SENATE—*Monday, April 1, 1968*

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

Dr. David S. Evans, executive secretary, Board of Christian Social Concerns, Michigan Conference of the Methodist Church, Grand Rapids, Mich., offered the following prayer:

Gracious and Eternal God our Father, we gather this day as free members of a nation blessed in so many ways by Thy divine providence. For Thy goodness unto us we give Thee our earnest thanks and ask that we might merit Thy favor in the days to come.

Comfort us in the moments when we feel buffeted by the winds of change, that Thou art ever near us to sustain us and give us the strength we need. Grant us wisdom to do that which is most creative for the cause of freedom at home and abroad regardless of the fear or favor of man.

This day, O God, the beauty of spring is all about us. Neither the harshness of winter cold nor the scorching heat of summer torment us. In this time of the blooming of the new flowers and the gentleness of nature's reawakening, may our spirits be touched with that spirit of hope and new beginnings that what we do may be freighted with a new promise and benefit for our own people and all mankind. We pray in the Saviour's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 29, 1968, be dispensed with.

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

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

TAX ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1968

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, because of circumstances I did not wish to discuss at the time, I thought it necessary to move to adjourn the Senate early on Friday afternoon.

I can say at this time that I was informed by a representative of the Secretary of the Treasury that the latter felt that if the Senate voted on Friday not to increase taxes, it would have had an adverse effect on negotiations going on in Stockholm at that time.

It was feared that such action might give the impression that the U.S. Senate was not willing to vote for a tax increase.

I believed that it would be possible to make the legislative history clear to the effect that on occasion when the House saw fit to send the Senate a measure recommended by the House, many of us who were not inclined to vote for a major tax increase under the parliamentary situation existing on this last Friday, would consider the matter in an entirely different light in the case of a major tax measure originating in the House. In other words, in my opinion, turning down a tax increase last Friday would not necessarily have closed the door at all.

Nevertheless, it was felt that this would be viewed by the foreign press in an entirely different light and might be very much misunderstood. This apparently was on the theory that the Senate would by such a vote be indicating its intention to not, under any circumstances, vote for a major tax increase. As I said, I believe this would not be an accurate reflection of the will of the Senate. But I, for one, as manager of the revenue bill on the floor of the Senate, did not wish to take any action at that point that might embarrass, or in any respect prejudice, the delicate negotiations in Stockholm in which the Secretary of the Treasury and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board were engaged, as representatives of this country.

It was for that reason that I moved to adjourn the Senate rather than have a vote on the Williams-Smathers substitute at that time. I have no idea what the result would have been. I believe it would have been a close vote, in any event. One can only speculate as to the outcome.

I believe Senators noted at that time that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] felt that by the Senate adjourning until Monday, he had been done an injustice, and that he would feel compelled to hold the floor all day Monday in order to keep the Senate from voting on the Williams-Smathers substitute. In view of this position—I had no doubt that the Senator felt strongly about the matter and would accomplish just what he said—I assured him that if it were within my power, I would postpone the vote on that matter until sometime on Tuesday.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Does that mean that there will be no votes on the Smathers-Williams package today?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have no objection to amendments that may be offered to it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I mean the final action.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. As I have said, if it were within my power, I will postpone votes on amendments until sometime Tuesday, in view of the gentleman's commitment I made to the Senator from Oregon. I honestly believe that had I not done that, he would have felt it his duty—each Senator must respond to his own conscience—to hold the floor all day.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Some of the Senators on this side of the aisle would like to have the record made clear and would like to make plans accordingly. Do I understand that it is the intention of the leadership that there be no vote on final action on the Smathers-Williams package today?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is my intention, yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in further reference to the remarks of the Senator from Louisana, I am familiar with the situation in which he found himself last Friday. I know that the Secretary was greatly concerned about the possibility that the Williams-Smathers substitute, which embraced both expenditure reductions and a tax increase, would be defeated and the effect that such action would have on the opinions of some of the leaders of the central banks in Europe as well as at home. I believe he was correct in that evaluation.

The rejection of the Williams-Smathers substitute, in my opinion, would be a firm announcement not only to the central bankers but also to the country that the U.S. Senate or Congress and the administration were not going to take any action toward fiscal restraint. I am afraid that would be the interpretation put upon the matter, at least is the interpretation put upon it.

I believe the administration would do well to be on notice and should have a clear understanding as a result of last week's votes that they will not get their tax increase bill unless it is accompanied by a bona fide, realistic, and firm control over spending.

That was made clear by the results of the previous votes. It is most certainly clear as to my own position. I regret very much that thus far the administration has not seen fit to support those of us who are trying to write into this package bone fide control over spending.

I listened to the President's speech last night, in which he chided Congress for its inaction on the proposals to cut spending and the proposals to raise taxes. Yet, this morning in conference with administration officials I am told that they still will not support the spending controls in this package.

I believe it is the height of fiscal irresponsibility on the part of the Johnson administration not to stand up and tell the American people what the position of this administration really is on the pending Williams-Smathers substitute bill. If they are against a cut in spending they should say so in clear language. If they are in favor of some control over spending then I would appreciate their support on tomorrow's votes here in the Senate.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I believe we will have to face up to the situation. Spending reductions and a tax increase must go together.

