration: Medical care, $68 million; general operating expenses, $9 million.

I urge the rejection of the Mundt amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield back the time remaining to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MUNDT. I yield back the remainder of my time, unless it has all been used.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on this amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota. 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 Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Alaska, [Mr. GRUENING] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] would each vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is paired with the

Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 46, as follows:

[No. 300 Leg.]

YEAS—43

Allott	Fannin	Pearson
Baker	Griffin	Percy
Bennett	Hansen	Prouty
Bible	Hickenlooper	Proxmire
Boggs	Hollings	Ribicoff
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Russell
Carlson	Javits	Spong
Church	Jordan, Idaho	Stennis
Cooper	Lausche	Symington
Cotton	McGovern	Talmadge
Curtis	Morton	Thurmond
Dirksen	Mundt	Williams, Del.
Dominick	Murphy	Young, N. Dak.
Eastland	Nelson	
Ervin	Pastore	

NAYS—46

Aiken	Hayden	Mondale
Anderson	Hill	Monroney
Bartlett	Holland	Montoya
Bayh	Inouye	Moss
Brewster	Jackson	Muskie
Burdick	Jordan, N.C.	Pell
Byrd, W. Va.	Kennedy, Mass.	Randolph
Cannon	Kennedy, N.Y.	Scott
Case	Long, Mo.	Smathers
Clark	Long, La.	Smith
Ellender	Magnuson	Tydings
Fong	Mansfield	Williams, N.J.
Gore	McClellan	Yarborough
Harris	McGee	Young, Ohio
Hart	McIntyre	
Hartke	Metcalf	

NOT VOTING—11

Brooke	Hatfield	Morse
Dodd	Kuchel	Sparkman
Fulbright	McCarthy	Tower
Gruening	Miller	

So Mr. MUNDT's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment to strike the language on page 1, line 6 beginning with the word "and." The time is under control.

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question first is on the committee amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh. Mr. President, we have to amend before we vote on the committee amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have an amendment at this juncture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois offers an amendment in lieu of the committee amendment, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read the amendment of Mr. DIRKSEN, as follows:

On page 1, line 6, beginning with the word "and" strike out down to and including line 13 on page 3 and insert the following:

"SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds that—

"(1) subsequent to the submission of the Budget for the fiscal eyar 1968 by the President in January of this year, conditions have drastically changed both as to estimated revenue receipts and estimated expenditures during the fiscal year 1968,

"(2) these changed conditions make a substantial reduction in such estimated expenditures imperative for the economic well-being and solvency of the country, and

"(3) the President has not taken or proposed action to effect a substantial reduction of such estimated expenditures.

"(b) It is the sense of the Congress that, before any final adjournment or recess of the first session of the Ninetieth Congress, the Congress should enact legislation limiting expenditures during the fiscal year 1968, whether from funds appropriated for such fiscal year or prior fiscal years, to an amount which is at least $5,000,000,000 less than the expenditures proposed in the Budget submitted by the President, unless, prior to such adjournment or recess, the President has notified the Congress that he has taken the necessary action to reduce such proposed expenditures during the fiscal year by at least $5,000,000,000."

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized. How much time does he yield himself?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the distinguished minority leader yield, without losing his right to the floor and the time not coming out of his time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield with that understanding.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the circumstances, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] may be recognized at this time, apart from the time limitation agreed to, and with the proviso that when he concludes, the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], will regain the floor and that his amendment will be pending.

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

ALLEGATIONS AGAINST SENATOR LONG OF MISSOURI

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, this is a matter of a report from the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct concerning the allegations that have been made with reference to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG]. I propose, for the committee, to read this report in full, after prefacing it by a few preliminary remarks, and then make a few additional remarks in conclusion.

I am sure this is of general interest, Mr. President, so I ask that we may have order, so Senators can hear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, Senators will recall that this matter arose through the allegations of an article in Life magazine and another newspaper or two, which were pointed out here on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. Soon thereafter, the committee talked with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG] about the matter, and he very willingly came in—may we have order, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; the Senate must be in order. The Senator will suspend until order is restored. Attachés and others who are milling about will remove themselves from the Chamber. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator may proceed.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Missouri came in and met with the committee, freely answered all questions that we asked, and gave us such information at that time as we desired.

Then, by unanimous vote of the committee, the chief counsel was directed to interview various persons who might have information about the payments to Senator LONG that had been mentioned in the magazine article and other related matters. In all, the committee staff interviewed 33 persons, and obtained records from three additional sources other than from those witnesses. The staff made four trips to interview people in St. Louis, New York, South Bend, and Chicago, in addition to Washington, D.C.

Mr. President, this report represents the unanimous agreement of the full committee of six members. I am very glad to be able to say that all members of the committee attended almost every meeting that we had—I think every member was present at every meeting except when one Senator was out of town.

The committee held seven meetings for the primary purpose of discussing and going over this matter, in addition to many other discussions that we had as individuals. The committee also held six hearings in executive session between July 17 and October 12 at which times the sworn testimony of 11 witnesses was heard.

I begin, now, to read the report, entitled "On the Matter of Senator EDWARD V. LONG, of Missouri:

The Committee has inquired into allegations against Senator Edward V. Long of Missouri. The allegations presented the principal issue as to whether payments made to Senator Long by Mr. Morris Shenker, a practicing attorney of St. Louis, Missouri, were made to influence the hearings on Invasions of Privacy conducted by the Judiciary Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, of which Senator Long was the Chairman, for the purpose of assisting Mr. James Hoffa of the International Teamsters Union.

That was the gravamen of the charge, or, as we call it here—the principal issue—whether or not the payments from Mr. Shenker to Senator LONG were made to influence those hearings, any hearings, or any act on his part as a Senator:

Senator Long came before the Committee and stated that all payments made to him by Mr. Shenker represented his share of fees earned by Mr. Shenker and himself between 1961 and the present for professional legal services rendered by them to five clients whom he named.

I call attention here to those dates, which cover really a broader period of time than was mentioned in the original charge:

The Committee staff interviewed Mr. Shenker, the clients or their representatives, and others who were found to have knowledge of the relationship between Mr. Shenker and Senator Long and of the services rendered to the clients. Mr. Shenker, each of the clients or their representatives, and staff members of the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure—

That was Senator LONG's subcommittee—

were then called before the Committee and testified under oath. At the direction of the Committee, the Committee staff obtained records of the clients and of Mr. Shenker—

I shall name these clients in a few minutes; they were substantial persons

or groups, some of them associates in business enterprises of various kinds. I shall describe them more fully later; but most of them were not small clients by any means—

relating to the fees, payments and services, which were presented in detail to the Committee. These records included copies of checks and their endorsements for all payments from four of the clients to Mr. Shenker, as well as all payments from Mr. Shenker to Senator Long.

Enlarging on that just a little bit, the clients paid the money to Mr. Shenker, and then Mr. Shenker paid Senator LONG the agreed part, representing the division between them.

With a few exceptions which we think are minor, we had before us all the cancelled checks of all those clients, showing the date paid by the bank and the bank's stamp endorsement. In addition, we had all the checks that Mr. Shenker gave to Senator LONG, also with bank markings:

In the case of the fifth client, not all of the payment checks could be found, but other financial records substantiating the payments were obtained. All of the checks bore regular bank endorsements showing dates of the payment by the bank, and also showed the amounts and the names of the payers and payees. This information corresponded with that of the payments stated to have been made by the clients and by Mr. Shenker.

To summarize briefly at this point: The testimony of Senator LONG and Mr. Shenker was corroborated, without any deviation in substance, by the clients, and further corroborated by these checks for which we now have copies.

To mention just one by way of illustration, here is a check dated December 13, 1961, payable to Mr. Shenker, which shows that it was paid by a bank on December 27, 1961. All the checks bear similar markings by the bank, with the date always stated, as is customary.

Mr. Shenker testified before the committee that the payments made by him to Senator Long represented Senator Long's share of legal fees earned from the five clients. The five clients or their representatives testified that the payments made by them to Mr. Shenker were for legal services rendered to them over a number of years. They testified that they knew that Senator Long was associated with Mr. Shenker in rendering legal and business counsel relating to the client's interests.

That is an important sentence. The word "they" means all the clients or their representatives. There was an estate involved and there were corporations involved:

They testified that they knew that Senator Long was associated with Mr. Shenker in rendering legal and business counsel relating to the clients' interests.

According to the testimony of their clients, or their representatives, and Mr. Shenker, the payments from the clients to Mr. Shenker as well as the payments from Mr. Shenker to Senator Long had no relationship whatsoever to Mr. Hoffa or to the Teamsters Union.

There was not any testimony showing any relation between these payments and Mr. Hoffa or the Teamsters Union.

Ordinarily we would not consider it wise or necessary to disclose the names of clients in a case like this; but under the circumstances of this case we believe it is necessary in order to give completeness and clarity to the meaning of the other facts developed and in view of the seriousness of the charges made against Senator Long. Therefore, we name the five clients in question as follows: The R. L. Warren Company, a stock brokerage and underwriting firm in St. Louis; Banner Industries Inc., a retail merchandising chain based in St. Louis; the Associated Life Insurance Company, a life and personal casualty insurance company, those home office is in Chicago and which does business in various States including Missouri; Mrs. Thelma Manne, a St. Louis woman who died in 1962; and Mr. Max Lubin, a St. Louis businessman.

The payment in the case of Mrs. Manne was made by her estate.

From the evidence and information that the committee has been able to develop, the committee has found no facts which show that either the payments to Mr. Shenker from the five clients, or the payments by Mr. Shenker to Senator Long, had any connection with Seantor Long's duties or activities as chairman of the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, the subcommittee hearings, or Senator Long's duties or activities as a Member of the Senate.

Under this state of facts, the committee finds no basis for public hearings.

As is true in all matters coming before it, the committee will hold itself in readiness to consider any additional evidence which may become available relating to this matter.

That would, of course, include evimittee.

The report is approved on this, the 25th day of October 1967. It is signed by all six members of the committee.

In summary and in substance, this entire case comes down at the present time to this: There is no connection shown between these transactions and Senator LONG's conduct as a Senator.

I refer back now for emphasis to what we stated in the very beginning paragraph:

The allegations presented the principal issue as to whether payments made to Senator Long by Mr. Morris Shenker, a practicing attorney of St. Louis, Missouri, were made to influence the hearings on Invasion of Privacy conducted by the Judiciary Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, of which Senator Long was the chairman, for the purpose of assisting Mr. James Hoffa of the International Teamsters Union.

That is, either in hearings or in any of his conduct, as a U.S. Senator.

That is what we inquired into and that is what we directed our attention to.

I think one other factual matter ought to be stated in fairness to Senator LONG. He and Mr. Shenker, who is a St. Louis lawyer with an extensive practice, have known each other for more than 25 years. That was part of the background that shed light on the case as a whole and showed that their association was not a sudden business connection that arose in this matter.

I think that covers the factual situation. I am not going to try to cover the evidence here, as I do not think it is necessary.

I did refer to the checks because they are documentary evidence showing the use of marking machines to indicate the date when the checks went through the bank in the normal course of business. They naturally have probative value.

Our activities were not confined merely to the persons I have mentioned here. Our activity went in other directions. We had sworn proof and testimony by some of the key staff members who conducted the subcommittee hearings. We went into many other matters. However, so far as we were able to determine, as I have said, there were no facts obtainable—and we can deal only in facts—that showed any connection other than that which I have described here and what the committee has described in its report.

That covers the report. I think it covers the necessary background of information. And I thank the Senate for the accommodation granted to the committee by way of unanimous consent.

Mr. President, for the sake of having the entire report in one place in the RECORD without any of my comments on the various parts thereof, I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, there was not sufficient time to prepare copies of the report for all of the Senators. However, we will make the report available to all Senators who request it. The report, of course, will be printed in the RECORD.

I especially thank every member of the committee for the long hours, the great concern and the utmost care given to this matter. Also I wish to thank our highly capable chief counsel, Mr. Ben Fern, and assistant counsel, Mr. Mike Spence. Each has performed in an admirable way.

I think the other committee members have all lived up to the finest traditions expected of a Member of this great body.

Mr. President, we will now return primarily to our labor of getting up a set of standards of conduct for the Senate. We have been interrupted on this task before. We have, however, been working on it to some extent even during the course of this investigation. I hope that we can have this ready some time during this session of Congress.

EXHIBIT 1

SELECT COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS AND CONDUCT, U.S. SENATE, REPORT ON THE MATTER OF SENATOR EDWARD V. LONG OF MISSOURI

The Committee has inquired into allegations against Senator Edward V. Long of Missouri. The allegations presented the principal issue as to whether payments made to Senator Long by Mr. Morris Shenker, a practicing attorney of St. Louis, Missouri, were made to influence the hearings on Invasions of Privacy conducted by the Judiciary Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, of which Senator Long was the Chairman, for the purpose of assisting Mr. James Hoffa of the International Teamsters Union.

Senator Long came before the Committee and stated that all payments made to him by Mr. Shenker represented his share of fees earned by Mr. Shenker and himself between 1961 and the present for professional legal services rendered by them to five clients whom he named.

The Committee staff interviewed Mr. Shenker, the clients or their representatives, and others who were found to have knowledge of the relationship between Mr. Shenker and Senator Long and of the services rendered to the clients. Mr. Shenker, each of the clients or their representatives, and staff members of the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure were

then called before the Committee and testified under oath. At the direction of the Committee, the Committee staff obtained records of the clients and of Mr. Shenker, relating to the fees, payments and services, which were presented in detail to the Committee. These records included copies of checks and their endorsements for all payments from four of the clients to Mr. Shenker, as well as all payments from Mr. Shenker to Senator Long. In the case of the fifth client, not all of the payment checks could be found, but other financial records substantiating the payments were obtained. All of the checks bore regular bank endorsements showing dates of the payment by the bank, and also showed the amounts and the names of the payers and payees. This information corresponded with that of the payments stated to have been made by the clients and by Mr. Shenker.

Mr. Shenker testified before the Committee that the payments made by him to Senator Long represented Senator Long's share of legal fees earned from the five clients. The five clients or their representatives testified that the payments made by them to Mr. Shenker were for legal services rendered to them over a number of years. They testified that they knew that Senator Long was associated with Mr. Shenker in rendering legal and business counsel relating to the clients' interests.

According to the testimony of the clients, or their representatives, and Mr. Shenker, the payments from the clients to Mr. Shenker as well as the payments from Mr. Shenker to Senator Long had no relationship whatsoever to Mr. Hoffa or to the Teamsters union.

Ordinarily we would not consider it wise or necessary to disclose the names of clients in a case like this; but under the circumstances of this case we believe it is necessary in order to give completeness and clarity to the meaning of the other facts developed and in view of the seriousness of the charges made against Senator Long. Therefore, we name the five clients in question as follows: The R. L. Warren Company, a stock brokerage and underwriting firm in St. Louis; Banner Industries Inc., a retail merchandising chain based in St. Louis; the Associated Life Insurance Company, a life and personal casualty insurance company, whose home office is in Chicago and which does business in various states including Missouri; Mrs. Thelma Manne, a St. Louis woman who died in 1962; and Mr. Max Lubin, a St. Louis businessman.

From the evidence and information the Committee has been able to develop, the Committee has found no facts which show that either the payments to Mr. Shenker from the five clients, or the payments by Mr. Shenker to Senator Long, had any connection with Senator Long's duties or activities as Chairman of the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, the Subcommittee hearings, or Senator Long's duties or activities as a Member of the Senate.

Under this state of facts the Committee finds no basis for public hearings.

As is true in all matters coming before it, the Committee will hold itself in readiness to consider any additional evidence which may become available relating to this matter.

Approved, this 25th day of October 1967.

JOHN C. STENNIS,
Chairman,
WALLACE F. BENNETT,
Vice Chairman,
A. S. MIKE MONRONEY,
EUGENE J. MCCARTHY,
JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
JAMES B. PEARSON,
U.S. Senators.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, it is needless for me to state that the report just given lifts a great burden off my shoulders. I am delighted with the report.

I express my deep appreciation to the chairman of the committee and to the other five members of the committee and to the members of the staff who have made this investigation.

This was a matter in which my honor and integrity were at stake for the first time in my entire career.

I am grateful to the committee and to the staff for going into this matter in so much detail. It was to my best interest that the matter be gone into in such minute detail as the chairman has outlined.

I express my gratitude and appreciation to the committee and to the staff for doing so.

I know that the investigation created a lot of work and a great problem for the members of the committee. I am sorry that I interfered with the work of the committee.

I am grateful that it is all over, and I appreciate the consideration and the effort that were put forth in bringing out all the facets and all the evidence in this matter.

Thank you so much.

Mr. STENNIS. Senator, I accept your expressions for the committee and for the entire Senate. You cooperated with us, also; you do not owe us anything, because we did not give you anything, except the honest conclusion to which the facts led us. I know you understand that, as does everyone else. But we do appreciate the spirit of the expression of gratitude as you have stated it.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 888) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time not be charged against either side.

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant 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 Senator from Illinois is recognized. How much time does the Senator yield himself?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. President, it has been said that the weakness of a democratic society is its refusal to face up to a crisis. I think, as I review as much history as I can encompass, that that is probably true. And that is probably true of our own society.

No one can serve in Congress a long period of time without concluding that when we are squarely up against a real crisis and a real challenge, we try to find ways to circumvent it instead of meeting it foursquare.

Now, let nobody argue that we are not confronted with a fiscal crisis, because we are. There is every indication that there is such a crisis and that it has to be met. First of all, we face this huge, looming deficit.

When the majority leader and I one evening spent 2 hours with the President, we went over that budget carefully and finally came up with a figure of $28.3 billion as a deficit. Well, that is a monumental deficit, if I ever saw one. And what it means, in homespun terms, is that after we have spent all the tax money which we take from individuals and corporations and from every other source, we shall still be short by $28.3 billion of paying our bills. It is that simple, and there is no prolixity or complexity about it.