I hope that during the remainder of this day—before we vote tomorrow—the administration will make clear to Congress and to the country their position on this package, that is, whether they want it approved or not.

I believe it will be disastrous if Congress does not take some action dealing with both control over spending and the question of taxes. I am not excusing the House or the Senate of its responsibility. We have a responsibility. I have said many times that we cannot point a finger at the President and then excuse our own responsibility by inaction.

By the same token, however, the President has a responsibility to speak to the Congress through his Budget Director and other representatives of the various agencies as well as on television. All I want the administration to do is to back up the President's statement of last night with support of this proposal to achieve the same result.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the thoughts stated by the Senator from Delaware are, of course, in line with the views of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, and I believe they are probably reflected by a majority of the members of the Ways and Means Committee in the House of Representatives, which has been conducting hearings on the administration tax bill this last year.

As I can best deduce, it has been the attitude of the senior members of that committee, particularly the chairman and the senior members generally, that they wanted to see what reductions were going to be made in the proposed spending program of the President before they reported a tax bill, if, indeed, they did report one.

My impression was that they were conducting hearings to consider the President's tax measure, and that there was a decided possibility that they will report a tax bill, although perhaps not precisely what the President recommended. It might reflect their views more than the administration's views. However, it was my view that in due course, if they were satisfied with respect to the level of spending and that a tax increase was necessary, the committee would recommend a tax bill. I have yet to see any indication from the House that the House suggests we pass a tax bill and approach it in this way.

It is my view that those statesmen in the House of Representatives are equally as aware of their responsibility and this Nation's interest as those of us who serve in the Senate.

I have seen no indication from them that they wish us to initiate the major tax bill by an amendment to one of the bills they have sent us. That view has had a considerable bearing on the attitude I have taken with regard to the Williams-Smathers substitute.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S DECISION NOT TO BE A CANDIDATE FOR REELECTION

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I have issued a statement to the press with regard to the President's dramatic statement last night. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

A STATEMENT BY SENATOR RUSSELL B. LONG OF LOUISIANA IN RESPONSE TO PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S ANNOUNCEMENT THAT HE WILL NOT BE A CANDIDATE FOR REELECTION

During my time, it has been my impression that people never fully appreciate a President while he is carrying the heavy burdens of his office. It is only after he has retired to the sidelines that people begin to reflect on the great difficulties with which he was confronted, and realize that he was doing his very best to protect and advance the interests of our people and, indeed, those of the entire free world.

So it will be with Lyndon Johnson. Now that he has removed himself from the race for re-election, his motives will be less subject to misunderstanding. There will, of course, be skeptics, but events will demonstrate that the President is a man of peace who nevertheless values freedom above all else.

A review of the President's historic speech reveals that, from this point forward, the emphasis will be on building a fighting force of South Vietnamese soldiers capable of bearing the brunt of the enemy attack.

Our adversary will be poorly advised if he views the President's statement as a sign of weakness or lack of resolve on the part of the United States. The President's message was directed toward uniting our people, and I believe that will be its result.

Some events in the short run might not give the impression that greater unity has developed in the Congress, but, as events transpire, it will be seen that the President's noble gesture meets with an appropriate response on Capitol Hill.

What this means with regard to the Presidential race cannot be predicted at this moment. Anyone's guess is as good as mine and, therefore, I shall not venture one.

WAIVER OF CALL OF CALENDAR UNDER RULE VIII

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar under rule VIII be dispensed with.

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

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATORS FOLLOWING MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have had requests on behalf of certain Senators that they be permitted to make speeches after the conclusion of morning business.

I ask unanimous consent that immediately after the conclusion of the morning business the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN] be recognized for 1 hour, that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] be recognized for 45 minutes, and that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] be recognized for 20 minutes.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 2029. An act to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 relating to the application of certain standards to motor vehicles produced in quantities of less than five hundred; and

H.J. Res. 933. A joint resolution to proclaim National Jewish Hospital Save Your Breath Month.

DECISION OF THE PRESIDENT NOT TO SEEK REELECTION

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the American people sat on the couch with history last evening. They watched and lived with a strong and virile leader in an hour of travail in the leadership of our country at a time of danger.

Unquestionably, in my mind, the hearts of millions of people reached out to our President as he dramatically and eloquently placed peace, unity, and the interest of his country ahead of all else.

For one who has had a career of public service spanning almost four decades to make the decision which President Johnson announced last night demonstrates a patriotism and a magnanimity which will live in history.

It is true that our country is deeply divided. It is not deeply divided about the patriotism, the generosity, or the courage of President Johnson. It is divided over the wisdom and the rightness of our policies in Vietnam.

President Johnson made a contribution toward the unity of our country and a possible peace. Unity is needed, but unity can only come in a policy that offers hope for peace.

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

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, in removing himself as a candidate for public office President Johnson has freed himself from the political inhibitions of a candidate.

If we are to have peace in 1968 it will only come, in my view, as a result of concession and compromise; consessions and compromises which would subject a candidate to charges of appeasement and ugly questions of being soft on communism.

The example which the President set last night and the act which he has taken places him in a position, in my opinion, more effectively than a candidacy would have done to take the hard decisions necessary for peace and to lead the

American people into acceptance of the hard choices that I think we must make and accept in order to achieve peace. At least, this is by earnest hope.

The choices before the President in the reassessment that has been under way, seemed to me to be generally threefold:

One, to escalate the war as had been recommended by many military leaders, not only an escalation in intensity of violence but also a geographic escalation. This has many risks and dangers which I shall not now discuss.

Second, to continue what we have been doing with all the consequent loss of life, uncertainty of time and outcome.

Third, deescalation—a reduction of violence in the war in the hope of a negotiated settlement.

To what extent the policy has been changed in this direction, I do not know. Perhaps we will learn as time unfolds.

There is a difference in policy and the strategy, tactics, and forces to implement that policy. The partial bombing pause is not a policy, it is a tactic. But it may indicate a policy.

I took more hope in the President's reiteration of his view that the Geneva Accord, to which we and other nations agreed in 1954, was an adequate basis for peace. It provided for self-determination for all the Vietnamese. It was the departure from this Accord that created and set in motion the course of events which has led us and the Vietnamese to such tragedy.

I have long believed, and I suggest to the President now, that a return to the Geneva Accord and a nonalined or neutral status for the former colonies of France, known as Indochina, offers the best hope for peace.

Mr. President, the President has moved toward unity. In this move, he deserves the compassionate and sympathetic regard of all Americans. Unity is a national need, unity upon a policy that will offer genuine hope for a negotiated settlement and America's ultimate extrication from a tragedy which has brought bloodshed, heartache, and trouble to our people.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, like millions of other Americans last night, I was shocked and stunned by President Johnson's statement that he would relinquish his chances for continuation in office as a sacrifice for the cause of peace and national unity.

I cannot recall a truly comparable act by any other individual in the history of this or any other nation. As we continue to defend the security of the United States and the strength of the American economy and as we continue to build a better America for our children and their posterity, we too, will be called upon to sacrifice for the good of the Nation. President Johnson has set an example whose leadership will serve his people well.

Those of us from the State of New Hampshire who supported President Johnson in his victory in the New Hampshire Presidential Preference Primary last month have had our judgment that he was the best possible man to lead our Nation in these troubled times vindicated. His actions last night have proven beyond any doubt his dedication to peace and to America, and his willingness to pay any personal price for the good of his country. My only regret is that we will not have his continued leadership during the next 4 years.

THE DECISION FOR PEACE

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, all of a sudden, a doubting world was electrified last night by the sudden realization of a simple fact too long overlooked in the bitterness of public debate. The American people believe in peace. They are a peace-loving people. They want peace with justice in this war weary globe. The President of the United States, the most powerful public servant in the free world, abruptly announced the termination of his public career, a sacrifice to signify beyond any shadow of uncertainty that this is the belief and the goal of a united American people. He lent an enormous credibility to his entreaties for peace. It was a worthy act to achieve a noble end. There should be no longer any question of America's willingness to negotiate with honor—that is the key word—for peace and stability in Southeast Asia.

The road to a just conclusion of this conflict will at best be arduous and difficult. The President's action sought to remove the issue from domestic American politics in a fateful election year. Last night, he put Vietnam above party, where it belongs. I believe with Republican help, it can be clearly demonstrated that we, most of us in this Nation, Democrats and Republicans together, have the same fundamental view.

Speaking to the Senate last May, as a member of the minority, I said that the Republican Party had a solemn duty to avoid making the Vietnam war, in which so many young Americans are now engaged in combat, a source of maneuvering for political advantage:

> The issue before us now is not the origin of our involvement in the conflict, but bringing it to a conclusion, honorably, and hopefully, peacefully.
>
> The role of our party is to seek that end, not for the sake of potential political gain but for the sake of the course of freedom for human beings.
>
> The role of a Republican Party must be a forthright one—criticizing where blame is due, providing alternative avenues for solution, and encouraging, advising, and warning the administration regarding our national policies, as we conceive them.

I believe that the American people have a right now to demand from both of our great political parties a pledge to unite in the common effort for peace with honor and justice—not solely for Vietnam, but for all of Southeast Asia.

Hanoi has now been given the clearest possible sign of American intentions and desires. I cannot resist the comment that it is probably more than it deserves. Radio Moscow has already characterized the President's dramatic action as a "maneuver."

Whatever the wellsprings of cynicism that have brought forth this scornful comment, let reasoning men understand. America, as a united country, has now thrown down the gauntlet for peace. Hanoi can either accept or reject the challenge. We pray ardently that she will accept, for the alternative would be dark, indeed. Let the Communist world realize that the President's actions cannot be tossed aside as a mere gesture. The alternatives to a genuine effort for peace are frightening to contemplate. Sane persons want to avoid a re-escalation of hostitilies. Hanoi must realize that whatever action is taken during the remainder of this year will have the united support of the American people.

Mr. President, I want to commend the President for moving toward a settlement on a broad international basis. The rapid response to the provocations in the Gulf of Tonkin in the summer of 1964 which brought us into the Vietnam conflict were not, regrettably, accompanied by our Western allies in joint action against North Vietnamese aggression.