I said to the President on that occasion:

> You might just as well throw that figure out of the window and make it $30 billion, because there are those unforeseen expenditures that are coming along, just as surely as day follows night, and they will have to be taken into account. I can't foresee everything that is down the road, but there is a crisis before the country, and a fiscal crisis is one of the most dangerous that I can think about.

You always have to consider the impact of this kind of deficit, first, on the interest rates, because this Government must borrow in the same market to which private enterprise, corporate entities, must go; and when there is keen competition for money, the interest rate is bound to go up.

If there is anything to the classical definition about inflation, that it means that there is more money than there are goods, and therefore goods will command higher prices, then of course we are going to have a dash of inflation.

This crisis also is affected by the fact that there has been an impasse on the so-called tax bill. The President has requested a surcharge tax of 10 percent, to yield, as I recall, roughly $6⅓ billion. That tax bill presently reposes in a pigeonhole in the Ways and Means Committee of the House, which is the revenue committee. We can do nothing about it, because all revenue measures must originate in the House of Representatives. We can amend, of course, if a bill comes this way; but essentially it must originate there. That is part, of course, of the dilemma which confronts us at the present time.

In addition, it is further complicated by the additional appropriations which have been voted, certainly by the Senate, if not by the House, and by the pay bills and other measures that have come along.

What intrigues me about it, when I say that a free country, a democracy, does not face up to a challenge, is the rather quaint language that appeared in the original resolution submitted by Representative WHITTEN, of Mississippi, with

respect to this interim resolution; because among other things was a rather interesting protective clause that nothing be done to permit the suspension of new starts in appropriations. That is by way of confessing, on the part of Congress, that you can get sacrifices where you will, but so far as we are concerned, we want no profane governmental hands to be laid upon public works projects, because those are peculiarly our own. If anything is needed to demonstrate that we refuse to face up to a crisis, that is it.

Then, in addition, were the exemptions there for the Post Office Department, for the Customs Service, and for the Internal Revenue Service, as if there might not be an opportunity to save money in those Federal activities as well.

Mr. President, it is not a happy thing to say; but, frankly, Congress is not doing its duty. The Constitution gives it the power of the purse. I am not unmindful of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, when we set up the General Accounting Office. We provided for a budget and a lot of other things. But that in no way relieves Congress of its responsibility when it comes to being keeper of the purse. That reluctance on new starts is an excellent example of how we have circumvented our duty. But the power of the purse is still here.

It is apparent that the President has made no recommendations, nor has anything been done under the General Accounting Act of 1921.

So the dilemma is here. I have spoken with some of the House leaders today. I know how adamant they are about this whole matter and what difficulty is going to be encountered in conference. It is not going to be easy. They are not going to be satisfied with a third or a fourth of a loaf. The Senate had better make up its mind to do something and if it does not, there is going to be a stalemate in that conference, or I will be badly mistaken.

This amendment, of course, is essentially only a sense of the Senate and House resolution. I can include the House and it still will not be subject to a point of order, in my judgment. But it calls attention to the fact that there have been changes since the original 1968 budget has been submitted and that there have been remarkable changes in the conditions that require action in the interest of our economic well-being and our solvency; and it calls attention to the fact that the President has not actually, nor has he proposed, any action with respect to a substantial reduction of estimated expenditures.

So it becomes the sense of the Congress that with respect to appropriated funds for the fiscal year 1968 and for funds previously appropriated that might be spent, there be a net reduction in an amount of $5 billion on those expenditures.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator could tell us what action Congress would have to take in order to meet the requirements of this amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, Congress would have to take the same action that it took in 1946, for in that year we had a rescission bill, and that bill by line and page spelled out exactly where all reductions were to be made; and we did it and we did it in a good, workmanlike, and business fashion.

I think I can point that out very concretely. Here is a copy setting that forth. This is Public Law 301 in the 79th Congress. That was in 1946. Title I reads:

> Executive Office of the President, Independent Offices, and Executive Departments.

We started right in with the Office of Emergency Management, the Independent Offices, the executive departments, one by one.

Here is the 17-page report.

Mr. ELLENDER. That would mean all of the appropriations heretofore enacted by Congress would have to be gone over by the Committee on Appropriations. According to the resolution and the evidence that was given to us by Mr. Schultz, appearing on page 54 of the Senate hearings on House Joint Resolution 888, the areas where appropriations are controllable amounted to $38 billion. In order to accomplish a savings of $5 billion in expenditures he reported that a fiscal 1968 appropriations reduction of $10 billion would be required.

Is the Senator familiar with that testimony?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It might well be.

Mr. ELLENDER. Here is the testimony and I shall quote it:

> Now, the total that I have listed and a few other smaller ones I haven't mentioned come in appropriations to $38 billion, in round numbers. To get $5 billion in expenditures out, which the Bow amendment talks about, would take about $10 billion out of that $38 billion.

The total that the Budget Director referred to appears in the hearing record immediately above the testimony which I quoted. The amounts of controllable appropriations and the areas where they may be found are listed. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the list be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

Areas where appropriations are controllable (not locked in)

	Thousands
Agriculture	$3,900
Commerce	970
Corps of Engineers	1,300
Health, Education, and Welfare	7,500
Interior	1,600
Housing and Urban Development	1,100
Justice	437
Labor	530
Post Office	585
Transportation	1,500
Treasury	920
Agency for International Development	2,600
State	300
Atomic Energy Commission	2,600
General Services Administration	560
National Aviation and Space Agency	4,500
National Science Foundation	526
Veterans	1,600
Office of Economic Opportunity	2,060
Military and civilian pay raises	1,000
Other	2,000
Total	38,088

Mr. DIRKSEN. All I have to say is that it is a question of whether the Congress of the United States has enough sacrificial spirit and enough diligence and is willing to tackle this job regardless of what any budget officer in this Government may say. To implement that fact I go back to what we did in 1946.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I can show cuts in 1946 that were holdovers from the war period, as low as $40 for the Naval Observatory; another is $572; for the Hydrographic Office, $94,942; the Office of Naval Intelligence, salaries, $2,932.

There was not an item that they did not go through, and with adequate staff. Mr. President, I am speaking now not off of the top of my head but from 17 years on Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

If we have the will to do the job we can do it. They can amend this resolution any way they see fit, but I have an idea that if we go to the other body, which is pretty adamant about this business, with a simple continuing resolution it is going to be a while before you will ever get an agreement in a conference committee.

Why should we not indicate our desire to get something done because the country is fully conscious and sensibly alerted to the whole question of economy? I do not want to be talking out of one side of my mouth and then going along like a good Senator with the Committee on Appropriations when they come in with a unanimous vote on an appropriations bill, when I may have violent objection to some item.

I want to declare an intent now, and when I am confronted with a charge that I was doing a lot of double talk on economy, this is the only way I have of saying to the country: Well, at least I submitted this proposal to the Senate and they did not take it. From then on I absolve myself of culpability and blame.

Mr. ELLENDER. I presume my good friend from Illinois realizes that since the amount on which cuts are going to be made aggregates only $38 billion, that would mean a cut of almost a third. In this huge amount is the space program of $4.5 billion; agriculture, $3.9 billion; Corps of Engineers, $1.3 billion, and many other programs.

I am wondering where we will be able to obtain the $10 billion which must be cut from current appropriations out of $38 billion in order to accomplish what the Senator seeks to do. I doubt that anyone would advocate reducing each of the items on the list I have just inserted in the RECORD by one-third. That is what would be necessary, presumably.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield myself 10 minutes under the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Would the Senator like to amend this to make it $4 billion?

Mr. ELLENDER. No. I think I would rather leave it to the Committee on Appropriations as we have done in the past.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, you are.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Am I correct that in a rescission bill, like the original appropriation act, it must originate in the House of Representatives?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not believe so.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wonder about that. This resolution simply expresses the sense of the Senate that unless the President finds some way to reduce this amount we propose to do it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Precisely.

Mr. McCLELLAN. We propose to do it by a rescission act. This gives the President one more chance and if he does not do it we propose to do so by this resolution. We would bind ourselves to do it, and to stay here during this session of Congress until we bring out a rescission bill and undertake to work out cuts in it and that we find we can make, should make, or are willing to make, in order to bring in the appropriations and expenditures; is that correct?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Congress will still have the opportunity to meet its responsibilities, if the President does not. I do not know whether he will or not. I do not know how difficult it will be to take that much out of here, but at least a rescission bill can be brought in and Congress can work its will on making cuts in appropriations already made which, in my judgment, is the right way to do it. I voted against these other proposals because I do not want to tell the President, "Go and cut wherever you will. Take whatever you want to and apply it somewhere else." I think we should take that responsibility. I hope that there will be a rescission bill to which I can offer amendments to cut those things which I think should be cut. The Senator from Illinois can do the same thing, and other Members of Congress can do the same thing.

Finally, when we can work out certain substantial reductions in appropriations, I think that is what we should do. I think that is what we must follow. If I understand the resolution correctly, it expresses the sense of the Senate that that is what we should do.

I thank the Senator from Illinois for yielding to me.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Make the record abundantly clear that this is a matter before us of a House joint resolution—No. 888. It comes from the House Appropriations Committee. This is a sense of the Senate resolution. It is quite in order on a resolution of this kind. I do not bind them. I would just like to get a declaration of intent on the part of the Senate when they go to conference on this measure, because it is going to run up against the Rock of Gibraltar in the House of Representatives before they get through.

The Senator from Arkansas is so perfectly right in this matter, if we can agree to a rescission bill and see where they can cut. But that is a matter for both Appropriations Committees and for a further recommendation to vote.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I was laboring under the impression that possibly a rescission bill would have to originate over in the House.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. They may so contend.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thought the Senator said a while ago that he did not think so, but assuming it does, it will be their responsibility on what to cut in appropriation bills already passed, and to initiate a rescission bill. If they do not do it, and if we can do it, the Senate should do it here, I think.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. As a matter of clarification, if Congress winds up cutting appropriations under the budget estimate by $5 billion, would this apply?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think so.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Another $5 billion on top?

Mr. JAVITS. No, it would not. All appropriations.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am thinking of the total cut of $5 billion.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is in expenditures.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In expenditures, right.

Mr. ELLENDER. That means, then, a $10 billion cut in appropriations.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Both expenditures made under the 1968 appropriations and expenditures made under prior appropriations. There is a wealth of unobligated money floating around this Government by the billions of dollars which we have never touched, and somehow we do not try to touch it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Could we fill out the factual situation? Perhaps it would help everyone. That is the reason I am speaking, because I have it clearly in mind, and I think that I am right. We have already reduced appropriations below the budget by roughly $2 billion-plus——

Mr. ALLOTT. Three billion-plus.

Mr. JAVITS. Three billion-plus. The resolution to the pending bill may reduce it another $2 billion. That would mean $5 billion from the appropriations. I realize that is not yet what the Senator has in mind.

As to expenditures, the budget called for expenditures of approximately $135 billion in which, roughly speaking, some 70 percent or better are out of current appropriations, and 30 percent, roughly, in round figures, out of previous appropriations. The proportions may be somewhat different.

As I understand what the Senator has in mind on this resolution, if the aggregate cut in appropriations below the budget, those already imposed and those to be imposed, it would aggregate $5 billion. The Senator, notwithstanding the reduction in his resolution, would consider that that met congressional intent?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, and the language here bears on that point.

Mr. JAVITS. If the aggregate reduction in expenditures from the proceeds of the appropriation bills and the proceeds of appropriations already made exceeds $5 billion, then certainly this would have been satisfied? So that to speak of it as $10 billion is inaccurate, for this reason: Surely, if we are cutting $5 billion out of expenditures based solely on what we are appropriating in 1968 and the appropriation bills, we have to have the cut of $10 billion, but if we are not doing that, because we are addressing ourselves to the present appropriation bills already passed——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Exactly.

Mr. JAVITS. In the early part of this fiscal year and those appropriations which carry over in terms of expenditures, on that basis I understand the Senator from Illinois clearly and I think the Senate does as well.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I notice that even the Bow amendment to the resolution in the other body exempts defense expenditures necessary in connection with Vietnam. Does the Senator think that that exemption at least should appear in his proposed amendment?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am not sure that any exemption should appear. I give the Senator some reasons why.

As the resolution was introduced, or at least got to the floor, by Representative WHITTEN of Mississippi, it contained exemptions for the military insofar as it related to Vietnam, social security, retirement pensions, veterans, and other items.

Almost always, in every discussion I have ever heard about rescissions, I know that a special point was made of those items. I do not quarrel with that. I do not believe it is necessary to tell Congress about it because both Houses of Congress are compassionate about our veterans and the Veterans' Administration. Both Houses of Congress are as much interested in it.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I doubt whether we have to pinpoint all those items. It would simply complicate the resolution. They went further and gave the President power to exempt the Customs Service and the Internal Revenue Service if the reduction had an impact on efficient collection of revenue. They went further than that and included a number of things. Then, for good measure, they added other proposals and exemptions and new starts, so that they could not be touched.

Now, I like to take the bitter with the sweet. If we are going to do something, let us not hump it all in under one department of Government. Let us exercise our responsibility under the Constitution, because the purse is still on Capitol Hill,

whether we like it or not, and we cannot disdain, we cannot absolve ourselves from that responsibility, no matter which way or how thick we cut it.

Thus, that is one reason why I did not complicate this resolution with a lot of exemptions. Let the committees do it. I am not going to pinpoint and say, "Keep your hands off this" or "Do not touch that." There are a few sacred cows in Government, I found out long ago. But, there are not very many. I think everyone knows where they are.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator will recall, I suspect, that I have had a printed amendment at the desk which I had expected to propose, but it is not appropriate now because it was drawn up against the background of our having passed only six appropriation bills at that time and having achieved a saving of only $2 billion at that time, whereas that picture has decidedly changed now and I have not had a chance to redraft the amendment. But I call attention to the fact that on lines 8 and 9 of that amendment I stated as the sense of Congress—I did not use the same words—that Congress believes that a total saving of $3 billion can be accomplished in the spending budget for fiscal year 1968, without severe disruption of the vital functions of Government.

I drafted that amendment in anticipation of what I thought would be—and I recited it in the amendment—a total saving in appropriations of approximately $5 billion.

My own feeling now is that, as well intentioned as the amendment is, a $5 billion cut in expenditures when applied to a situation with appropriations which have been considerably reduced from what they were—we have not reduced appropriations of earlier years, but we have reduced very largely proposed appropriations for this year—will be too deep a bite and too great a cut to be readily placed anywhere in the controllable items.

I was wondering if the distinguished Senator would give thought to a change to $4 billion or even $3 billion in view of the fact that we have already shown that budgeted appropriations are going to be reduced in excess of $5 billion.

The Senator, of course, drafted his amendment, likewise, on the basis of what was available at the time it was drafted. We have been passing bills rapidly and have been bringing them out of conference—two bills which have not been acted on, as well as two yesterday—all of which had substantial reductions.

I was wondering if the Senator would give consideration to a proposed reduction of the $5 billion, which would be for the purpose of the spending budget, which is quite a different thing from the appropriations budget, to either $3 billion or $4 billion. I merely make that suggestion.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I understand the President is going to send over another supplemental bill totaling about $4 billion for the war in Vietnam. Would that mean we would have to effect a $9 billion reduction in expenditures?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If it is going to be in the 1968 budget and it becomes an expenditure, then we are going to have to find the $5 billion somewhere. I must emphasize that a cut in appropriations is one thing, because we can appropriate $500 million for a project, and then have an expenditure of only $10 or $20 million in the first fiscal year. But as we go along, that is when it begins to increase. It is necessary in this fiscal year and the next fiscal year, not 10 years from now, to meet this fiscal crisis. It is here.

I point out that Great Britain is in a dilemma and the Prime Minister is fighting like made to prevent the devaluation of the pound. We are informed that West Germany has agreed to buy $125 million of our bonds. Then we go into the open market to compete with business and industry, and watch the interest rates go up. I do not want that on my conscience.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I just call attention to the fact that payments are being made this year on ships or airplanes or Government buildings of any kind, or VA hospitals, or many other products which are not built in a year, and for which the appropriations made 2 and 3 and 4 years ago are in part applicable. All of that has to be considered. I was especially thinking about the defense matter, because we do have ships building and we do have planes in the pipe line. It seems to me the exception of at least the Vietnam defense spending might be helpful, but I simply suggest that to the distinguished Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is not an easy thing, on a pleasant afternoon, when the Senate is in a good mood, to reduce the ante by $1 billion.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I want to ask the minority leader if, in requesting a $5 billion reduction below the budget request, he takes into consideration the probable reduction in the foreign aid program, which has not yet been authorized. I believe there will be a $800 million cut in the authorization, and there will probably be some further reduction in the appropriation. Will the $5 billion reduction be in addition to that reduction or will the additional billion come out of the $5 billion reduction which the Senator's amendment would provide. Would the reductions enacted up to now come out of the $5 billion proposed or will it be in addition?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Anything which is expended pursuant to appropriations in this fiscal year comes within this.

Mr. AIKEN. That would be within the $5 billion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

I make the emphatic point that everything that has been said in behalf of the tax bill which is languishing in the House Ways and Means Committee finally winds up with: "Sop up this extra spending money by a surcharge on present taxes, both individual and corporate. In so doing you take this spending money out of the economic bloodstream and you ease the inflationary pressures."

It can be done two ways. It can be done by taking it away from everybody after they have it. It can be prevented from falling into their hands during this fiscal year by chopping it off before it ever gets to the corporate treasury or to the hands of the individual. Take your choice.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. PERCY. I would like to indicate my support for the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Illinois for a number of reasons.

First, this Saturday morning, I was at a business council meeting, at which 200 of the most distinguished businessmen in this country, representing virtually every State, were in attendance. I have never, in the 12 years I have been attending these meetings, seen the business community so concerned about whether or not Congress will face up to its responsibility. Many of them have, individually or collectively, called upon the Congress to cut expenses and called upon the President to cut expenses. They have said they are so concerned about inflation in this country that many of them indicated their support for a tax increase. They all feel that the problem must be attacked first at the spending level.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. PERCY. Second, I support the amendment because the Secretary of the Treasury has recently said that if we do not have a tax increase the economy will be in a shambles. The same effect can be had by reducing expenditures first, since the cuts now under consideration would yield $5 billion or $6 billion.