We must not make the same mistake on the way out that we made on the way in. A just solution of this conflict must bring a durable peace. The human race needs assurance that the cycle of bloodshed raging over the past 20 years in East Asia will have come to an end, and a durable one. This can only be achieved by broad agreement among all those who have a joint interest in a fair settlement. Conclusion of hostilities on a bilateral basis between America and Hanoi could not possibly solve the broader issues and could easily be made a sound stage to drum us out of Vietnam in dishonor or—God forbid—defeat. Geneva, or its equivalent, is the correct forum. The President, to his great credit, stated that was his judgment in his address to the Nation last night.

TAX ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1968

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, representing the minority, I want to ask my able friend, the acting majority leader [Mr. LONG of Louisiana], whether he is in hopes of arranging a unanimous-consent agreement for a vote tomorrow on the Smathers-Williams amendment. If he did, I would hope it would not come before the middle of the afternoon, to accommodate some of our returning colleagues.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, there is nothing firm at all in my mind. As I said before the distinguished acting minority leader came in, I received an entreaty from the Secretary of the Treasury that we should not have a vote on the matter Friday. That being the case, I felt I could not explain my reasons for it at that time. I will see if I can discuss the matter with my colleagues.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Separation of Powers of the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

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

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S NEW INITIATIVE TOWARD POLITICAL SETTLEMENT OF WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, President Johnson's new initiative toward a political settlement of the war in Vietnam affirms the best purposes and character of our country. His decision to cease the bombing of North Vietnam and to seek the good offices of the Geneva Conference offer an opportunity for negotiations and an honorable peace, if North Vietnam and its supporters, Communist China and the Soviet Union, truly seek an end of the war.

Whatever may be the political and domestic implications of President Johnson's decision not to seek again the Presidency, his decision, in a moving way, supports the sincerity of his purpose to bring the war to an honorable and peaceful close.

I have urged that the question of Vietnam be submitted to the Geneva Conference, and as one who since 1966 has urged an unconditional cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam to test the possibilities of negotiations, I consider the President's order, which he characterized in his speech as unilateral, essentially unconditional and above quibbling.

I do hope this pause and cessation will be of such duration that it will provide without question an opportunity for acceptance.

Leaders of countries throughout the world have urged this course of action upon the President. They ought now to give him their full support. And it is the duty of the Congress and of our people to support the President in every way that we can to help achieve the honorable peace that our country so earnestly seeks.

I join with others in saying the President last night spoke courageously, and spoke with honor and with nobility.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S WITHDRAWAL FROM PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, President Johnson's withdrawal from the presidential campaign was a dramatic act of statemanship. In doing so, he moved by deed not by platitude, in the direction of his long professed belief that the war in Vietnam and its successful resolution should take precedence over anyone's political role or political ambitions. I believe that this act will loom very large in the history of our time.

But I sense, in listening to the comments that have been made today, and some of the press reactions to the President's action that the point of his move may be misread. It may be misread both here at home and abroad. If the President's move is interpreted as an American recession from its basic position in Southeast Asia, if it is regarded as a retreat from our firmness, then Hanoi can hardly be expected to respond favorably to an effort to bring them to the negotiating table.

I submit to my colleagues the thought that if we are genuine in looking toward negotiations, we would do well not to foster false hopes about a steady American deescalation and retreat from our position in Southeast Asia; for if it is indeed the impression we convey, Hanoi's position will be, "Let us sit it out; let us wait, because we do not have to negotiate anything."

The only real hope for negotiations, it seems to me, is negotiation from a position of steadfastness and firmness.

Likewise, through the airwaves I have noticed with some serious misgivings the rather uniform response out on the campaign trail some of the more belligerent critics of the administration's policy in Asia that this proves that they were right all along and that the President was wrong and he has now confessed it. I want to say to those fostering that criticism, Mr. President, that they have grievously misread the President's motivation and his reasons. President Johnson, in the deep sense of history that has moved him in the pursuit of his policy in Southeast Asia, is mindful of how dangerous it is to play the tune of policy in the Far East to the scales of a political election year. The thrust of President Johnson's proposal to Hanoi, it seems to me, is not based on any so-called reversal the second guessers wish to read into the President's brave act. His motivation last night, his withdrawal, was inspired on a much higher level than that.

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

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask that I may proceed for an additional 3 minutes.

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

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I think it well that before we over-expect or overreact to all the implications attendant upon last night's drama, we search our own souls again; that we remember that the pursuit of a basic American policy with respect to this issue is now more than 20 years of age. Harry Truman and Dean Acheson spelled out this national-interest implication in the chances for a favorable balance in Asia to emerge from the wreckage of war. President Eisenhower and John Foster Dulles, his Secretary of State, were very specific in expressing it as a part of that continuing policy; namely, that what happens in Southeast Asia makes a difference to the United States. President John F. Kennedy pursued the same conviction, as has President Johnson.

The point that should not be lost upon us is that that policy has not changed; that nothing that was said last night altered it; and that the basic interests of our country are to stand for the simple and obvious fundamental fact which has come to be dramatized in the agony and the bitterness of Vietnam, that is, that the geography of Southeast Asia should not be transformed or transferred by force of arms, and that if it happens again, it will happen again, and still again and again.

The best place to arrest that impulse, the best place to thwart that kind of grand design, is at its inception, at its beginning. That, it seems to me, is what the President of the United States is trying to get through to all of America: That with all the divisiveness that has occurred, with all the bitter criticisms that have been hurled in the direction of the President, we should not lose sight of these deep fundamentals. I think that otherwise we would run the risk of missing the whole point of the President's act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wyoming has again expired.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask that I may have an additional 2 minutes.

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

Mr. McGEE. I would hope that the surviving contenders for this most awesome office in the land, yes, in the world, the office of President of the United States, will reassess their own language that they have been using during the last 2 weeks on the stump.

They should reassess the options that they believe honestly to be available to their country before they plunge ahead with new promises—most of which, in my judgment, they would find it very difficult to live up to once the ballots were counted and the results were in.

I would like to believe that those who would seek this highest office in the land this year would be straightforward enough, now, to come to grips with the problem of American policy in Eastern Asia in the national interest rather than in the context of an election year expediency, it behooves all of the candidates to readdress themselves to a much higher level in their quest for the awesome office of the President of the United States. Hopefully, the President's action will also force the other candidates to weigh more rationally the options open to the United States in Southeast Asia.

We must remember, Mr. President, that we have now a whole generation of new governments in Asia, a whole generation of new leaders in Asia, a whole generation of new economic developments and social restructuring, all of which were dependent upon an American presence that, in effect, pledged stability and resistance to the use of force and violence as to instruments to prohibit Asia's self-determination.

What happens, then, if we follow the advice of those who propose that we steadily withdraw and back out? What happens to the prospects of those who took that chance? I think the consequences are obvious, Mr. President; and I think, if we welsh in Vietnam, the whole cloth of Southeast Asia would become unraveled.

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

Mr. McGEE. I ask unanimous consent to speak for 2 more minutes, Mr. President.

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

Mr. McGEE. With that great doubt, then, injected into the scene of the Orient, even Korea would come unhinged, and where the process would stop no one could then predict.

It is this that hangs in the balance on the kind of decision our country makes this year; and I sincerely hope,

Mr. President, that all of the candidates will reassess their own stands, as they have demanded that the President reassess his, and that they will address themselves more forthrightly to the whole question of what our realistic capabilities and responsibilities must be in the months ahead.

Finally, Mr. President, I once again pay tribute to President Lyndon Johnson. His withdrawal not only should pin a greater sense of responsibility on the other presidential aspirants, but I believe his action will also stand as one of the most high-minded and significant developments in our country's recent political history.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the lead editorial, entitled "In the Name of Unity," published in this morning's Washington Post.

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

IN THE NAME OF UNITY

President Johnson, by his moving declaration that he will not seek nor accept the nomination of his party, has taken himself out of the presidential campaign, barring developments that at this juncture simply cannot be foreseen.

He has at the same time, by both his remarks on his candidacy and the suspension of bombing in nearly all Vietnam, taken the war out of the presidential campaign as far as it is in his power to do so.

He has made a personal sacrifice in the name of national unity that entitles him to a very special place in the annals of American history and to a very special kind of gratitude and appreciation.

Many public men have spoken in the name of national unity to advance their own cause and candidacy. The President last night put unity ahead of his own advancement and his own pride.

The shape of the forthcoming presidential campaign is obscure at this moment; but it ought to be, by any normal expectation, a campaign of less divisiveness and less bitterness than the one the country had expected. The President lanced the boil of faction and opened the abscess of partisanship on the body politic. It is to be hoped that his surgery will diminish the fever of public life and permit the Nation to pursue its political decisions in a climate of restraint and prudence.

The verdict of history remains to be written upon an Administration that has attacked the social and racial problems of America with skill and vigor. The judgment of the world remains to be pronounced upon the success or failure of foreign policies that will influence world affairs for generations.

Americans need wait no longer, however, to conclude that the man who spoke to them last night is a man who greatly loves his country and who deeply cherishes its unity.

THE PRESIDENT'S DECISION NOT TO SEEK REELECTION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President—

I shall not seek and will not accept the nomination of my party for another term as your President.

Thus spoke the President of the United States last evening, in a most historic address to the American people and to the world. I have been interested in the reaction to that speech, and am somewhat disturbed at the different interpretations given, especially by those who seem to raise questions, once again, about the credibility of the President, and who put their own interpretation on what he has to say.

I am quite certain that the President was honest, candid, and forthright, and that he meant what he said. I am quite certain that he searched his own soul before he made that historic declaration. I believe every word he said, and I think the Members of the Senate, unanimously, do as well.

There has been some talk by a candidate of the other party which seems to indicate that he considers this "the year of the dropout." I do not like that term, because I think it denigrates the position taken by the President of the United States last night. The President laid before the people once again the fact that he stood by the San Antonio formula, as refined, and I think I can state without fear of opposition that at no time has he dropped his efforts to bring about, if possible, a way to the negotiating table. Something on the order of 30 public attempts have been made, and in excess of 100 unpublicized attempts have been made.