The third reason is that when the President put in his budget early this year, we had a forecast of an $8.5 billion deficit. Many of the appropriations were based on that figure. We now have a forecast of a $28 billion to $30 billion deficit. We have to reflect that in the votes we make on the floor, but the executive branch which formulated the appropriations should lend its expertise to the task as well.

Fourth, the cruelest tax of all is inflation. It is ridiculous to be voting for bills to help people in the lower income levels one day and the next day be voting for appropriations which impose the cruelest tax of all; namely, inflation. Everyone who is living on a fixed income and social security will suffer in an insidious decline in their standard of living.

Lastly, I addressed a group of businessmen who were visiting this country with the cooperation of private organizations for the purpose of encouraging them to invest in American industry. Those are the same people to whom, year after year, the Government has been

saying and lecturing, "You must put your fiscal house in order. Cut down expenses and stop inflation." That is the very question they are putting to us today—what we have been telling them for 20 years.

I support the amendment because I believe it is a meaningful device wherewith to bring about spending reductions. In my maiden speech in the Senate, which was listened to by at least two or three of the pages in a late morning hour, I chose this subject; I thought then and I feel more strongly now: it is as important as anything we can do to cut the budget by $5 or $6 billion. After such cuts, if it were still necessary, I would support a tax increase to stop the spread of inflation.

This amendment is logical and needed, and I enthusiastically support it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me say to my respected junior colleague that if any Member of this body can speak with authority, he can. He was at one time the head of one of the largest enterprises in this country, the Bell & Howell Co. in Chicago. It is a worldwide enterprise and a worldwide business, and it is big business.

He has been in and out of these problems over quite a period of time. So I welcome his testimony on this matter, because I do believe he speaks with rare authority.

I yield the floor.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon, at the time of the unanimous-consent agreement, assurance was given by the distinguished majority leader that time would be yielded on the bill; and I wish to be recognized.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There will not be much time available. How much time does the Senator wish?

Mr. ALLOTT. Ten minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I had better check and find out. Before or after the vote on the amendment?

Mr. ALLOTT. Before the vote.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has 25 minutes remaining on the bill.

Who yields time?

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

I have only one other observation to make. It was late last year that a celebrated French financier came here and was interviewed at considerable length and on a number of occasions.

Making it desperately emphatic, he said, "You are in jeopardy; you are headed for danger, and you will not face up to it."

What do Senators think is going to happen to the credit of this country in the treasuries abroad, with President de Gaulle raiding our gold supply—it gets thinner and thinner—and with stories in the air, now, that the cover will be taken off the Federal Reserve notes? What then? With the cover off of the demand deposits and Federal Reserve notes, what is left except a managed paper currency, and nothing more?

We are headed for trouble, and this kind of expenditure increases the danger. I do not believe we properly respond to our duty in this body by trying always to jockey for political position, to see whether we cut or whether the cut is coming from the other end.

The President is the executive branch, and, therefore, an independent coordinate branch of Government.

I want to see Congress do its duty under the Constitution. I am chargeable, as one Member of this legislative branch, and I wish to be able to go home and stand on a platform in front of everybody and say, "Here is what I tried to do, and I could not get support enough to do it, so I absolve myself from responsibility, and you put the blame where it belongs when these interest rates start going up, when inflation gets its fingers into the price of every commodity in every grocery store."

It will happen, just as surely as day follows night.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. PELL. Would I be correct in assuming that if passed, this cut could be made from the defense budget as well as any other item?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, it could, yes.

Mr. PELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But can you imagine a Member of Congress so little interested in the security of this country as to cut the defense budget?

I say to my friend, I was around here for another war, and was on an Appropriations Committee when we were appropriating for war, and I was here when we had the rescission bill of 1946. I have a copy of that bill in the form it became law. I know what the general attitude of Congress is in these matters.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

We did not have to pinpoint it and say, "Do it here or do it there."

Mr. PELL. If this passed, I would hope some of it would come out of the Defense Department. I was wondering whether it could come out of it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, they are free to vote for it, if that is the way they want to do it. But I leave it to the committees on this and the other side of the Capitol, and am willing to let them come in with their recommendations. This is no place to try to do it item by item or line by line, as anyone knows whoever had much experience on an Appropriations Committee.

Mr. President, I close by saying to the Senate, "You had better not go back to the other end of the Capitol empty-handed, because if you do, you are going to have trouble in the conference committee, believe me."

I yield the floor, and I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 10 minutes on the bill.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, first I wish to say that I intend to support the amendment of the distinguished minority leader; but I think it is very important that the record be clear, because few people understand it, as to why the control of appropriations alone will not reduce expenditures accordingly.

May we have order, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. ALLOTT. To the average individual, it appears obvious that if you cut the appropriations $5 billion, you have therefore cut expenditures by $5 billion.

I refer anyone who is interested to page 49 of "The Budget in Brief," on which there appears a flow chart which illustrates more graphically than anything else I have seen why a cut in appropriations does not equal a cut in expenditures. In other words, to cut $1 billion from expenditures, you have to cut at least $2 billion, or perhaps $3 billion or even more at this time of the year, out of appropriations.

Referring to this chart, we see, for example, that the new authority recommended to Congress this year was $144 billion. Of that new authority only $95.7 billion was to be used in 1968. But unspent from previous years is $125.6 billion, of which $39.3 billion flows into 1968, making the total expenditures for 1968 $135 billion.

Those same past authorizations, unspent, flowing forward in later years, together with what flows forward from the authorization this year, result in unspent authorizations for expenditures in following years of $132.8 billion.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Using those calculations—and I think the Senator is correct—would it not follow, then, that this resolution, to cut expenditures by $5 billion, might require a cut in appropriations of about $10 billion?

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is correct, and I intend to discuss that in a few moments.

Mr. President, various figures have been used on the floor here today to indicate the economies being effected. I have in my hands a table which is up to date as of noon today. This includes the action of the conference committee on NASA and the conference committee on Independent Offices, which we have every reasonable expectation, at the moment, to think that the House of Representatives will accept, although we might be surprised. In addition to those items, it includes all bills which have been enacted into law, and shows that thus far, the conference committees have agreed upon total appropriations of $100,118,000,000, which figure is $3,209,000,000 under the President's budget. That is as of noon today. I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[Dollars in millions]

Bill	Adjusted budget estimate	House passed	Senate reported	Senate passed	Budget (plus or minus)	Conference	Budget (plus or minus)	Public Law
Agriculture	$5,021.09	$4,770.58	$6,782.53	$6,782.53	+$1,761.43	$4,952.95	−$68.14	90-116
Defense	71,548.00	70,295.20	70,156.42	70,132.32	−1,427.58	69,936.63	−1,647.38	90-93
District of Columbia	526.06	463.34						
Foreign aid	3,818.74							
Independent offices	10,802.51	10,013.18	10,431.46	10,514.83	−305.68	10,139.47	−681.13	
Interior	1,458.22	1,365.31	1,399.24	1,399.36	− 58.86	1,382.85	− 75.37	90-28
Labor-HEW	13,424.15	13,137.48	13,409.84	13,421.66	−2.49			
Legislative	275.70	228.09	274.41	275.89		275.70		90-57
Military construction	2,937.00							
NASA	5,100.00	4,583.40	4,678.90	4,678.90	−421.10	4,578.90	−521.20	
Public works	4,867.81	4,622.92	4,776.06	4,776.06	−91.75			
State, Justice, and Commerce	2,342.94	2,194.03	2,185.87	2,186.11	−156.83			
Transportation	1,718.62	1,530.20	1,651.41	1,651.41	−67.21	1,581.91	−136.71	90-112
Treasury-Post Office	7,615.15	7,499.23	7,555.17	7,555.17	−59.98	7,545.64	−69.51	90-47
Total	131,473.99	120,474.87	123,036.90	123,098.35		100,118.35	−3,209.36	
Plus interest on debt	14,200.00							
Total	145,673.99							

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the real substance of the issue is that Congress has been irresponsible over the past 2 or 3 years in its spending authorizations, and has appropriated excessive amounts. It is a cold fact that there exists today a new breed of economists, who believe that we cannot spend too much on this Government, and can spend ourselves into prosperity. We have finally come down to the hard nub. We nearly came against the crash gates a year ago in September.

We have again come around that circle in another year, and are down to the hard nub. We have to do something about it.

I hold in my hand a UPI dispatch under today's date from the Department of Labor, I believe. It states as follows:

An average city family of four needs an income of at least $9,191 to maintain a modest standard of living, according to the government.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire UPI dispatch to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

COST OF LIVING

WASHINGTON.—An average city family of four needs an income of at least $9,191 to maintain a modest standard of living, according to the Government.

This is more than double the amount the Government estimated was needed in 1951 and is $3,091 a year more than was needed in 1959.

The most expensive city in the 48 adjacent States is New York, where the average family would need $10,293 per year.

The least expensive of the cities surveyed was Austin, Tex., where a family of four could get by on $8,088.

Honolulu was even more expensive than New York. A family there would need an income of $11,489 to maintain a modest standard of living. And Alaska is even more expensive than that, though not included in the survey.

The figures released by the Bureau of Labor Statistics yesterday represented living costs last fall. They are presumably even higher now.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, it is ridiculous to find that income requirements have more than doubled since 1951 to maintain a modest standard of living, but it does show what the policies of this Government have been. And we cannot exonerate ourselves, nor can we excuse ourselves from our part in this procedure.

The distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee said yesterday in the Senate:

Mr. President, if it is necessary to reduce expenditures at this time, before the Congress adjourns, I recommend that the Committees on Appropriations of the two Houses undertake an examination of the bills which have been signed into law and the bills which will be sent to the White House soon, and if the amounts are found to be excessive, that a rescission bill be considered in the two Houses.

I agree wholeheartedly with that proposal except that I do not think that action will be taken.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues a bill that has been offered by me in the past and also this year. It is S. 1611, and it does for the Congress exactly what was proposed in the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

My bill would provide that before any one appropriation bill became law, all appropriations bills would have to be enacted and they would all have to be reviewed and Congress would have to adopt a resolution approving the total amount appropriated. Congress would then have put its final stamp of approval on the total appropriations, not just one of 15 parts.

So far, I have not been able to obtain any hearings on the bill. However, I commend the bill to the attention of my colleagues, because if we are going to gain control of the fiscal picture of this country, we must adopt some such approach as this.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my bill, S. 1611, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

S. 1611

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That unless otherwise expressly provided therein, no expenditure authorization contained in a general appropriation Act for any fiscal year shall become effective until there shall have been enacted—

(1) all other general appropriation Acts for such fiscal year; and

(2) a joint resolution containing a statement of the aggregate amount of expenditure authorizations for such fiscal year contained in all such general appropriation Acts, including any amendments thereto, and a statement to the effect that the Congress approves the expenditure of such aggregate amount.

SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

(1) The term "expenditure authorization" means an appropriation, contract authorization, authorization to spend from public or corporate debt receipts, limitation on expenditures authorized to be incurred against revolving funds or funds of government corporations, cancellation of obligations of Government agencies to the Treasury, reappropriation, reauthorization, or any other authorization to withdraw moneys from the Treasury of the United States, but does not include an appropriation of trust funds or a transaction involving public debt retirement.

(2) The term "general appropriation Act" does not include a deficiency or supplemental appropriation Act, or an Act or joint resolution providing temporary expenditure authorizations pending enactment of a regular appropriation Act.

SEC. 3. This Act shall be effective with respect to general appropriation Acts for fiscal year 1968 and subsequent fiscal years.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois has apparently stepped off the floor for a moment. I think that his proposal would be better received in terms of reality if the figure in the proposal were reduced to $4 billion rather than $5 billion.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I agree completely with the distinguished Senator. I think that a $4 billion reduction in the spending budget is within reach and within reason. I would rather have it $3 billion, but $4 billion is within reach. I do not think that $5 billion is reasonable. It would destroy a great many vital activities of the Government.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois has just returned to the floor. I have said in his absence that I am going to support his amendment because I feel it is just indefensible for the Senate of the United States—knowing the situation in England, knowing almost for a certainty what effect the reaction that takes place there will have on this country, and knowing that infla-

tion is increasing day by day—after the efforts of the House, even though we may disagree with the way in which the House took action—were to simply go back to the House this afternoon with a simple continuing resolution saying: "We have changed the date from November 23 to November 15, but this is the best we can do."

It is not the best we can do. We can do a lot better. And that is the reason that I have voted for the Williams amendment and the Mundt amendment. That is the reason I will vote for the pending amendment.

I would vote for the amendment of the Senator from Florida, which he may or may not offer later; but we cannot say to the people of this country: "The Senate is so derelict in its responsibilities that, after the efforts on the part of the House to limit expenditures, the best we can do in the Senate is to come back to the House with a little continuing resolution after having exercised great ability here by merely changing the date of the continuing resolution from November 23 to November 15."

Mr. President, I cannot go home to my people and say that this is all we could do. Mr. President, I wish to propound a question to the distinguished minority leader.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is allotted 2 minutes on the joint resolution.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, in view of the explanation which the Senator heard me make yesterday, and the substance of which I have stated again today, relative to the position on appropriations and expenditures, would the Senator be willing to modify his amendment to $4 billion rather than $5 billion, which would be a more realistic figure, at least in my opinion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My friend, $1 billion is a lot of money to talk about on the Senate floor on a lovely afternoon when I am in a pretty good mood. That is my trouble. I always feel like bargaining, as the Senator knows, but how much we will have left by way of actual reductions before we get through, I do not know.

I will modify the amendment with respect to expenditures in Vietnam and use the language that appears in the House amendment—"except by those expenditures in excess of $22 billion that the President may determine are necessary in behalf of our military effort in Southeast Asia."

They fully agree on that. And I am content to add that to my proposal.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I have discussed this suggestion with quite a few Senators, and I think there are some who realize the relationship of appropriations and expenditures and who honestly believe that a $10 billion cut is not within the realm of possibility, but that if a $4 billion expenditure limit were placed in the amendment, rather than $5 billion, some of them at least might be prone to support the amendment.

I offer that only by way of suggestion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will my friend bargain for $4.5 billion?

Mr. ALLOTT. Such an amount will not get the votes that the other amount would receive, I tell my friend.

The Senator has my vote anyway, but I think that $4 billion is a much more realistic figure.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I submit a modification of the amendment which is on the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modification will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

In line 7 of subsection (b) and after "President," insert the following: "except by those expenditures in excess of $22 billion that the President may determine are necessary in behalf of our military effort in Southeast Asia."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I so modify my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is accordingly modified.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think there is still a little time left on the bill.

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

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in looking over the proposal of the distinguished minority leader, there come to mind a number of questions which I think are worth considering. In the first place, this sense of the Congress resolution has to do not with appropriations, but with expenditures. And there is a great difference between expenditures and appropriations per se.

I believe the distinguished Senator from Florida has indicated that the Appropriations Committees have in mind a cut from the original request for this year of somewhere between $4 billion and $5 billion when all of the bills are taken care of.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. That has now gone well over $5 billion.

Mr. MANSFIELD. With the other appropriation bills?

Mr. HOLLAND. With the bills already voted on and the cuts that are assured, meaning the highest figure enacted by either House, and without very great new cuts on the supplemental request—I think there will be cuts in the OEO for this year—it would still be well over $5 billion.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think that speaks well for the responsibility which Congress has shown once again.

I think we ought also to keep in mind the fact that estimated revenue receipts are down, and estimated expenditures for the fiscal year 1968 are up.

In the case of Vietnam, it is my understanding that there will be sought, a further increase of $4 billion, and it appears to me that under the proposal now before the Senate there are no exemptions for funds allocated to Vietnam.

Furthermore, it is my understanding that the original budget request was approximately $135 billion. Since then, it has been increased by $1.5 billion, so that now it amounts to $136.5 billion.

I hope that this matter will be studied thoroughly. I do not believe it is in the best interests of the Senate, much less the Congress, to adopt the amendment. Moreover, I take exception to subsection 3 in section 2, wherein it is stated that the President has not taken or proposed action to effect a substantial reduction of such estimated expenditures. Just what can the President do if Congress—both Houses—holds back on appropriations? At the present time the President has six, I believe, out of 14 or 15 measures; and except for the defense appropriation, some of the largest funding measures are yet to be sent to him.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

I realize, of course, that the matter is based on "estimated expenditures," and I would point out that when you relate expenditures to appropriations, the ratio is in favor of expenditures and against appropriations.

This is an amendment the Senate could well do without, and I hope very much that it will be defeated.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let me emphasize again that what this amendment deals with is expenditures, not appropriations. The language is very clear: "to reduce to an amount which is at least $5 billion less than the expenditures proposed in the budget."

I am not concerned about the appropriations for the moment, because we can appropriate to our heart's content. The question is, Is the money going to be spent and pushed into the bloodstream of this country? That is the source of the inflation. That will be the source of our headaches from here on out with respect to prices and with respect to interest rates. So I emphasize again that it deals with expenditures; for to do otherwise would not get at the root of the evil.

Now, with respect to paragraph 3, I think that is only a statement of fact: "The President has not taken nor proposed action to effect a substantial reduction of such estimated expenditures." He has not. If he has, it should have come to this body in the form of a message from the President. It should have been an executive message of some kind. No such message has come, no such recommendation has come, either to this body or to the Appropriations Committee of the Senate or of the House, so far as I know. And if anyone can show that such a recommendation has come, I will be more than willing to strike paragraph 3 from the resolution. But I have not been able to find it.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as the Senator well knows, the President has been pleading for the appropriation bills to be sent down, so that he could

look into the factors of both appropriations and expenditures. He has almost gotten down on his knees; and so far, out of 14 or 15 appropriation measures, he has received six.