I approve thoroughly the call issued by the President to both the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union that the Geneva Conference be once again brought into existence. I disagree completely and emphatically with the statement in Moscow this morning which calls this speech by the President a "maneuver."

I do not know what those people have to know to be aware of what the truth is when it is uttered. The Russians are very good at talking peace. They are very good at talking about stopping the bombing as a prelude to peace. But when the time comes to put action where their words are, they can always find an excuse.

Who has been holding up the reconvening of the Geneva Conference for 3 years? The Soviet Union.

Who has been preaching peace for the past 3½ years? The Soviet Union.

Who has said that if the bombing is stopped, there is a good possibility that negotiations will get underway? The Soviet Union, from the lips of her leaders.

Who has been blocking the U.N. resolution, passed by this body unanimously, in the Security Council? The Soviet Union.

What do they mean? Do words have no significance for them? Are they the only ones who speak the truth? Are they interested in peace in Southeast Asia and throughout the world, or are they not? To repeat, I think it is about time that they put their actions where their words are, and I think that time is long overdue.

I am also in full accord with the statement made by the President that he had ordered, as of 9 o'clock last night, a stop to the bombing of North Vietnam except for that area above the DMZ. And even there I am in accord with him, although I would like eventually to see all bombing stopped as far as the north is concerned—negotiations or no negotiations.

And I am in accord with him on that because of the fact that we have men concentrated in Khesanh, Conthien, Camp Carroll, and other areas along the DMZ. Those men are entitled to all the protection, air and otherwise, that they can get, because those men are there, not because they made the policy, but because under the Constitution they are obligated to carry out the policy laid down in Washington.

I pay my respects to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], who I know has been in the forefront in seeking to bring about a consolidation and concentration of the war to South Vietnam and a cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam, always with the proviso that as far as American soldiers, Marines, and others along the DMZ are concerned they should be given full aerial protection.

The President also said last night that the increase in U.S. forces will not be the 206,000 which has been mentioned from time to time, but on the order of 13,000, and those only in the form of support troops to take care of the elements of the 82d Airborne Division and the Marines sent from the west coast several weeks ago as a result of the Tet offensive. That is understandable. That very likely is necessary. And even that increment will keep the overall figure under the 525,000 limitation set for mid-1968.

The President also emphasized, this time more strongly than ever—and I approve completely—that the South Vietnamese should become more active in this war and assume more of the primary responsibility, and also that they should start talking with other South Vietnamese. And, to my way of thinking, that means the Vietcong, because I do not care what one says or how one looks at it, this is basically a civil war and most of the opponents of the allied forces in South Vietnam are South Vietnamese. So, we cannot gloss over that fact, because that is just what it is—a fact. And if there is to be a solution of South Vietnam, then I think it is high time that Saigon which, at the present time, is run by two North Vietnamese—President Thieu and Vice President Ky—get together with the NLF, the political arm of the Vietcong, and that the South Vietnamese themselves not only increase their strength from Saigon with which to carry on the fighting, which is their responsibility, as the President indicated, but also seek to achieve a diplomatic settlement among the South Vietnamese themselves.

In that respect, I express the hope that the present Saigon government will seek to broaden the areas of its responsibility, and its personnel; and to that extent, I also hope that it would include a coalition composed of the Cao Dai, the Hoa Hao, the Montagnards, the Buddhists, the Catholics, and all other groups, so that that additional strength and assistance will be added to its government as well.

Mr. President, I thoroughly approve also, in addition to the warning given to South Vietnam—a warning long overdue—to get together with all South Vietnamese, of the statement made by the President of the United States that on the basis of the Geneva Conference, we were prepared to withdraw as the North Vietnamese withdrew. However, may I say also that the President said at Ma-

nila that we would withdraw our forces from South Vietnam 6 months after peace was achieved.

We have no desire to hold bases that we built at Danang, Cam Ranh Bay, or elsewhere. South Vietnam, in my opinion, is not vital to the security of the United States. And I would hope and expect, and I know, that the words uttered by the President at Manila after that conference would still hold true and that if peace is achieved, we will do our best to get out of that area lock, stock, and barrel at the earliest opportunity.

I believe the President, in his speech, followed that old precept which he gave to us so often while he was the majority leader of the Senate—the precept from Isaiah in the Bible "Come now and let us reason together."

Yes, he has reasoned with his advisers, with himself, and he has reasoned with some Members of the Senate, both those who were for his policy in Vietnam and those who were against it. And he has done it on many occasions which were unpublicized. He has paid heed to what some of us had to say, and he has done his best in line with his responsibility to find a way to the negotiating table.

I express the hope that the principle uttered by the President on yesterday would not only be heard by Brezhnev and Kosygin, so that they would lend their efforts and their leadership to bring about a reconvening of the Geneva Conference—because, after all, the U.S.S.R. is one of the two cochairmen—but that Ho Chi Minh will read the speech and take it at face value.

I would hope that all of them and all of us would understand that the President indeed made a great sacrifice on yesterday when he announced that he would not be a candidate for reelection.

I hope there will be no question raised in this country about the credibility of Lyndon B. Johnson in this or any other respect. Oh, I know of the rumors and speculations that have gone around. But I wonder how many people took the time and the effort to really find out just how vague and misleading this supposed credibility gap was. To the best of my knowledge, the President at no time has ever knowingly misstated the truth to the American people. It is true that he has said something on one day, and perhaps something quite different occurred a week later. But on the basis of the facts which the President had at his disposal at the time he made that statement, or those statements, he was telling the American people the truth.

So, I hope, Mr. President, that we recognize that not only has the President searched his soul, but that a lot of us have also searched our soles, and so have the American people.

It is my belief that because of what occurred last night, there will be better understanding and greater tolerance on the part of all of us.

I hope the personal attacks, the placards that carry scurrilous sayings, the invidious comparisons, and the lack of dignity would be done away with; and I would hope that, regardless of the feelings of any of us insofar as Vietnam or any other matter is concerned, we would treat the one who happens to occupy the office of the Presidency with the dignity, the courtesy, and the respect which is his due.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a transcript of the President's address on the Vietnam war and his political plans, which appeared in the New York Times of April 1, 1968.

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

TRANSCRIPT OF THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS ON THE VIETNAM WAR AND HIS POLITICAL PLANS

Good evening, my fellow Americans.

Tonight I want to speak to you of peace in Vietnam and Southeast Asia.

No other question so preoccupies our people. No other dream so absorbs the 250 million human beings who live in that part of the world. No other goal motivates American policy in Southeast Asia.

For years, representatives of our Government and others have traveled the world seeking to find a basis for peace talks.

Since last September they have carried the offer that I made public at San Antonio. And that offer was this:

That the United States would stop its bombardment of North Vietnam when that would lead promptly to productive discussions—and that we would assume that North Vietnam would not take military advantage of our restraint.

Hanoi denounced this offer, both privately and publicly. Even while the search for peace was going on, North Vietnam rushed their preparations for a savage assault on the people, the Government and the allies of South Vietnam.

Their attack—during the Tet holidays—failed to achieve its principal objectives.

It did not collapse the elected Government of South Vietnam or shatter its army—as the Communists had hoped. It did not produce a "general uprising" among the peoples of the cities, as they had predicted.

The Communists were unable to maintain control of any of the more than 30 cities that they attacked, and they took very heavy casualties.

But they did compel the South Vietnamese and their allies to move certain forces from the countryside into the cities.

They caused widespread disruption and suffering. Their attacks, and the battles that followed, made refugees of half a million human beings.

NEW ASSAULT FORESEEN

The Communists may renew their attack any day. They are, it appears, trying to make 1968 the year of decision in South Vietnam—the year that brings, if not final victory or defeat, at least a turning point in the struggle.

This much is clear: If they do mount another round of heavy attacks, they will not succeed in destroying the fighting power of South Vietnam and its allies.

But tragically, this is also clear: Many men—on both sides of the struggle—will be lost. A nation that has already suffered 20 years of warfare will suffer once again. Armies on both sides will take new casualties. And the war will go on.

There is no need for this to be so. There is no need to delay the talks that could bring an end to this long and this bloody war.

Tonight, I renew the offer I made last August: to stop the bombardment of North Vietnam. We ask that talks begin promptly, that they be serious talks on the substance of peace. We assume that during those talks Hanoi will not take advantage of our restraint.

We are prepared to move immediately toward peace through negotiations. So tonight, in the hope that this action will lead to early talks, I am taking the first step to de-escalate the conflict. We are reducing—substantially reducing—the present level of hostilities, and we are doing so unilaterally and at once.

Tonight I have ordered our aircraft and our naval vessels to make no attacks on North Vietnam except in the area north of the demilitarized zone where the continuing enemy build-up directly threatens allied forward positions and where the movement of their troops and supplies are clearly related to that threat.

The area in which we are stopping our attacks includes almost 90 per cent of North Vietnam's population, and most of its territory. Thus there will be no attacks around the principal populated areas, or in the food-producing areas of North Vietnam.

FULL HALT POSSIBLE LATER

Even this very limited bombing of the North could come to an early end—if our restraint is matched by restraint in Hanoi. But I cannot in good conscience stop all bombing so long as to do so would immediately and directly endanger the lives of our men and our allies. Whether a complete bombing halt becomes possible in the future will be determined by events.

Our purpose in this action is to bring about a reduction in the level of violence that now exists. It is to save the lives of brave men—and to save the lives of innocent women and children. It is to permit the contending forces to move closer to a political settlement.

And tonight I call upon the United Kingdom and I call upon the Soviet Union—as cochairmen of the Geneva conferences and as permanent members of the United Nations Security Council—to do all they can to move from the unilateral act of de-escalation that I have just announced toward genuine peace in Southeast Asia.

Now, as in the past, the United States is ready to send its representatives to any forum, at any time, to discuss the means of bringing this ugly war to an end.

I am designating one of our most distinguished Americans, Ambassador Averell Harriman, as my personal representative for such talks. In addition, I have asked Ambassador Llewellyn Thompson, who returned from Moscow for consultation, to be available to join Ambassador Harriman at Geneva or any other suitable place—just as soon as Hanoi agrees to a conference.