I would reiterate what the distinguished Senator from Florida has said: that the estimated reduction in appropriations for this fiscal year by the Appropriations Committees of both Houses—and we should have some faith in them because, after all, they are our representatives and our delegates—will amount to approximately $5,147,000,000.

Furthermore, I point to page 54 of the hearings on the continuing resolution, fiscal year 1968, where Mr. Schultze, the Director of the Budget, states in effect that it takes $2 of appropriations to get a $1 cut in expenditures. So what we are really toying with or considering in the pending amendment is a far higher figure than appears on the surface.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think the majority leader still continues to talk about appropriations. I am talking about expenditures.

I want to see him cut out the money and not spend it. Not a figure on a piece of paper that finally goes down to the other end of the avenue. It is the expenditure that counts, so far as the impact on the country is concerned. And that is the reason for holding this to an expenditure item.

With that, I think I will rest the case and yield back the remainder of my time, if the remainder of the time on the other side is yielded back.

Mr. President, at this point I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

MEDAL OF HONOR PRESENTED TO MAJ. HOWARD V. LEE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the fact that an outstanding hero of the war in Vietnam, Maj. Howard V. Lee, was awarded the Medal of Honor today by the President of the United States for extraordinary gallantry.

Major Lee is the seventh Marine and the 21st awardee to win the Congressional Medal of Honor in the Vietnam war. He showed extraordinary leadership in rescuing a platoon he commanded, as commander of a total company, which would have been wiped out but for the valiant fire laid down by the major, who was then a captain, and only two additional soldiers. This indicates what an individual can do in a great struggle.

Mr. President, I know that his example will inspire all Americans, as it always has in our history; and I ask unanimous consent that the citation of this remarkably courageous New Yorker, who once was a resident of the district I represented in Congress when I was a Member of the House, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

MEDAL OF HONOR PRESENTATION BY LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO HOWARD V. LEE, MAJOR, U.S. MARINE CORPS, AT THE WHITE HOUSE, WASHINGTON, D.C., ON OCTOBER 25, 1967, AT 1300 HOURS

The President of the United States takes pleasure in presenting the Medal of Honor to Major Howard V. Lee, United States Marine Corps, For service set forth in the following Citation:

For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty as Commanding Officer, Company E, Fourth Marines, Third Marine Division near Cam Lo, Republic of Vietnam, on 8 and 9 August 1966. A platoon of Major (then Captain) Lee's company, while on an operation deep in enemy territory, was attacked and surrounded by a large Vietnamese force. Realizing that the unit had suffered numerous casualties, depriving it of effective leadership, and fully aware that the platoon was even then under heavy attack by the enemy, Major Lee took seven men and proceeded by helicopter to reinforce the beleaguered platoon. Major Lee disembarked from the helicopter with two of his men and, braving withering enemy fire, led them into the perimeter, where he fearlessly moved from position to position directing and encouraging the overtaxed troops. The enemy then launched a massive attack with the full might of their forces. Although painfully wounded by fragments from an enemy grenade in several areas of his body, including his eye, Major Lee continued undauntedly throughout the night to direct the valiant defense, coordinate supporting fires, and apprise higher headquarters of the plight of the platoon. The next morning he collapsed from his wounds and was forced to relinquish his command. However, the small band of Marines had held their position and repeatedly fought off many vicious enemy attacks for a grueling six hours until their evacuation was effected the following morning. Major Lee's actions saved his men from capture, minimized the loss of lives, and dealt the enemy a severe defeat. His indomitable fighting spirit, superb leadership, and great personal valor in the face of tremendous odds, reflect great credit upon himself and are in keeping with the highest traditions of the Marine Corps and the United States Naval Service.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House further insisted on its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 58, 59, and 67 to the bill (H.R. 9960) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; agreed to the further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. GIAIMO, Mr. SHIPLEY, Mr. MARSH, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. MAHON, Mr. JONAS, Mr. MINSHALL, Mr. WYMAN, Mr. TALCOTT, and Mr. BOW were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE CHAIR

Mr. HOLLINGS. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President and under the provisions of Public Law 170 of the 74th Congress, announces the appointment of the following Senators to attend the Interparliamentary Union meeting, to be held at Rome, Italy, on December 3 through 9, 1967: Senators YARBOROUGH, HOLLINGS, ALLOTT, and JORDAN of Idaho.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 888) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I note that in subsection (1) of paragraph (a) of the distinguished Senator's amendment, he refers to the fact that conditions have drastically changed "both as to estimated revenue receipts and estimated expenditures during the fiscal year 1968."

I take it that statement would mean that the Senator is not talking about applying his reduction to the original estimate of expenditures submitted in January but to the present estimate. Am I correct?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Precisely so.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am correct?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, how much time is remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has 11 minutes remaining on the amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, may I be recognized for 3 or 4 minutes?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, for the Senator from Arizona I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I voted for the last amendment sponsored by the Senator from South Dakota because I felt he was touching upon a responsibility which is that of the Congress itself. His amendment was confined to the appropriations.

On the other hand, Mr. President, this amendment has to do with expenditures. If any mistake has been made appropriating too much money, that was the responsibility of the Congress itself. It was our deliberate act.

Now, we are a three-branch government. I do not think it is within the jurisdiction of the Congress itself to mandate the President of the United States without his consent on expenditures of money.

Once we have appropriated the money, the responsibility to spend the money is an executive function. It is a function that belongs to the President of the United States and he can spend the money that has been appropriated or he can freeze the money that has been appropriated. But that is his exclusive jurisdiction.

Now, this is a simple joint resolution to extend the authority under the existing continuing resolution. In this amendment we are saying to the President of the United States in a very subtle fashion, "We, the Congress, have appropriated too much money but now, Mr. President, unless you do something about not spending $5 billion of that money which we have appropriated, then we are going to do this to you; we are going to do this to you before we adjourn this Congress."

I think if we want to address the President of the United States on the expenditure of money we should go hat in hand to the White House and say, "Mr. President, we have been too extravagant. Now, you, as a very judicious man, you as a very frugal man, will you please help us out of this dilemma and please not spend $5 billion of the money we sent you to spend?"

But all of this has political overtones. All we are doing here is trying to put the cat on the back of the President of the United States, and for what? For something we ourselves have done. We have appropriated too much money. Only 2 weeks ago we appropriated millions and millions and millions of dollars for public works that were not even budgeted—not even budgeted.

Now we are telling the President of the United States, "You go ahead, Mr. President, this is your responsibility. You do not spend $5 billion of this extravagant amount that we sent to you, including what we did 2 weeks ago."

That is what is wrong with this amendment. It is impertinent to the President of the United States. What we should do, if we want to do something, because of the situation that now exists that we did not recognize, is to say, "We ask you, please, Mr. President, won't you help us out of our dilemma? Won't you help us out of our injudiciousness, and please do not spend the $5 billion we sent you to spend."

Then we would be acting with a little bit of discretion and with a little bit of respect and courtesy.

All we are doing in Congress is appropriating, appropriating, and appropriating. Then, the next day, we are telling the President of the United States, "Don't spend it."

Oh, yes, it makes some fancy headlines, and it is the subject of every Republican Party dinner in the country, and it makes pretty good reading on the part of some people.

We are in financial trouble. The President of the United States anticipated an administrative deficit of maybe $25 billion. We cannot stand that deficit unless we either cut the budget or raise taxes. Otherwise, we run ourselves into inflation. We all understand that.

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

Mr. PASTORE. I will take 2 minutes more.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am glad to yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator.

But, Mr. President, the time has come when we assume the responsibility. The time is at hand when the supplemental bill comes up here to do what needs to be done on the appropriation bills which are still pending. That is our responsibility and we can do something about saving the money that needs to be saved.

But this very glorious, very dramatic gesture of making it appear that if the President of the United States does not do what we tell him to do, then before we go home we will teach him a lesson. My goodness gracious. Where is our commonsense? Where is our common courtesy? Shame on us, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for one-half minute?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Rhode Island is very persuasive, but I am sure he does not want the RECORD to show that after the work done by the Public Works Appropriations Committee we appropriated, I think he said, millions and millions and millions over the budget.

Mr. PASTORE. No; I did not say that. Unbudgeted items.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Unbudgeted items.

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct. That is what I said.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand unbudgeted items of about $4 billion and the whole bill was millions and millions and millions of dollars under the budget.

Mr. PASTORE. I remind the Senate that $4 billion is billion, billion, billion, billion—four times a billion. [Laughter.] That is what I said. Whether it is peanuts or potsful of money, if it does not belong there, let us take it out. I voted against it, even though it had one of my projects in it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We are about millions and millions under the budget.

Mr. PASTORE. I did not say that. I said that we voted unbudgeted—unasked for millions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am overwhelmed by the compassionate sentiments of my distinguished friend from Rhode Island. I am glad that he shares my view. I have said over and over again this afternoon that I want Congress to share and, in fact, to accept the responsibility for this budget. No one has yet stood in his place anywhere, any time, and stated as a matter of fact that the President ever proposed a cut or sent us a message. OK, I accept it. I will bleed with him if he does not want to do it. But I want to do my duty and this resolution states, in view of the fact he has not done so, we ought to stay in this session until we bring about a cut of $5 billion in expenditures.

What good does it do to cut an appropriation when it goes into the bloodstream out of previously appropriated funds that are roaming around in this Government by the billions that we cannot touch and have not touched. The only way to meet inflation and the dangers down the road is to take it out of the expenditure stream, because that is what is going to count.

The President gets in on the other end of the road. He said, "Give me a tax increase of $6.3 billion." I say let us cut $5 billion out of the expenditures and that comes pretty close to meeting the tax increase.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I rest the case.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I have enjoyed this debate. The distinguished senior Senator from Illinois has made many fine speeches. I have heard him in both the House of Representatives and the Senate. I have heard him on platforms in Republican conventions. Some Members of the Senate seem to take the pending speech seriously.

This is a toothless resolution. It means nothing. It merely states that it is the sense of the Senate that, under certain contingencies, the Senate or Congress should do so-and-so.

Well, many of us know that there are many things we should do, but it does not mean anything unless we do them.

If the Senator from Illinois is sincere and wants to cut expenditures $5 billion, then let him offer an amendment rescinding the appropriations.

That would mean something.

This is just a stump speech—a toothless, meaningless stump speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? Is all time now yielded back?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has now been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

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. NELSON (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. 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. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from

North Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 45, as follows:

[No. 301 Leg.]

YEAS—39

Aiken	Eastland	Mundt
Allott	Fannin	Murphy
Baker	Griffin	Pearson
Bennett	Hansen	Percy
Boggs	Hickenlooper	Proxmire
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Russell
Carlson	Javits	Scott
Church	Jordan, Idaho	Smith
Cooper	Lausche	Stennis
Cotton	McClellan	Talmadge
Curtis	McGovern	Thurmond
Dirksen	Monroney	Williams, Del.
Dominick	Morton	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—45

Anderson	Hayden	Mondale
Bartlett	Hill	Montoya
Bayh	Holland	Moss
Bible	Hollings	Muskie
Brewster	Inouye	Pastore
Burdick	Jackson	Pell
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Randolph
Cannon	Kennedy, N.Y.	Ribicoff
Case	Long, Mo.	Smathers
Ellender	Long, La.	Spong
Fong	Magnuson	Symington
Gore	Mansfield	Tydings
Harris	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Hart	McIntyre	Yarborough
Hartke	Metcalf	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—16

Brooke	Hatfield	Nelson
Clark	Kennedy, Mass.	Prouty
Dodd	Kuchel	Sparkman
Ervin	McCarthy	Tower
Fulbright	Miller	
Gruening	Morse	

So Mr. DIRKSEN's amendment, as modified, was rejected.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was not agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the committee amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have not been ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, House Joint Resolution 888 was passed by the House of Representatives on Wednesday, October 18, by a vote of 253 to 143.

It is significant that 86 Democrats supported this resolution, including the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, WILBUR MILLS, of Arkansas.

Every member of the Virginia delegation—six Democrats and four Republicans—voted for House Joint Resolution 888. Insofar as Virginia is concerned, at least, this was not a partisan political matter.

The Virginia delegation in the House of Representatives was convinced, as am I, that drastic action must be taken to put the Nation's financial house in order.

While there are objections to House Joint Resolution 888, I feel that under the circumstances—faced with the tremendous deficit of approximately $20 billion—that its enactment is justified.

Mr. President, in August at a meeting with a group of businessmen at least one Cabinet official told these businessmen that the administration would reduce spending by $7½ billion.

As a result of that meeting, I sent the following telegram to the Honorable Alan S. Boyd, Secretary of Transportation:

> I understand that at a recent meeting with a group of businessmen you asserted that the Administration would reduce spending by $7½ billion. I would appreciate an early reply of confirmation and, if possible, brief information regarding proposed cuts.

Mr. Boyd replied thusly, under date of August 23:

> The Administration has not prepared a list of specific items it intended to cut from the budget because of the fact that the Congress has not completed the appropriation process. It would be irresponsible to begin making cuts prior to knowing exactly those appropriated items from which the cuts would be made and sound expenditure control can best be brought about by knowing precisely what Congress will have appropriated for 1968. When Congress has completed all of the appropriations for 1968, the Administration then, after reviewing the new appropriations, will submit its list of items which it believes can best be cut from the federal budget.

Frankly, I am not impressed with the administration's reasoning.

What the administration's spokesmen say, in effect, is this: We can get by with $7½ billion less than the recommendations contained in the President's budget. We can get by with $7½ billion less, but you appropriate it anyway—and then we will not spend it.

Ten months ago the President estimated that the deficit for the current fiscal year would approximate $8 billion. Today we are told by the Treasury Department that the deficit will exceed $20 billion.

Thus it is clear that the whole fiscal situation has changed and, therefore, the budget ought to change with it.

Mr. President, the Senate Appropriations Committee has eliminated every aspect of House Joint Resolution 888 with the exception of continuing the appropriations until November 15, 1967.

I realize the Appropriations Committee has been working long and hard to bring some order to the choatic condition created by the swollen and expanded budget recommendations of the President.

I would like to support the committee's position. But I feel the House action, under the circumstances facing us at the present time, was justified.

So I shall vote against the committee amendment, thus voting to sustain the action of the House, which would limit expenditures for the current fiscal year to $131,500,000,000, "except those expenditures in excess of $22 billion which the President may determine are necessary in behalf of our military effort in Southeast Asia."

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, is the present vote on the committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is what the yeas and nays have been ordered on?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. The question is on the committee amendment to strike out the language beginning with the word "and" on line 6, page 1, down to the end of the joint resolution.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, is this a final vote, or is another vote still required?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A vote on passage is required.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll——

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GRIFFIN. If the committee amendment is defeated, does it mean that the House joint resolution as it was sent over to the Senate will then be before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The House language would come back into the joint resolution.

Mr. GRIFFIN. So a vote against the committee amendment would be a vote for the House joint resolution. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment to strike the language beginning with the word "and" on page 1, in line 6, to the end of the joint resolution.

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 Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], would each vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea" and the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

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

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

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 34, as follows:

[No. 302 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Aiken	Hayden	Montoya
Anderson	Hill	Moss
Bartlett	Holland	Muskie
Bayh	Inouye	Nelson
Bible	Jackson	Pastore
Brewster	Javits	Pell
Burdick	Jordan, N.C.	Randolph
Byrd, W. Va.	Kennedy, N.Y.	Ribicoff
Cannon	Long, Mo.	Scott
Case	Long, La.	Smathers
Cooper	Magnuson	Smith
Ellender	Mansfield	Tydings
Fong	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Gore	McIntyre	Yarborough
Harris	Metcalf	Young, N. Dak.
Hart	Mondale	Young, Ohio
Hartke	Monroney	

NAYS—34

Allott	Fannin	Pearson
Baker	Griffin	Percy
Bennett	Hansen	Proxmire
Boggs	Hickenlooper	Russell
Byrd, Va.	Hollings	Spong
Carlson	Hruska	Stennis
Church	Jordan, Idaho	Symington
Cotton	Lausche	Talmadge
Curtis	McClellan	Thurmond
Dirksen	Morton	Williams, Del.
Dominick	Mundt	
Eastland	Murphy	

NOT VOTING—16

Brooke	Hatfield	Morse
Clark	Kennedy, Mass.	Prouty
Dodd	Kuchel	Sparkman
Ervin	McCarthy	Tower
Fulbright	McGovern	
Gruening	Miller	

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader about the program for the remainder of today, for tomorrow, and for the rest of the week, if he can tell us.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question raised by the distinguished minority leader, when we dispose of this bill, that will be the end of the business for today. We shall have some bills, not of major importance, for tomorrow. We hope to have three or four conference reports tomorrow and Friday. There may be some votes on those reports, because of the feeling which the subject of appropriations seems to have generated in both Houses.

On Friday at 12:15, the Senate will leave the Chamber in a body, to proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives to attend a joint meeting, which will be addressed by President Gustavo Diaz Ordaz of Mexico.

So I hope Senators will be aware of the possibility of votes tomorrow and Friday, and will be cognizant of the distinct honor which is being paid us by the President of Mexico when in addressing a joint meeting on Friday next.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the majority leader.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 888) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 888) is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the joint resolution.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on passage.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, first of all, I express my appreciation for the graciousness of the majority leader, because we had run completely out of time on this side of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will withhold for a moment, until order is restored.

The Senator from South Dakota may proceed.

Mr. MUNDT. I take this brief time simply, Mr. President, to point out why I shall vote "no" on the question of passage, and to recommend that course of action to my fellow Senators. I know it will not be followed, because we have tested the waters of economy today, and found in them tremendous interest, much support, and a great deal of illuminating discussion. But we lacked the votes in order to quite make the grade in demonstrating any determination for economy on our side. I am gratified of course that only five Republican votes were included in those opposing my economy amendment.

Unfortunately, today, we have closed the door to any economy effort. But by voting "no," we could at least avoid locking the door, and we would keep the latchstring out and our options open.

If we vote "no" and the "nays" prevail, the matter will go back to our Appropriations Committee tomorrow, and we will have before us there all the matters which have been discussed and the objections which have been raised, and will be able to test the capacity of the Appropriations Committee to come up with some other type of continuing resolution containing some formula for effectuating economy.

If we simply vote "yea," we put ourselves in the position of throwing the cold water of indifference on the economy fires which are burning in the House of Representatives, and will really come close to extending to the House a gratuitous insult, because the best we shall have done with their effort will be to turn the whole thing down.

So I submit that voting "no" on passage will keep our objectives open, and keep the hopes for economy alive; and I predict, if that view should prevail, it would result in a shorter conference, in more constructive action, and in a faster disposition of this problem than if we simply shirk our responsibility now and vote to postpone the whole issue until November 15 by voting in favor of the continuing resolution.

I suggest the wisdom of a negative vote.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate but a few minutes.

I shall vote "yea" for the resolution. I believe that is the appropriate vote. I think when it came out of the large Committee on Appropriations with only four "nay" votes, that indicated that a good many Senators on that committee feel that this is the proper course, after having looked at the matter much more in detail than is possible here.

So far as I am concerned, I would have been glad to have voted for something like the Dirksen amendment, and offered to do so if the Senator had reduced his figure to a $4 billion reduction of the spending budget. I am sure there were many others who felt the same way. I was not willing to vote for a declaration which expressed the possibility of a cut beyond what I thought was reasonable or could be done, without destroying vital functions of Government.

A $4 billion cut in the spending budget means a cut of somewhere between $7 and $8 billion in appropriations for both this year and prior years. I felt that was the extreme limit to which we could go, and know that a good many other Senators felt as I did.

I believe we will have room, in conference, to work the matter out.

I must say that every time we pass an additional appropriation bill—and we have four of them, now, out of conference and ready to be passed—this resolution becomes more and more meaningless, and it will soon be entirely meaningless. Mr. President, I think that a "yea" vote is the courteous vote to the House of Representatives, and will show we are not simply disregarding what they have done.

But we think that in conference something can be better worked out than what they did on the spur of the moment on the floor.

I have talked to a good many Members of the House of Representatives who feel the same way and who are not happy

about the action taken by the House on the floor, more or less on the spur of the moment, when four different amendments offered from the House took the place of the committee proposal that had come to the floor prior to that time.

I shall vote "yea" for the passage of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having expired, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass? On this question 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 Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] would each vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea" and the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

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

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 26, as follows:

[No. 303 Leg.]

YEAS—59

Aiken	Hill	Muskie
Anderson	Holland	Pastore
Bartlett	Inouye	Pearson
Bayh	Jackson	Pell
Bible	Javits	Randolph
Boggs	Jordan, N.C.	Ribicoff
Brewster	Kennedy, N.Y.	Russell
Burdick	Long, Mo.	Scott
Byrd, W. Va.	Long, La.	Smathers
Cannon	Magnuson	Smith
Carlson	Mansfield	Spong
Case	McClellan	Stennis
Eastland	McGee	Symington
Ellender	McGovern	Talmadge
Fong	McIntyre	Tydings
Gore	Metcalf	Williams, N.J.
Harris	Mondale	Yarborough
Hart	Monroney	Young, N. Dak.
Hartke	Montoya	Young, Ohio
Hayden	Moss	

NAYS—26

Allott	Dominick	Morton
Baker	Fannin	Mundt
Bennett	Griffin	Murphy
Byrd, Va.	Hansen	Nelson
Church	Hickenlooper	Percy
Cooper	Hollings	Proxmire
Cotton	Hruska	Thurmond
Curtis	Jordan, Idaho	Williams, Del.
Dirksen	Lausche	

NOT VOTING—15

Brooke	Gruening	Miller
Clark	Hatfield	Morse
Dodd	Kennedy, Mass.	Prouty
Ervin	Kuchel	Sparkman
Fulbright	McCarthy	Tower

So the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 888) was passed.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed by the Chair.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the passage of the continuing appropriation resolution the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, adds another monumental achievement to an already abundant record of outstanding public service. Senator HAYDEN employed the same keen understanding of the problems involved in this funding measure that has characterized his efforts in behalf of so many of his past accomplishments.

The consideration of this particular resolution presented an issue basic to the nature and function of the appropriations responsibility of the Congress. In meeting that issue, Senator HAYDEN led the fight to sustain here in the Senate, what I feel is the proper role of the Congress with respect to funding measures. He deserves the highest commendation of the Senate for the vital part he has played in obtaining this success.

Joining Senator HAYDEN was the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] whose articulate support was most persuasive. As on all issues that gain his endorsement, Senator HOLLAND's advocacy was at once brilliant and highly effective.

The senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is likewise to be commended for urging so capably his strong and sincere views on this matter. Though he advocated a different position than that which ultimately prevailed, he did so with the same articulate expression and broad expertise that have always credited his participation. The senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the distinguished minority leader, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], also deserve high praise for the strong advocacy they employed in urging their respective positions.

We welcomed and immensely appreciated the support of other Senators who joined the discussion. Notable were the contributions of the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. They too, deserve high commendation.

And finally, to the entire Senate goes the deep appreciation of the leadership for the magnificent cooperation demonstrated by all Senators in disposing of this matter promptly, efficiently and with full consideration for the views of every Member. I am confident that the conferees on this measure will exercise their best efforts to assure swift action by the Congress so that the affected agencies of the Government will not be impeded in the administration of their various programs.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 noon tomorrow.

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

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR PERCY TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the transaction of morning business on tomorrow, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] be recognized for up to 30 minutes.

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 report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate 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; and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 to the bill and concurred therein.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11641) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Water Resources Council, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 to the bill, and concurred therein, with an amendment, in which it requested the

concurrence of the Senate; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 to the bill and concurred therein; and that the House insisted on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13 to the bill.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 4772) to authorize the Secretaries concerned to direct the initiation of allotments of the pay and allowances of certain members of the Armed Forces for the purpose of making deposits under section 1035 of title 10, United States Code.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION AND SOVIET DISCRIMINATION AGAINST ITS JEWISH COMMUNITY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this year the Soviet Union is marking the 50th anniversary of the Russian Revolution and commemorating a half century of Communist rule. But today in the U.S.S.R. there remains a substantial group of people being denied even fundamental religious and cultural rights guaranteed to them by Soviet law—the 3 million Jews of that nation who comprise the second largest Jewish community in the world.

Although the Soviet Union is an atheistic country, Soviet law does provide for those who would observe their religious faith. However, unlike other faiths in the U.S.S.R., the Jews cannot publish devotional literature, manufacture religious articles such as prayer shawls, and cannot have official contacts with their coreligionists abroad. Other religious groups may have a central or coordinating structure; the Jews are denied this.

The discriminatory treatment by the Soviet Union of its Jewish citizens in contrast to the equality accorded them in other Communist countries in Eastern Europe. According to reports by the World Jewish Congress, the 110,000 Jews in Rumania, the 80,000 Jews in Hungary, the 18,000 Jews in Czechoslovakia, and the 6,500 Jews in Yugoslavia receive substantially the same treatment as do members of other religious faiths. This equality of treatment is what we ask of the Soviet Union.

As the Soviets commemorate the 50th anniversary of Communist rule we are reminded of the words from Leviticus which describe how, in ancient times, during the jubilee fiftieth year the enslaved were freed and, as is written on our Liberty Bell, liberty was proclaimed throughout the land. We hope that the Soviets, too, might honor this ancient injunction:

> And ye shall hallow the fiftieth year and proclaim liberty throughout the land unto all the inhabitants thereof; it shall be a jubilee unto you;
>
> And ye shall return every man unto his possession and ye shall return every man unto his family.

JEWS IN SOVIET UNION CONTINUE OPPRESSED

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, Jews in the Soviet Union continue to feel the weight of discrimination, despite the official Soviet policy which condemns antisemitism.

It should be a matter of concern to the Soviets that their policy clashes with their practice. The Jewish minority should have the same opportunity to follow their cultural and religious traditions as other minorities in that country. They should not be subject to restrictive quotas in employment and education.

Mr. President, I join my Jewish friends in the hope that the yoke of oppression will soon be lifted from their fellow Jews in the Soviet Union.

FATHER JACQUES MARQUETTE—PIONEER

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it will be 293 years on December 4 of this year that the renowned Father Jacques Marquette and two young French "woods rangers" disembarked from their canoe at what is now 28th Street and Damen Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and settled down for the first white man's winter in that area. Throughout the years, this outstanding event has been recognized by some event, beginning in 1924, but it has been a decade or more that December 4 has passed by without a mention of the contribution this Jesuit priest, who helped bring Christianity to the wilderness, made not only for those in the Chicago area but also for our State and Nation.

A political and social science teacher, John "Bill" Handzel, at Niles West High School, Skokie, Ill., is most interested in a park or marina at the site, or at least a replica of the hut where Pere Marquette spent that cold winter of 1674—the first white man's home in Chicago. The first Christian mission founded by Father Marquette is memorialized in Utica, Ill., where a marker stands on the grounds of St. Mary's Church.

Many in our Nation are filled with gratitude for those noble and brave men who experienced hardships, suffering, and even death in the building of our great Nation, and during these trying times it is even more important that we pause for reflection and commemorate those such as Father Marquette. December 4, 1674, is an important day in history.

SOVIET-HUNGARIAN RELATIONS—OCTOBER 25, 1967

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, 11 years ago this week the people of Hungary rose up against the cruel Soviet regime that maintained an iron grip on their country. Miraculously, the revolution took hold—for a few precious days. Hungarians looked to the outside world for help and recognition of their brave act.

Freedom is not so easily won when a small band of patriots struggling against impossible odds is coldly ignored by their powerful friends. Within a few days, Soviet tanks were rolling in the streets of Budapest, and the Soviets had crushed the spark of freedom. The West stands guilty for its failure to heed the call of humanity that week.

However, I do not intend today to speak of what is past. It is the present that counts for the most today. On all sides we hear statements that the terror of 1956 has abated, that the Hungarian Communist regime of 1967 is mellowing, and is becoming independent of the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, those who make such statements are not up-to-date on Hungarian affairs. I would like to point out that only last month, on September 7, 1967, the Hungarian puppet regime signed a Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance with the Soviet Union. Under this agreement, Hungary pledged itself to remain a Soviet satellite for another 20 years.

There are some who believe that the word "satellite" is out-moded when describing the Soviet empire. This treaty of September 7 should banish any such beliefs. The treaty proves that Hungary is completely integrated politically and economically with the Soviet Union. Moscow treats Hungary as a conquered nation, which must pay tribute to its masters. The terms are so humiliating, and so disadvantageous to Hungary that it is difficult to imagine that the Communist bosses would want it publicized. Yet I am told that the text was published in full in the official newspaper of the Hungarian Socialist Worker's—Communist—Party the day after it was signed. As in the days of Ghengis Khan, the conqueror glories over the conquered. New economic legislation to take effect on January 1, 1968, indicates the price that Hungary will have to pay to her masters.

I think it should be pointed out first that the top leadership of the Hungarian Communist Party is handpicked and trained in Moscow. As in every other Communist country, the Central Commitee of the Communist Party is the real ruling force of the land. No one is allowed on the Central Committee unless he obeys the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party implicitly.

The new treaty consists of nine articles. It replaces a similar treaty signed in 1948 and retains all important elements of the earlier agreement, but incorporates new provisions to bring it in line with present Soviet foreign policy.

The "eternal friendship" of the two countries "based on the firm principle of socialist internationalism" is emphasized in the preamble as serving the interests of the socialist community of the world.

Artcile 1 promises that the contracting parties will also strengthen this eternal friendship in the future and will act for the unity of the socialist countries.

Article 2 deals with the bilateral and multilateral economic, scientific, and technical cooperation in accordance with the principles of the "international socialist sharing of the workload" within the Comecon—the Communist "common market." Hungary's participation in Comecon activities, therefore, became

a subject of bilateral state relations between the U.S.S. and Hungary.

Cultural cooperation and joint creative activities are the subject of article 3 which broadens the field of exchange in all phases of education, science, and culture.

Article 4 obligates both parties to strengthen the socialist world system and to aid nations "liberated from colonial rule and following the road of strengthennig their national independence and sovereignty."

The Warsaw Pact is mentioned in article 5 as the means to guarantee the present frontiers of the member nations to that pact, and to prevent "the aggression by the forces of militarism and revanchism"—an obvious reference to the United States and West Germany. The provision ties Hungarian policy even more closely to that of the Soviet Union than previously and lessens the possibility of any genuine Hungarian initiatives on the European scene.

Article 6 provides for immediate military and any other aid in case of aggression against one of the contracting parties based "on the natural right to individual or collective self-defense." This means that Soviet troops undoubtedly will remain on Hungarian soil.

The obligation to consult in important international matters affecting the interests of both countries is established in article 7. This provision, however, goes much further by prescribing that the parties "must act according to a common standpoint harmonized in accordance with their mutual interests."

The last two articles refer to formalities and provide that the treaty shall be in force for at least 20 years.

The treaty is regarded by an editorial in the official Communist paper as "not only one important factor of our foreign policy, but also an unalterable obligation belonging to the basic pillars of our socialist national existence which serves our best national interests as well as the cause of general peace and the worldwide progress of socialism." Such a candid admission of the fact that the existence of the present regime is dependent on the Soviet Union is one of the rare slips of the tongue printed in an official publication of the Communist Government of Hungary.

The chairman of the Council of Ministers, Jeno Fock, in his speech after the signing of the treaty, said:

> Our goals and principles are mutual, our parties and governments profess in the most important matters similar views and act in unity.

Janos Kadar, the head of the Communist Party, expressed his thanks to the Soviet Union for the internationalist help extended in 1956 to crush the revolution and promised the full cooperation of the Government of Hungary with the Soviet Union.

Leonid Brezhnev, the leader of the Soviet Communist Party, lauded Kadar and the Communist Party of Hungary for their contribution to the common cause of revolution.

The dependence of the Hungarian economy upon the Soviet Union was further increased through the Hungarian-Soviet trade agreements. The results of these agreements were recently published in Hungary on the occasion of the 22d anniversary of the first of such agreements.

The article does not contain data on the price structure of the foreign trade relations of the two countries which were always known to be discriminatory to the detriment of Hungary. However, the proportion of Soviet imports and exports clearly indicates that the entire Hungarian economy is at the mercy of its big partner.

In 1966 one-third of the entire foreign trade of Hungary was transacted with the Soviet Union. This in itself would be a very dangerous proportion for any country's economy. However, since Hungary in the past two decades was industrialized with emphasis on heavy industry—on instructions from the Kremlin—without having either the raw material basis or the necessary energy sources, an analysis of Hungary's imports from the Soviet Union quickly shows that the entire Hungarian economy can be brought to a standstill if the leaders of the Soviet Union decide to suspend the raw material and energy shipments.

According to the statistics published in the aforementioned article, 67.8 percent of all Soviet imports into Hungary consist of raw materials and semifinished goods, and 27.5 percent is machinery and factory equipment. If the percentage of the Soviet shipments is compared with the total imports of certain goods, the results are even more startling: 85.1 percent of crude oil, 76.8 percent of electric energy, 49.5 percent of cotton, 50.1 percent of coke, 62.7 percent of newsprint, 79.1 percent of lumber, 42.1 percent of rolled steel, and 97.5 percent of pig iron needs of Hungary are supplied by the Soviet Union.

The same article, praising the generosity of the Soviet Union, mentioned that there is hardly a worker in Hungary who does not work with raw materials or energy coming from the U.S.S.R.

The Hungarian exports to the Soviet Union show similar disproportions; 47.3 percent of the shipments to the Soviets consist of machinery and factory equipment, and 29 percent of industrial consumer goods.

Hungary exports to the Soviets more than half of the production of its entire machine and fine mechanical industry, and two-thirds of the total production of the Hungarian pharmaceutical industry.

Hungary's bauxite mining is foremost in Europe, but the bauxite is shipped to the Soviets for smelting, and the aluminum is sold—at a price much higher than the world market would justify—to Hungary for domestic needs. Yet it is well-known that the Soviets sell aluminum cheaply to Poland to make aircraft for the war machine.

In addition to these inequities, Hungary had to join the Comecon which controls the economies of its members. The official communique of the executive committee of this organization was issued on July 8 of this year which announced that the economic plans of the member states for the years 1971–75 must be coordinated. This coordination must extend to the international specialization of production, matters of cooperation and standardization, bringing into harmony the building of industrial establishments, geological explorations, scientific and technical cooperation, and matters of furthering the development of mutual trade. The chairman of the Executive Committee of the Comecon is the representative of the Soviet Union. No further comment is necessary.

On the home front the main concern of the leaders as well as of the majority of the population is the "new economic management" which is to begin on January 1, 1968. Although all features of the change in the economic structure of the country have not yet been made public, nevertheless, the facts already known indicate that the general uneasiness of the people is not without reason.

The new system of the economic structure stems from the realization that the totally centralized organization of the nation's economy, built up after the Soviet pattern, led the country close to bankruptcy. The balance sheets of the government-owned enterprises showed greater losses every year. The agriculture, socialized almost completely, could not even feed the nation, while in the past Hungary was able to export agricultural products in large quantities.

According to the rules of the planned economy, production plans were made at the highest level of the administration for the whole country. The plan prescribed what to produce and how much, regardless of the needs of the population. Prices were set by the government while disregarding the costs of production. The situation was similar in all countries of the Soviet-dominated bloc, and even in the Soviet Union itself. But, changes were already being introduced in most countries in various degrees.

Hungary's leaders decided to follow a unique method and change the whole system drastically and simultaneously in all fields of the economy.

The basic feature of the economic reform is that the economic management will be decentralized and the decisions pertaining to production will be made by the enterprises within the very elastic framework of the general national economic plan.

Another very important measure will be that most prices will be set by the enterprises on the basis of production costs and the artificially maintained price structure of officially established prices will be discontinued.

The main emphasis is put on the profitability of the economy as a whole as well as of the individual enterprises. To achieve this the government was forced to abandon several features of the hitherto existing system which, at least from the viewpoint of propaganda, were the most important achievements of the people's democracy: job security, free social benefits and the relatively low prices of services and certain goods.

Some of these measures are already shaped in the form of statutory rules, and several others still await publication. One of the most important steps was the enactment of an entirely new Labor Code which was unanimously adopted by the

Hungarian Parliament less than a month ago at its last session held on September 27–29, 1967.

Contrary to the previous code, which was quite a detailed regulation, the new code is only a framework of basic principles which will be flushed out with implementing decrees issued by the government.

One basic rule of the new code abolished virtually all restrictions pertaining to the termination of employment. Until now it was frequently pointed out by official Hungarian circles that in the people's democracy the workers enjoy the greatest job security, and their employment may only be terminated under conditions prescribed by law. Although in practice this system did not work as well as in theory, and employment was frequently terminated mainly for political reasons, it may be said that a certain degree of job security still prevailed, and managers—at least formally—had to comply with the provisions of the law.

Under the new system termination of employment in general will be left to the manager's discretion. At a time when the enterprise managers will be under the heaviest pressure from the government to show profit and use the manpower as efficiently as possible, this discretion undoubtedly will result in the firing of a sizable number of workers and employees. The fear of large-scale unemployment is so great that the Minister of Labor felt it necessary to say some reassuring cliches. He went so far as to refer to the Constitution which guarantees the right to work. The Minister, however, interpreted this provision in a manner which may lead to the conclusion that a large segment of the working population may only find work in fields other than their profession or trade, that is, only low-paid manual work.

In such a situation, political pressure undoubtedly will play an even larger role than ever before. Several signs in this direction may already be found in the daily press. The increased activity and power of the Communist Party in the field of personnel policies is heavily emphasized. A party secretary expressed the role of the Communist Party's organizations in the plants in the following manner:

> It must be indispensable that in selecting the cadres, on promotions and dismissals, in preparing the performance ratings the economic leaders must ask for the opinion of the party organization and the trade union, and these opinions must also be heeded.

The Communist regime was always proud of the fact that social benefits, such as working clothes, child care in the factory nurseries, meals at the places of work, use of summer resort homes, and so forth, were free or only a nominal sum was charged to the workers. In the future the workers will have to pay the total cost for these. Considering the fact that under the new economic management the prices of goods and services will be set according to actual cost and profits and, therefore, all prices will go up, the discontinuation of the free social benefits will considerably lower the already low living standards. At the same time there is no hope that wages will be raised.

At present the standards of living are unbelievably low. According to the official statistics the average yearly net income of a worker in the year 1964 was 12,762 forints, while the average expenditures of a person in the same year amounted to 13,437 forints. To provide a family of three—husband, wife, and one child—only with food a worker needed 14,610 forints, which means that the average working person is unable even to feed the smallest family.

It was an almost unique situation in Eastern Europe that peasants in Hungary, although forced to join the agricultural cooperatives—kolkhoz—retained their title to the land which they contributed to the cooperative. To acknowledge this right to ownership the cooperatives were obliged to pay a nominal rent for the use of the land owned by its members.

A recently enacted law put an end to this privilege and simply transferred the title to agricultural lands used by the cooperatives from the original owners to the cooperative by operation of law and without compensation.

The result of this measure will obviously make the peasant even more dependent upon the mercy of the state; the nominal rents that he formerly received will be abolished.

Mr. President, I want to remind my colleagues that the Hungary I have been speaking of is the Hungary of today. This is the same country which is supposed to be achieving independence and cultural freedom. Those people who make such statements are simply not being realistic. They express their own hopes, rather than the facts. The information I have been presenting today is taken directly from official Communist Hungarian sources. These are the real facts which we must look at if we wish to appraise Hungarian communism objectively. Eleven years after the Soviets put down the Hungarian revolution, they still remain the masters today.

ANTI-SEMITISM IN THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, 22 years ago, when the regime of Adolf Hitler collapsed, one hoped that the age-old practice of anti-Semitism would also collapse. The Nazi era, characterized not only by naked aggression but also by the most heinous religious repression since the Inquisition, had awakened the conscience of the world.

Yet now, in 1967, 22 years later, Jews in the Soviet Union are subjected to great pressures and restrictions. They are not allowed to organize on a state or national level. The number of synagogues is steadily reduced. Rabbinical training is severely circumscribed. It is almost impossible to obtain religious articles. Jews receive harsh treatment in Soviet courts. The emigration of Jews is strictly controlled. Their contacts with foreigners are discouraged. They are excluded from certain areas of the government and the army. They may not attend international Jewish meetings, and they cannot show any interest they may have in their coreligionists in Israel. There is not a single Jewish school in the Soviet Union. Prayer books and Bibles cannot be published.

That is the sad story of official discrimination against the Jewish people of the Soviet Union.

But it is not the only story of anti-Semitism in 1967. Last June, when the Arab-Israel war erupted, the Government of the United Arab Republic moved harshly against Egyptian Jews, imprisoning hundreds of them and confiscating the property of the Jews of Cairo. Many of Egypt's Jews are still behind bars. When, on October 5, President Nasser sent his representative to a synagogue to present Jewish new year greetings to the Jewish community, it was discovered that the rabbi and many members of the congregation were still in prison.

Here are two nations, the Soviet Union and the United Arab Republic, both practicing anti-Semitism against their own nationals of the Jewish faith. And they practice it in 1967, when many of us like to think that such prejudice belongs to the past.

In May of this year I communicated my strong feelings against Soviet anti-Semitism and Egyptian provocations against Israel to the Embassies of the Soviet Union and the United Arab Republic in Washington. I urge my colleagues and all Americans of good will to make known their own objections to the outrage of anti-Semitism wherever it may be manifested.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON WORKS FOR PEACE—SENATOR RANDOLPH STRESSES OTHER PARTIES MUST BE WILLING TO NEGOTIATE—HO MUST SPEAK, SAYS THE ECONOMIST EDITOR

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Members of this body and the citizens of our Nation have been subjected to a steady stream of protests that President Lyndon Johnson is not actively and sincerely pursuing a peaceful settlement of the Vietnam conflict. A substantial number of those who offer suggestions for negotiations seem to place the entire burden of responsibility on the United States—this is unjust and unfair treatment of President Johnson and his advisers. His attempts to find paths to peace are a matter of public record. Although persons have the right to disagree with our Vietnam policy, I believe it is incumbent upon all citizens to give fair recognition to the President's endeavors for a just settlement.

Assuredly, no person has a greater desire for an end to the Vietnam struggle and for world peace, than the Chief Executive of our Republic.

President Johnson, in his recent speech before the annual meeting of the International Federation of Commercial, Clerical and Technical Employees, stated that America appears to be "searching alone" for peace in Vietnam. He further emphasized that "In every way we can, we search for peace in Vietnam. Those who began the war are not willing to sit down with us to explore ways to end it."

Mr. President, negotiations cannot be conducted by only one of the parties at issue.

The Christian Science Monitor, an

excellent daily newspaper, Friday, October 20, carried a reprint of a cogent commentary from the London Economist on this point. The article is entitled "If Only Ho Would Speak."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this material be inserted in the RECORD.

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

[From The Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 20, 1967]

IF ONLY HO WOULD SPEAK

The guessing game about what goes on in President Ho Chi Minh's mind gets more complicated every week. The latest contribution comes from Mr. Humphry Berkeley in [The] Times. Mr. Berkeley says that U Thant told him recently that he could "guarantee" that the North Vietnamese would agree to negotiate with the Americans within three or four weeks if the Americans stopped bombing them. That word "guarantee" goes beyond anything the United Nations Secretary-General has said in public. U Thant has never claimed more than that he himself is "convinced" that things would turn out that way. Which is different. It is, in any case, curious that Ho Chi Minh's intentions should have to be interpreted through what Mr. Berkeley says U Thant says the North Vietnamese say.

The confusion this hearsay evidence can lead to was illustrated by what happened to India's defense minister. . . . Mr. Swaran Singh told the UN General Assembly on October 6th that he believed the end of the bombing would be followed not only by negotiations but also by a "cessation of all hostilities." For a moment it looked as if Mr. Singh was on to something important. . . . But two days later his own prime minister, Mrs. Gandhi, was obliged to say in Moscow that Mr. Singh's statement was merely "an opinion," and that she herself thought that no one could say anything so positive.

It would be much simpler if North Vietnam's leaders would confirm or deny the ideas that other people attribute to them; but they don't. Until they do, the second-hand hints that emerge from Hanoi could be either a spark of hope for negotiations or a wrecker's beacon. . . .

There are two unanswered questions—unanswered, that is by the North Vietnamese themselves. The first is whether President Ho is interested in negotiations at all, even if the bombing is stopped. He may rather keep on fighting until he knows, next November, who the next American president is going to be; or at least until he knows whom the Republicans are going to put up against Mr. Johnson. . . .

The second question is what they would do on the battlefield if talks did start. The North Vietnamese cannot reasonably be expected to withdraw their own troops from the south, or to stop supplying them. President Johnson made it clear as long ago as February that he understood that. But it is just as unreasonable to expect the Americans to let negotiations drag inconclusively on for a year or more—as they did in Korea—while the North Vietnamese assemble and equip a new army and push it into the south along routes freed from the danger of air attack. . . .

These are fair questions. Until somebody answers them, with authority, it will be hard to believe in those nods and winks from Hanoi.

—The Economist [London]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, the urban crisis which our Nation faces has been widely discussed—in newspapers and magazines, on radio and television. Its widespread ramifications have been discussed by learned academicians and public officials, and by concerned citizens all over our Nation. Recently the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] gave an address entitled "The Summer of our Discontent," in which he summed up in a very few pages much of what others have taken chapters and books to say.

Senator MAGNUSON recognizes "that many American cities are no longer amenable places in which to live," and adds:

> They provide very little of the good life for a majority of their inhabitants and a great deal that is sordid, wretched, and hopeless. In many cases, they have been stripped of their beauty, excitement, urbanity, and splendor to stand as monuments to poverty, degradation, prejudice and humiliation.

The Senator's statement of our responsibility is clear and concise:

> I must insist that failure to take major and sweeping actions to relieve the legitimate tensions and grievances will further widen the gulf that already threatens to divide our nation . . . . The War on Poverty and the quest to rebuild urban America . . . [are] for all Americans because all Americans stand to gain.

Senator MAGNUSON's thoughtful remarks are matched by his actions in the Senate. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations of the Committee on Appropriations, he led the successful fight to restore the model cities and rent supplement appropriations which the House slashed earlier this year. As chairman of the Committee on Commerce, he has become the leader of the fight to protect the American consumer. From auto safety to flammable fabrics, from cigarettes to door-to-door salesmen, the senior Senator from Washington has seen to it that the 89th Congress and the 90th Congress so far have produced more items of consumer protection legislation than any previous Congresses in our history. Senator MAGNUSON deserves the thanks of all of us.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator MAGNUSON's thoughtful and constructive address about the problems of our cities be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE SUMMER OF OUR DISCONTENT

(An address by WARREN G. MAGNUSON, U.S. Senator from Washington, the Seattle Rotary Club, September 13, 1967, Seattle, Wash.)

In this summer just past we have seen the greatest domestic upheaval this nation has known in over 100 years. In city after city, from Portland, Oregon to Tampa, Florida disturbances ranging from minor rock throwing incidents to full-scale rioting bordering on revolt have erupted. The massive urban slums of Detroit and Newark were suddenly turned into embattled war zones. Businessmen, clerks, college students, and workingmen were mobilized in National Guard outfits and rushed to the erupting cities to shoot, arrest, and restrain fellow Americans who seemingly went berserk.

Policemen were forced to the streets in riot helmets. Armed with high powered rifles, they have had to fight what resembled small scale guerrilla warfare. To a degree almost unknown in previous American law enforcement history, policemen were exposed to grave personal risk. Rarely before have our dedicated law enforcement officers had to suppress such savage violence, billowing up from the depths of discontent, misery, and frustration, that have turned our cities into seething jungles of lawlessness.

Many, who are ordinarily law-abiding citizens, suddenly turned to looting upon seeing the complete disintegration of law and authority. Others, nurturing pent up hostilities and frustrations, fiendishly took to the rooftops armed with weapons believing that the anonymity of the mob would shield their brutal sniping at policemen, guardsmen, and even, in some cases, helpless bystanders.

Fire, one of man's oldest enemies, emerged once again as a terrifyingly destructive force. Out-of-control flames hungrily devoured homes, businesses, and public buildings. Our cities' firefighters were paralyzed by fear of snipers and mobs bent on assault. The flames from the arsonists' fire bombs spread from building to building, silhouetting the crazed looters senseless frenzy to snap up the riches.

The American public, up until now smugly complacent about the enormous tensions seething in our urban slums, have suddenly been assaulted with the avalanche of disorder. From the television screen and the pages of the daily newspapers, the headlines and sound tracks have screamed out across America to pierce a restless calm. A longtime erosion of general respect for the law has suddenly turned into a galloping disregard for lawful authority, the rights of property ownership, and a shallow value of human life and well-being.

To me, this domestic turmoil, this violence and mob rule is the most frightening development in American society in a hundred years.

And it is monumentally ironical.

It erupts in a period of unprecedented prosperity and well-being for the vast majority of Americans. It comes at a period in which the unemployed number less than four percent of the American labor force. It comes when the median American family is nearing a ten thousand dollar a year annual income. It comes at a period when more American young people are pursuing higher education than have ever done so in the past. It comes when most Americans can expect to live to 70 or past, relatively free of disabling, crippling or confining diseases. It comes at a time of magnificent bounty for the American people. And it comes at a time when many of us naively believed that we were making deliberate progress in improving race relations in the United States.

In the relatively short period of time since the uprisings have outraged our law-abiding American majority, a great debate has begun over where to place the blame. It has drawn in country preachers, black racists, local beat patrolmen, Congressmen, and Senators, poverty fighters, Communist propagandists, and critics at large. Each has tried to outrace the other in an attempt to point the finger and it has become fashionable in some quarters to place the blame on the war on poverty. That's a little like blaming the doctor when cancer strikes. Equally as absurd, some point to decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court. Others argue that the rioting is caused by politicians attempting to appease the Negro vote. Still others claim the violence is a direct outgrowth of peaceful civil rights activities that have been successful in securing basic rights for America's Negroes. These are the simple, pat, black and white answers which it seems to me are inadequate explanations. I'm certain that sociologists, economists, and political scientists will spend days and years trying to arrive at an-

swers, but I suspect that they will never be entirely successful.

One of the most troubling and perplexing truths that *has* emerged, spotlighted as it has been by the fires of mass revolt, is the fact that many American cities are no longer amenable places in which to live. Aristotle once observed that men come together in cities to live and remain together to live the good life. Judged by his standards, American cities do not measure up. They provide very little of the good life for a majority of their inhabitants and a great deal that is sordid, wretched, and hopeless. In many cases, they have been stripped of their beauty, excitement, urbanity, and splendor to stand as monuments to poverty, degradation, prejudice and humiliation.

Their once proud houses stand stooped and broken, testifying to long years of neglect by their opulent landlords who have fled to the burgeoning suburbs. Where great broad avenues once served as exciting channels of commerce and transportation, they now are a constant reminder of the congestion of vehicles and human being that threaten to choke these gasping urban transportation networks. Where children once played in green and open playgrounds sprinkled amidst the urban grandeur, there are now only office buildings, factories, shops and apartment houses. But the children don't play here anymore. Instead, they mass on narrow broken sidewalks, in the fetid alleys and on the sinking steps of the dank, gray, rat-infested tenement buildings.

This is urban America in 1967.

No, it isn't Seattle—at least not yet, Rather it's Philadelphia, Washington, Chicago, New York, Trenton, Newark, Baltimore, Boston, Los Angeles, San Francisco and scores of smaller but nonetheless desperate cities. Some have had rioting, others have not, yet all share the misery, degradation, and poverty that foster a climate conducive to disorder.

Many have used the phrase "crisis in the city" to describe the shocking events of recent months. The phrase sums up well the fact that every American city faces monumental problems in housing, employment, education, and law enforcement. Problems of such scope and depth that an unrelated incident can trigger enough violence to tear apart an American city in a single night. But even this description does not envelop the core of the crisis. We face, not only a crisis in housing, employment, and law enforcement, but also a crisis of belief. The people of the slums are losing their belief in the promise of America. And the rest of us, though confronted with statistics that tell us one of three slum residents has a serious employment problem, still are unwilling to act upon the belief. The simple fact is that legitimate complaints are a major cause of the anger and bitterness that transform a local incident into a matter of national survival.

I will not argue that we can guarantee an end to violence by passing programs that would eliminate all the grievances and injustices that press so heavily on the residents of our central cities. But, on the other hand, I must insist that failure to take major and sweeping actions to relieve the legitimate tensions and grievances will further widen the gulf that already threatens to divide our nation.

I am becoming increasingly disgusted with those in this nation, and many are influential national leaders, who are demanding that we abandon our efforts to provide our cities and their people the decency and the escape from poverty and despair that remains despite this nation's astounding wealth and affluence. These classical reactionaries would rescind all civil rights legislation, kill the war on poverty, and discontinue funds for the federal government's urban rebuilding program in retaliation for what have been termed race riots. These are the voices who cry out in anger when they see television newsfilms showing Negro looters piling TV sets into Cadillacs in Detroit but who never wince when reading of a 3-year-old Negro girl bitten to death in her bed by rats. These unseeing Americans are victims of this senseless rioting, too. Victims, in the sense that they lash out with hatred and vituperation against all of our impoverished Negro Americans, including those who peacefully and lawfully await the day that the American dream of opportunity and equality will be a reality.

This new anti-Negro mentality is well exemplified by the column of a nationally syndicated newspaper columnist who recently dismissed American urban poverty this way, and I quote, "But nothing points up the phoniness of this cause more sharply than the news pictures showing Negro looters loaded down with cases of whiskey and television sets." Ordinarily such shabby reasoning would be dismissed as merely the prattling of a crank, but I am alarmed to note that this kind of reaction is widespread.

There is, it seems to me, a widespread misunderstanding concerning our desire to relieve the desperate plight of the cities which again and again has been labeled "appeasing rioters."

Let me make myself unmistakably clear.

Rioters, looters, murderers, and arsonists and those who incite and promote violence should not be spared the full and unremitting punishment of law. These reckless hoodlums, outlaws, punks and trouble-makers, whether they be black or white, must be swiftly and sternly punished. They must be forced to understand that violence will not be tolerated; they must be handled in the sternest manner if our great heritage of law and order is to prevail. We will not allow our precious heritage to be jeopardized by this lawless fringe who seize upon this spirit of restlessness, despair, and frustration and seek to destroy what little dignity the Negro urban American still possesses. Stern punishment must serve as an example to others who, alienated from this complex and sometimes unjust society, might seek to wreak their vengeance on our cities and their law abiding inhabitants. These black racists, most of whom are thoroughly discredited within the Negro community, must be constantly observed to see that their insurrectionist mouthings are not allowed to foment black Americans. Those who are frustrated by great promises of a better tomorrow but who, so far, have seen their urban ghettos slip deeper into the abyss of squalor and depravity.

But in our haste to safeguard our precious American heritage of law, we must not be deterred from the task of rebuilding urban America. Not only Watts, Detroit, Newark but all the American cities in which the dream of a great tomorrow somehow seems unattainable. We must not turn from the desperate plight of millions of law abiding Americans who, in this great age of richness, have been engulfed in the ever widening chasm between rich middle class America and their own world of abject poverty. These unfortunate Americans who have patiently awaited the opening of the doors of opportunity in the slums of American cities.

We have endured a summer of urban violence without parallel in the Nation's history. These events summon us to action. They are grim reminders of the intolerance which has become endemic in our cities. They pose a challenge to the reputation of the Nation and to the will of its people. The challenge is as immense as the task is clear. It is to preserve the domestic tranquility so that the promise of the Constitution may be pursued by all Americans under law and in order.

We do not reward rioters when we stimulate the building of the kind of housing and neighborhoods in which people can live decently and safely. We do not reward rioters when we seek to provide educational opportunities for youngsters unaware of the wonderful world outside the invisible walls of the ghetto. We do not reward rioters when we seek to train poor, uneducated men and women who are not equipped to be productive members of our complex society. We do not seek to reward rioters when we ask for funds to kill the rats that many of our major cities continue to ignore. Rats which bite thousands of youngsters and infants each year. We do not seek to reward rioters when we build city playgrounds and open spaces for children who have never seen a grassy field or a swimming pool.

No, we are not speaking of rewards but of responsibilities. Not responsibilities to rioters but obligations to the United States, its future and its people. We are challenged, wherever we may come from in the Nation whether from rural or urban States because, in the end, we are one nation and there is no future for any part of it unless there is a future for all of it. We are challenged to redress wrongs too numerous to mention, too old to ignore.

There are no overnight answers to this challenge, no instant solutions to the problems of the cities. Money alone is not the answer. Government action alone is not the answer.

But equally as clear and emphatic is the fact that no solutions are possible without money and no long-range solutions will take place unless there is government action, prompt and persistent and at all levels.

President Johnson summed up the nature of our responsibility recently when he said, "If we become two people—the suburban affluent and the urban poor, each filled with mistrust and fear one for the other—we shall as well condemn our own generation to a bitter paradox; an educated, wealthy, progressive people who would not give their thoughts, their resources or their will to provide for the common well being."

Where are the answers to meeting our responsibilities? Which is the path that will lead us toward a better, more productive future for our great urban masses? Where do we begin—at what level of government or with which resources of the private sector? How much do we spend? These are the questions that demand our attention, our best talent, and our total commitment. I don't have any pat answers or grand scheme. Neither does President Johnson nor Governor Evans nor Mayor Braman. But that should not detract from our continuing search and our efforts to organize and fund some imaginative ideas which have already been formulated.

Let's take a look at what we have now that is worth preserving and strengthening.

One hundred years after Abraham Lincoln established the Department of Agriculture, cities were given, in 1965, an equal voice in the Cabinet by the creation of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The model cities program of 1966 and the rent supplement program of 1965 provided new and advanced legislative tools for rebuilding cities and improving housing for the poor.

In that short 2 year span, legislation has been enacted looking to the modernization of city transportation so that Americans may get into and out of and around in our cities easily, cheaply, and safely.

Minimum wages for 41 million workers were raised in 1966; nearly a million workers have been retrained under new man power programs.

More than 20 million Americans are receiving decent meals through a food-stamp and school-lunch programs.

Eight million disadvantaged youngsters, and nearly a million young college students, are today benefiting from the great commitment to education which was made by this

Government in the landmark education acts of 1965.

In 1964, pioneer legislation was enacted in an effort to break the appalling line of chronic poverty in America and two million Americans have already risen above that line.

During the past 3 years, we have invested more than $16 billion in new programs of this kind. Additional billions have gone into older programs, such as public assistance, public housing, social security, urban renewal, hospital construction, and unemployment compensation.

These programs have served to meet some of the more gaping of the gaps in metropolitan America and to meet the more urgent needs of millions of urban Americans. A *continuance*, and I stress a continuance, of these programs is essential if we mean even to hold the line against the rapid decay of the cities.

Recently, we in the Congress have been involved in a tremendous fight over two of the most important new programs to be put forward in years. The Rent Supplement Act and the Model Cities Program. Both have come under heated attack by many critics who have only recently acknowledged that they misunderstood the programs.

Rent supplement is an imaginative new concept which may offer long term hope for rebuilding America's urban housing. By utilizing the resources and the talents of American private enterprise to construct and manage low cost rental housing, we will be able to provide decent dwellings for millions of Americans who now know only the tenements. This is not a give-away program. This is not public housing. This is not endless welfare. It is the opposite. Rent supplement housing offers the disadvantaged and the unemployed the incentive to work, to care for a dwelling, and to take pride in a better city. It also provides incentives for private business and other interested groups to lend a hand in rebuilding our great cities.

Recently, my appropriations subcommittee has taken action to restore the 40 million dollars to this program that was slashed in the House. Next week, we will have the bill on the Senate Floor and I am hopeful it will be approved.

The Model Cities plan too, needs our urgent support. This is an entirely new concept aimed at an eventual total rehabilitation of our core cities. It is a local program, put together by local officials to meet peculiar local needs. I am pleased that our outstanding Mayor, Dorm Braman, has submitted one of the first applications for this important project and have every hope that Seattle will be among the first model city projects to get underway. Applications for programs have come in from all over the country, from big city and small and the only thing they share in common is unique and uncommon answers to some of the most compelling problems.

One city has requested funds to train residents of depressed neighborhoods in rehabilitation of housing. Another city has proposed a local training academy for the model neighborhood where community leaders, managers, and administrators would be schooled and trained in order that they could play a direct role in the rehabilitation of their core area.

These are imaginative ideas and they offer hope for a better tomorrow. They offer promise that the Model Cities program will be successful. Again, my appropriations subcommittee has increased the funding for this important effort over the sum approved by the House and I am hopeful that the Senate will fully support this action.

Let's not forget the war on poverty either. Of course, most of you here today are well aware of the splendid OEO programs now functioning in Seattle and Tacoma. The programs have the support of most of the community and have been well managed and planned, but too often mistakes or careless judgment by a couple of poverty workers stirs a storm of protest. What the protesters never remember is that in city after city this summer, the war on poverty people were in the forefront trying to cool tensions below the boiling point. There are dozens of examples of dedicated young men and women who personally intervened at grave danger to themselves in an attempt to quiet the mobs. Unfortunately, in many cases their efforts were too little and too late. But, this effort must continue—this program must go on because it offers millions of Americans the hope for a better tomorrow.

Now is not the time to damn the darkness. Instead it is the time to light a candle. Now is not the time for politics. Now is the time to resolve that the ghettos must go, that our cities must be rebuilt, that all our children must be accorded an excellent education, that every American must have equal opportunity for self-fulfillment, that, in short, the war on poverty must be won. This is the way to guarantee the preservation of our constitutional form of government, and of a society built upon law and order, law which is just, and order which reflects the dignity of all citizens, irrespective of the color of their skin or economic status in our society.

In conclusion, I want to say a word about ghettos. Right away we think of a city slum. But there is another kind of ghetto, an interior ghetto of the mind where we seal off parts of democracy that don't suit us, where we box off our obligations to justice and shut out our commitments to fairness. This ghetto of the mind is no less stinking and rotten than the ghetto of the city.

In truth, the war on poverty and the quest to rebuild urban America is not being fought for the poor. It is for all Americans because all Americans stand to gain by it. Not just with peace in our cities, but also peace in our hearts.

I thank you all very much.

VIETNAM

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, for many weeks, the Senate and the country have debated our policy in Vietnam. I have listened with attention to the diverse views expressed by my distinguished colleagues, and I share their deep concern. I have carefully reevaluated and reconsidered every proposal. Today, I wish to state my position.

Daniel Webster once said:

> It is one of the greatest reproaches to human nature that wars are sometimes just.

One might add that wars are never pleasant to either talk about or to conduct.

In 1968, the people of the United States must select their President. Throughout this year, attempts to tell the truth must not be labeled a campaign trick and mocked as an effort to frighten the people of the United States so that it may appear essential to keep in command the present Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. To admit that our democracy could not face the truth and act on it, even in a campaign year, seems to me an admission that democracy cannot survive. I will not admit that the structure of human freedom which has been built by Washington and Jefferson and preserved by Lincoln is doomed to perish because some men would question motives and sneer that patriotism is party politics.

Probably no person in the country is better informed on every aspect of the situation in Vietnam than is the President of the United States. His responsibilities are awesome. He deserves the respect of the Nation. I know that he is doing what he thinks best.

There are those who question his judgment, and such questions, if directed responsibly, can be constructive in serving to clarify the nature of the situation in Vietnam. But there also are those who question the President's motives. These people do the country, the President, and themselves a great disservice. They belittle their country, and they belittle themselves as well. There can be no reasonable questioning of the motives of the President, or of the Government, on the subject of Vietnam.

Mr. President, the right to disagree is one of the fundamental rights of our society. Disagreement and dissent within the bounds of law, order, propriety, and decency are healthy and should be welcomed.

But when we note the disagreement, the dissent, and the demonstrations that are sweeping the country, let us not lose sight of the proper perspective. As the Secretary of State said yesterday in Los Angeles, it is not the demonstrators but the fighting men in Vietnam who really speak for the American people today.

Some words spoken by Theodore Roosevelt also are appropriate here. He said:

> No nation ever yet retained its freedom for any length of time after losing its respect for the law, after losing the law-abiding spirit, the spirit that really makes orderly liberty.

I would remind my colleagues and this country that in America no man is above the law and no man is below the law.

Mr. President, we have all read the great editorials which have appeared in the press of the United States, but I have here an editorial from a British newspaper, the Daily Telegraph, which is directly on this point. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

VIETNAM MIASMA

Fortunately there is reason to believe that increasing criticism and organized protests in America against the Vietnam war, although they increase the strain in the White House and in the field, will not divert President Johnson from his course or seriously affect the war effort. Unfortunately what they are doing is to harden the North Vietnamese Government in its refusal to negotiate.

It has long been clear that the American Army cannot be beaten. The shaky political scene in South Vietnam has been transformed by successful elections in mid-war and despite a host of traditional problems (when will the North have elections?) As Mr. Rusk said a few days ago, without contradiction, defections from the Viet Cong have doubled in a year, Communist recruitment of Southerners has halved, areas under enemy control are being steadily reduced, roads are being opened up. Hanoi's latest hope is that civilian morale in America will crack under a small dent in affluent living and the irksome realities of responsibility, before the morale of the hunted, starving, outnumbered, battered and decimated Viet Cong and North Vietnamese.

That such a possibility should ever be conceivable is due to the influence of a distorting miasma composed of a variety of American weaknesses, frustrations, escapisms, personal rivalries and social conflicts, with a masterful infusion of Left-wing and Communist propaganda. Thus it is accepted that the Communists are justified in invading South Vietnam and systematically massacring loyal local officials. Thus Ho Chi Minh is not blamed for insisting on American withdrawal or for making it a point of honour not to reciprocate in any way for the cessation of bombing.

The critics of President Johnson would sweep the country if they could suggest a convincing alternative policy. Confronted by the facts they can only offer the hope that Ho would become another Tito. This is a prospect that non-Communist countries of Asia do not relish, and a risk they do not wish to take. Australia and New Zealand have given fresh proof of this by increasing their forces in Vietnam, and the Japanese Prime Minister by his projected visit to Saigon. If the Americans withdrew to strong points the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese would regain the countryside. If the bombing was stopped the flow of men and arms would increase. The sooner Ho realises that he cannot win on American campuses and boulevards the war he is losing in Vietnam, the sooner will he come to the conference table.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, any serious consideration of American policy in Vietnam, any serious analysis of the problems we face or the situation in which we find ourselves there, should begin by at least a review of the history of our involvement.

In the interest of brevity, I would take the Geneva Conference of 1954 as a point of departure. Prior to that, as we all know, Vietnam had fought and won a war for national independence from the French. The United States did not formally participate in the Geneva Conference of 1954 which ended this war. Nonetheless, we did play a critical backstage role at Geneva. The very fact of the possibility of military intervention by the United States may have influenced Hanoi in agreeing to settle for a temporary division of Vietnam at the 17th parallel and for independent states of Cambodia and Laos. When the Geneva accords were signed, the United States made it clear that we would view any aggression in violation of the accords with grave concern and as seriously threatening international peace and security. We also made it clear, just as we had with regard to the divided nations of Germany and Korea, that we favored their reunification through free elections supervised by the United Nations.

A few months afterward, at Manila in September of 1954, we signed the treaty setting up SEATO, the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. In this SEATO Treaty, South Vietnam and its territory were included as a "protocol state," and the signatories specifically accepted the obligation, if asked by the Government of South Vietnam, to take action in response to armed attack against South Vietnam and to consult on appropriate measures if South Vietnam were subjected to subversive actions. This treaty was ratified by our Senate in February 1955, by a vote of 82 to 1.

At about the same time, in late 1954, President Eisenhower committed the United States to furnish economic support for the new government that President Diem had organized and which was already showing itself considerably stronger and more viable than many had believed possible. Finally, in early 1955, without any formal statement the United States began to take over the job of military assistance to South Vietnam.

Thus, during the 1954–55 period the United States both undertook a major treaty commitment involving South Vietnam and began a major supporting role. Again, these actions were accepted with very wide support in the United States as the debate and the vote in the Senate abundantly proved at the time. Further, the relevant Senate documents state conclusively that there was full understanding of the grave implications of the Southeast Asia obligations, particularly as they related to aggression by means of armed attacks.

As long ago as 1954, and the reasons for this view only increased with the passage of time, there was a firm conviction in the Senate and in the public at large that a successful takeover by North Vietnam or Communist China of any state bordering them in Southeast Asia would in very short order also destroy the capacity of other nations of Southeast Asia, either neutral or aligned, to maintain their independence. These are the basic reasons underlying the position we took in Vietnam and Southeast Asia in 1954 and 1955.

This American commitment, undertaken for the good reasons outlined above during the administration of President Eisenhower, was confirmed and reinforced by President Kennedy, who firmly believed that our commitment in South Vietnam was not one that he could abandon without undesirable consequences throughout Asia and, indeed, the world. By the fall of 1961 the "guerrilla aggression" which North Vietnam had instigated, directed, and supplied had reached truly serious proportions, and morale in South Vietnam had been badly shaken. President Kennedy believed that the threat implicit in this North Vietnamese aggression could not be met without major additional U.S. actions. President Kennedy, rising to the challenge and the specific requirements of the situation, decided to commit a system of advisers, pilots, and supporting military personnel that gradually rose to the level of 25,000 men between 1961 and 1964.

By December of 1964, the North Vietnamese, apparently having exhausted their manpower pool of ethnic Southerners and casual replacements who would do their bidding in the South, sent a regiment of troops of the regular army of North Vietnam into the South. Several other regiments of the regular army of North Vietnam infiltrated into the South in the spring of 1965. It was in response to this massive and clearcut armed aggression that the United States brought in, first limited numbers of combat troops in the spring of 1965 and finally, in the late summer of 1965, committed a major combat force to the area.

Now, there is one simple question that all Americans must ask themselves. Is the freedom and security of South Vietnam vital to the United States?

If the answer to this question is in the negative, then our course is clear. We should withdraw our forces from South Vietnam immediately, admit our mistake to all the world and await the consequences. Perhaps we could establish the outposts of freedom somewhere else in Southeast Asia—perhaps we could retreat to the Philippines, the Mariannas, or even the State of Hawaii. If our involvement is not vital, then clearly we should get out, just as quickly as we possibly can.

I reject this position. I believe that the freedom and security of South Vietnam are vital to the freedom and security of our country, and that we should oppose aggression in Southeast Asia with military force.

With that said, our purpose at the present time must be to determine how we can best achieve our goals—how we can protect freedom and prevent aggression; and how we can prevent the Communists from taking by force a strategic part of the world.

To begin with, there are three possible courses of action open to the United States:

First. Withdrawal of our military forces.

Second. Intensive escalation of our military effort.

Third. Continuation of the policy we are now following.

Let us examine these choices.

First, withdrawal. As I have just stated, this is unthinkable and impossible. It would have disastrous results.

It would likely bring about the collapse of South Vietnam, and then Laos, Thailand, Burma, Indonesia, and whatever else is left of Southeast Asia.

It would likely result in the slaughter of hundreds of thousands of people in South Vietnam and other countries who are relying upon the United States for their protection and the preservation of their freedom.

It would put a permanent stain—the stain of blood—on the honor of the United States. Our word, given and accepted in good faith, would be broken; our commitments rendered worthless; our credibility forever in doubt.

It would provide encouragement to the Communist movement around the world.

Two refinements of a policy of withdrawal have been advanced: the enclave theory, and a bombing pause.

The enclave theory is unworkable from a military point of view. It would establish our military forces as sitting duck targets for enemy attacks. The cost to the United States in casualties and dollars would be increased enormously.

Another bombing pause also would be inconsistent with our goals in Vietnam. We have tried this before. It never has worked. On the contrary, the enemy has taken advantage of bombing lulls to resupply its forces and repair the damage from previous raids. Clearly, a bombing pause would be to our disadvantage.

At the other extreme, there is the possible course of action that calls for an intensive escalation of our military campaign. This might include invasion of

the North and the use of nuclear weapons against the enemy.

Adoption of this policy also could have disastrous results.

It might lead to a worldwide nuclear war that would destroy civilization as we now know it.

If the United States invades North Vietnam, then Red China may be forced into the war against us. This could very possibly lead to open collision with the Soviet Union in Vietnam or elsewhere. It obviously would result in a tremendous increase in U.S. casualties.

Moreover, the United States would be labeled the aggressor in such an escalation of our military campaign against the North. This is directly contrary to our purpose. We are not aggressors and we do not want to be aggressors. Our mission is to protect and defend, not to attack.

Thus, we are left only with the course we presently are following in Vietnam. I believe this is the best course among the choices available to us. It has proven effective to date and, given time, I believe it will lead us to the goals we seek in Vietnam; namely, peace.

We are an impatient people; we fear we are at an impasse, a stalemate, a draw in the Vietnamese conflict. Can memories be so short to forget that it was only 2½ years ago that the Vietcong were on the offensive throughout South Vietnam and were close to overrunning all the country? The administration has made information available which clearly proves that we have been making slow but steady progress. Over the past year, the South Vietnamese desertion rate has steadily declined. Defections from the Communist side have doubled over the rate in 1966 which was in turn double the 1965 rate. Two years ago, the South Vietnamese Army was losing three weapons for each weapon captured. Today the South Vietnamese Army is capturing four Communist weapons for each one they lose. The Communists are losing in combat more than four times as many men as all the allied forces. The Communists are on the defensive. Allied forces have shattered the enemy offensive across the DMZ. Food has become a critical problem for the VC even in the Mekong rice bowl. It is clear that there has been a favorable change in the military situation in the past 2 years. In a military sense, the North Vietnamese cannot win, and they know it.

Mr. President, while I support the present policy of the United States in Vietnam, I would offer several suggestions for improvements entirely consistent with that policy:

First. The tours of combat duty that our military men serve in Vietnam should be strictly limited. It occurs to me that perhaps our young men subject to the draft are bearing more than their share of the burden. A selective callup of reservists and National Guardsmen, individuals and units with needed skills, makes sense to me. These men are trained, readily available and certainly aware that they are subject to call. Greater use of these Reserve Forces would relieve the burden on our young draftees.

Second. Our present bombing strategy in the North should be intensified to fully accomplish its objective: the destruction of the enemy's supply sources. The port of Haiphong should be closed, either by bombing or mining, to prevent any importation of supplies into the North by ship. All military airfields in the North should be destroyed. All powerplants, military storage facilities, railroad lines, and roads of any military significance should be put out of operation.

Third. We must insist on a greater participation by the Army of South Vietnam. If necessary, we must be tougher with the Saigon generals. South Vietnamese and United States forces should be mixed in units whenever possible. We must demand reforms in the operations of the South Vietnam Government and an end to the corruption and inefficiency that often hinders the war effort.

Fourth. We must also insist on greater participation and cooperation by the other sophisticated and industrialized nations of the world. True, we are not alone in South Vietnam. Some 43 countries are involved. But we must toughen our stance toward some nations who, by other actions, are actually harming our war effort. No country that opposes the Communist aggression in Vietnam should trade with the enemy. Nor should the United States trade with countries which, themselves, trade with the enemy. The United States should curtail its economic aid programs to all these countries. The full economic, moral, and political power of the United States must be used to secure international cooperation in our undertaking to protect the freedom of all people.

Fifth. As I stated in the Senate a week or more ago, the United Nations must become actively involved in the efforts to seek a solution to the war. The United States should press vigorously, in the Security Council and the General Assembly, for a greater and more effective role by the U.N.

Mr. President, millions of impassioned words have been poured out in recent months about Vietnam. Yet, one single line in one single Presidential speech seems to sum up why we are there, why we fight, and what we are fighting for.

In his remarks to the International Federation of Commercial, Clerical & Technical Employees on October 23, President Johnson said:

> Peace and stability will come to Asia only when aggressors know that they cannot take another people's land by force.

That, in my humble opinion, is what Vietnam is really all about.

We do have solemn international treaties which we must honor.

There is our national interest and the national word of the United States to be honored.

There are the long-range interests of the United States as it faces Communist China with almost a billion people.

But the basic, commanding fact which committed us to Vietnam, and which makes us stay, is that Americans have never stood by while stronger nations battered weaker ones.

To back down now is not in the American tradition.

For good or evil, for better or worse, the United States is and must remain forever committed to the world community. There is no longer any place to hide.

Through war and peace, the United States has always tried to use its resources in a constructive and compassionate way.

We did so during the First World War, during World War II, during the Korean war, and during the would-be Communist-inspired civil wars around the globe. We are doing so in Vietnam today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the remarks of the President of the United States to the International Federation of Commercial, Clerical, and Technical Employees on October 23, 1967.

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

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT TO THE INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF COMMERCIAL, CLERICAL, AND TECHNICAL EMPLOYEES, OCTOBER 23, 1967

It is a great pleasure for me to welcome you here for your first conference in this hemisphere.

I have been familiar for many years with your work.

In 1961, I took one of the most rewarding exciting trips of my life with your President—Jim Suffridge. We visited a number of your countries together, on a mission for President Kennedy. It was on that journey—with Mr. Suffridge as my guide—that I saw some of the worldwide activities of FIET.

I saw then in other lands what I knew well in my own—working people building better lives for themselves and better futures for their families through their labor organizations. I saw schools, new housing and health clinics, credit unions and cooperatives which had been created largely with the help of their trade unions.

As you meet to study the problems and the promise of tomorrow, I join you as one who shares your vision of the good life. I come as the representative of 200 million people who want very much to see a world in which all the guns of war are stilled; in which every nation is free to mark its own course; in which every man is able to build—through his own effort—fulfillment for himself and opportunity for his children.

We can agree quickly that this is the goal we all seek—because we are not the first to put it into words. In this generation, many men from many lands have talked hopefully of a stable world of growing promise—because for the first time in man's history it is realistic to think in global terms about improving man's condition.

The fact that mankind now can rid this planet of ignorance and hunger is one of the most awesome bits of knowledge we live with.

It is History's cruel paradox that man should finally acquire this ability, after all his years of struggle, just as he also gains the power to destroy his race.

The rest of his story will be told—if it is told at all—in terms of which power he employs.

He can use his atomic might to make the deserts of the world bloom—or to incinerate his planet.

We can use our science to develop weapons that dwarf the mind—or to expand men's minds with learning.

We can commit our sons to a new generation of peril—or leave them the foundation stones for a new civilization.

The will to live is the strongest human impulse. It generates a stubborn optimism which runs deep in the human spirit.

An eloquent American writer has given it voice in our time. "I believe," he said, "that man will not merely endure; he will prevail. He is immortal, not because he alone among creatures has an inexhaustible voice, but because he has a soul, a spirit capable of compassion and sacrifice and endurance."

William Faulkner spoke those words almost two decades ago. It is a measure of how far we have come that they sounded braver then than they do now.

The great victories of reason and agreement, which can assure the survival of the human race, still lie ahead of us.

The ones behind us are modest and small.

But they are victories nonetheless.

We have not yet passed safely through the danger we have created. But we have walked far enough to dare to hope that we will make it.

The fact that war itself has not yet disappeared is a matter of infinite tragedy.

Many thousands of our countrymen are today involved in a bitter conflict in a land far from here—because armed invaders try to impose their will on their neighbor.

In every way we can, we search for peace in Vietnam. But we appear to be searching alone. Those who began the war are not willing to explore ways to end it. They cling stubbornly to the belief that their aggression will be rewarded—by our frustration, our impatience, our unwillingness to stay the course.

It will not be so.

Peace and stability will come to Asia only when the aggressors know that they cannot take another people's land by force.

Our Asian allies fighting beside us believe this.

And so do the leaders and the people of those free nations in the path of conquest.

But to end the threat of war, we must do even more than keep aggression in check.

Most wars are bred in conditions of human misery. Aggressors are boldest when they can exploit a people's discontent.

This discontent churns in a world where illiteracy cripples two-fifths of the adult population—and where disease still dooms children to an early death.

The experience of the last decade proves that violence erupts most often in nations which are poor.

The great work of our day, then, is to change the conditions that encourage war—to do something about the old tyrannies of hunger and disease and ignorance, which still enslave two-thirds of the human race.

That work has well started.

I am proud of the role my own Nation has played in the beginning of this worthy adventure. A leading public figure of a free Asian country recently said about the United States: ". . . This is perhaps the first time in history that a world power has consciously used its strength and wealth to promote the interests of weak and poor nations."

On behalf of our people, I believe that tribute is well-deserved. The American people have used their resources in a constructive and compassionate way—because we have had to learn quickly the lessons which history forced upon us overnight.

Today, history teaches us all a new lesson.

A concept of world order is quietly emerging which offers the world its best chance for constructive change.

It is a new sense of community. It links together states that share a common geography.

There is no word which can adequately describe it and convey the excitement and hope it generates. But for want of a better term, we refer to it as regionalism.

It is built on an awareness which has grown rapidly in the minds of many men. That idea is simply this—despite the passions of nationalism, the problems of an area respect no national borders. There is a belief that action can be more effective when it is taken in unison. There is a determination to work together in shaping a common destiny; through economic development.

The logic of this idea first became evident in Europe. The chaos of war forced the leaders of Western Europe to look with new insight into the old patterns of rivalry. They reached a significant conclusion. They saw that the more they could travel together, the faster they could move to a prosperous future. Going it alone, they might never make it. The European Common Market was a result of this thinking.

In Latin America, economic integration is clearly seen as the key which can unlock strength dreamed of for centuries.

In Asia the same idea has now begun—for the very first time—to persuade separate nations of their common purpose.

Africa, too, is feeling the stirrings of a regional spirit.

Only in the Middle East do ancient rivalries and frustrations still seem to inhibit the prospects of cooperation. But in our search for new solutions to old challenges, there is hope even here that men will look together at the problems they share.

Nowhere is the road easy, and nowhere has that road yet been fully travelled. But men and nations are moving ahead.

In my years of public life, no development in world affairs has encouraged me more. Behind the headlines of crisis, a new spirit of progress has been quietly at work.

The United States will continue to encourage its development and to support its growth.

But the world itself remains man's first community. And problems still must be met on a global basis—weather control, for example, and the spread of nuclear weapons, and international monetary reform.

World trade is yet another.

Just five years ago, the major trading countries began the most ambitious round of trade negotiations ever undertaken. Because these talks were initiated by a great American President, they took his name, and became known as the Kennedy Round.

This past summer, the Kennedy Round was successfully concluded. It brought tariff reductions greater than any in history. It moved the world closer to the healthy trading conditions on which the prosperity of many nations depends.

It was an historic landmark in the efforts of all of us to create a sounder world community.

Preserving the gains won in the Kennedy Round is essential to the world's harmony and well-being.

It will not be easy. Freer trade often causes temporary but painful dislocations. And today, once again, we hear protectionist voices rising out of the past.

But larger interests must prevail. We must consider our common interests in protecting our consumers; in promoting healthy and competitive industry and agriculture; in raising the productivity and wages of our workers.

We have an enormous stake in keeping and extending the benefits of 30 years of constructive trade policy.

And our overall interest lies in working together to establish new conditions for a peaceful and more prosperous world order.

To the developing countries, striving to reach the 20th Century industrial world, trade is the lifeline of hope.

The leading nations of the Free World are together studying ways to improve the trading position of those emerging lands. In the meantime, the Kennedy Round increases the trading opportunities they so badly need.

That increase in strength is not enough to assure their industrial success. But it is a step forward.

The world is moving fast. Developments measured a step at a time may not stir the mind as forcefully as the headlong rush of crisis can.

And through a generation of peril, progress has often moved forward by short steps. Yet those steps now add up to many miles.

It is good for us all, I think, when we are burdened by the awareness of how far we must still go, to look back and reflect on how far we have come.

Thank you.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator from Maryland is a very hard-working Senator on the Armed Services Committee.

Today, he has presented to the Senate a thoughtful analysis of the situation as it confronts our country in its efforts to withstand aggression and subversion in Vietnam.

I commend the Senator on this very realistic and sensible evaluation of the situation and of our clear responsibility as a nation in meeting our commitments toward the Republic of Vietnam. I wish to thank the Senator for having made this statement. I think it was timely. It was needed. I trust that Senators and other Americans will read the very cogent and lucid speech that has been made by the senior Senator from the State of Maryland.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague, the acting majority leader, and my associate on the Senate Armed Services Committee, for his very gracious remarks.

I yield the floor.

DR. FELIX C. CABALLOL AND WIFE, LUCIA J. CABALLOL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the message from the House of Representatives amending S. 1108.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1108) for the relief of Dr. Felix C. Caballol and wife, Lucia J. Caballol, which was, in line 4, strike out all after "Caballol," where it appears the first time, down through and including "wife," in line 5.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of Dr. Felix C. Caballol."

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on June 13, 1967, the Senate passed S. 1108 to grant permanent residence retroactively to a husband and wife, in whose cases it was stated that U.S. citizenship was a prerequisite for employment in their respective fields of medicine and teaching.

On October 17, 1967, the House of Representatives passed S. 1108 with amendments to delete the name of the female beneficiary.

So that there will be no further delay in providing relief for the principal male beneficiary, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to S. 1108.

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

The motion was agreed to.

ROSEMARIE GAUCH NETH

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the message from the House of Representatives amending S. 445.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 445) for the relief of Rosemarie Gauch Neth which was in line 4, strike out all after "Neth", down through and including "Vietnam," in line 6.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on June 13, 1967, the House passed S. 445, to enable the widow of a U.S. citizen serviceman killed in Vietnam to file a petition for naturalization under the provisions of law applicable to spouses of U.S. citizens.

On October 17, 1967, the House of Representatives passed S. 445, with an amendment to delete the language in the bill referring to the deceased husband.

While the action of the House of Representatives was unnecessary, it does not affect the benefits provided in the bill, and I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment to S. 445.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 26, 1967, at 12 noon.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Retirement of Russell S. Hilbert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK H. McDONALD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 1967

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is with mixed emotions that I today bring to your attention the November 1 retirement of Russell S. Hilbert, superintendent of Redford Union Schools, Redford Township, Mich.

Russ Hilbert has dedicated 43 years of his productive life to educational administration, so his retirement, though a reward for his many years of service, is also regarded as a great loss for the Redford Union School system. During those 43 years, Russ has served as school superintendent, not only in the Redford Union School system, but also in the Michigan communities of Sebewaing and Romeo.

Except for postgraduate study done at the Universities of Chicago and California, Russ Hilbert has been a lifelong resident of the State of Michigan, having been born near Wayland in Allegan County. Russ attended Wayland public schools and did his undergraduate work at Western Michigan University. His masters degree was earned at the University of Michigan, where he also did postgraduate work.

During World War II Russ served his country as an officer in the U.S. Air Force. He saw action in the Pacific theater.

Russ Hilbert serves as chairman of the teachers retirement committee of the Michigan Association of School Administrators, is a charter member of the Redford Township Music Society, served as a director of the Redford Township Chamber of Commerce, and on the Governor's Committee on Pre-Paid Hospital and Medical Plans, and is a former president of both the Macomb and Wayne County School Administrators.

As you can see, Mr. Speaker, Russell Hilbert has dedicated his life to bettering his fellow man, and the job he has done stands as a fine example for those who are to follow.

I share today in the pride which Mrs. Hilbert and the Hilberts' daughter, Mary Margaret, sons James and Roger, and six grandchildren derive from the contribution Russell Hilbert has made to enrich the lives of all those who know him.

Seized by Pettiness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL E. BUTTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 1967

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal spoke editorially Monday on a matter about which Members of this House have been generally silent, quite possibly from embarrassment.

I am referring to the arbitrary and lightly taken exclusion of employees of the Office of Economic Opportunity from the pay increase for Federal employees. The Wall Street Journal rightly condemns this as a "gratuitous insult." It is an insult not only to the dedicated employees of that agency and to the entire U.S. Civil Service, but it taints this House as well. This country enjoys the most competent and trustworthy civil service in the world. That some of these men and women have been singled out for financial penalty is an unhappy commentary on the legislative whims of this body.

Mr. Speaker, many Members of the House have honest misgivings about certain aspects of the poverty program. Fair criticism must be based on the substance of the war on poverty, not on "seizures of pettiness," in the Journal's words, exemplified by the vote on the pay bill.

You might hope—

Says the Wall Street Journal, that—

The House had learned its lesson from the self-demeaning anti-rat episode, but you would hope in vain.

I continue to have hope, Mr. Speaker, not only that the wrong done by the House will be undone, but that when the economic opportunity bill comes before this body at long last, we will buckle down to work and act with seriousness, constructiveness, and good sense.

GOP Turns Its Back on Our Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 1967

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, those Republicans who voted so determinedly against model cities and rent supplements yesterday should understand that by their actions they rang the bell for another round of urban riots.

It seems as if they would rather see blood run in the streets than lift one little finger to clean up the slums.

By their votes on these two bills, the Republicans showed their total disinterest in the problems of the cities—as well as demonstrating a full measure of hypocrisy.

Virtually all the Republican Presidential candidates, their Governors and mayors, as well as their members of Congress, screamed to high heaven at the time of last summer's riots that the Government must provide more assistance to the cities—and must encourage private industry to help.

But when the moment of truth arrives—when they are called upon to vote for programs which do exactly what they say must be done—they run like scared rabbits.

They are the first to scream that our cities are in a mess but they are the last to do anything about it.

Particularly in regard to rent supple-