I call upon President Ho Chi Minh to respond positively, and favorably, to this new step toward peace.

But if peace does not come now through negotiations, it will come when Hanoi understands that our common resolve is unshakable, and our common strength is invincible.

Tonight, we and the other allied nations are contributing 600,000 fighting men to assist 700,000 South Vietnamese troops in defending their little country.

Our presence there has always rested on this basic belief: The main burden of preserving their freedom must be carried out by them—by the South Vietnamese themselves.

We and our allies can only help to provide a shield behind which the people of South Vietnam can survive and can grow and develop. On their efforts—on their determinations and resourcefulness—the outcome will ultimately depend.

That small, beleaguered nation has suffered terrible punishment for more than 20 years.

I pay tribute once again tonight to the great courage and the endurance of its people. South Vietnam supports armed forces tonight of almost 700,000 men, and I call your attention to the fact that that is the equivalent of more than 10 million in our own population. Its people maintain their firm determination to be free of domination by the North.

There has been substantial progress, I think, in building a durable government dur-

ing these last three years. The South Vietnam of 1965 could not have survived the enemy's Tet offensive of 1968. The elected Government of South Vietnam survived that attack—and is rapidly repairing the devastation that it wrought.

FURTHER TASKS FOR SAIGON

The South Vietnamese know that further efforts are going to be required to expand their own armed forces; to move back into the countryside as quickly as possible; to increase their taxes; to select the very best men they have for civil and military responsibility; to achieve a new unity within their constitutional government, and to include in the national effort all those groups who wish to preserve South Vietnam's control over its own destiny.

Last week President Thieu ordered the mobilization of 135,000 additional South Vietnamese. He plans to reach as soon as possible a total military strength of more than 800,000 men.

To achieve this, the Government of South Vietnam started the drafting of 19-year-olds on March 1. On May 1, the Government will begin the drafting of 18-year-olds.

Last month, 10,000 men volunteered for military service. That was two and a half times the number of volunteers during the same month last year. Since the middle of January, more than 48,000 South Vietnamese have joined the armed forces, and nearly half of them volunteered to do so.

All men in the South Vietnamese armed forces have had their tours of duty extended for the duration of the war, and reserves are now being called up for immediate active duty.

President Thieu told his people last week, and I quote:

"We must make greater efforts, we must accept more sacrifices, because as I have said many times, this is our country. The existence of our nation is at stake, and this is mainly a Vietnamese responsibility."

He warned his people that a major national effort is required to root out corruption and incompetence at all levels of government.

We applaud this evidence of determination on the part of South Vietnam. Our first priority will be to support their effort.

We shall accelerate the re-equipment of South Vietnam's armed forces in order to meet the enemy's increased firepower. And this will enable them progressively to undertake a large share of combat operations against the Communist invaders.

BUILDUP IN U.S. FORCES

On many occasions I have told the American people that we would send to Vietnam those forces that are required to accomplish our mission there. So with that as our guide we have previously authorized a force level of approximately 525,000.

Some weeks ago to help meet the enemy's new offensive we sent to Vietnam about 11,000 additional Marine and airborne troops. They were deployed by air in 48 hours on an emergency basis. But the artillery and the tank and the aircraft and medical and other units that were needed to work with and support these infantry troops in combat could not then accompany them by air on that short notice.

In order that these forces may reach maximum combat effectiveness, the Joint Chiefs of Staff have recommended to me that we should prepare to send during the next five months the support troops totaling approximately 13,500 men.

A portion of these men will be made available from our active forces. The balance will come from reserve component units, which will be called up for service.

The actions that we have taken since the beginning of the year to re-equip the South Vietnamese forces; to meet our responsibilities in Korea, as well as our responsibilities in Vietnam; to meet price increases and the cost of activating and deploying these reserve forces; to replace helicopters and provide the other military supplies we need, all of these actions are going to require additional expenditures.

The tentative estimate of those additional expenditures is $2.5-billion in this fiscal year and $2.6-billion in the next fiscal year.

These projected increases in expenditures for our national security will bring into sharper focus the nation's need for immediate action, action to protect the prosperity of the American people and to protect the strength and the stability of our American dollar.

On many occasions I have pointed out that without a tax bill or decreased expenditures, next year's deficit would again be around $20-billion. I have emphasized the need to set strict priorities in our spending. I have stressed that failure to act—and to act promptly and decisively—would raise very strong doubts throughout the world about America's willingness to keep its financial house in order.

Yet Congress has not acted. And tonight we face the sharpest financial threat in the postwar era—a threat to the dollar's role as the keystone of international trade and finance in the world.

Last week, at the monetary conference in Stockholm, the major industrial countries decided to take a big step toward creating a new international monetary asset that will strengthen the international monetary system.

And I'm very proud of the very able work done by Secretary Fowler and Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve Board.

But to make this system work, the United States just must bring its balance of payments to—or very close to—equilibrium. We must have a responsible fiscal policy in this country.

TAX BILL IS URGENT

The passage of a tax bill now, together with expenditure control that the Congress may desire and dictate, is absolutely necessary to protect this nation's security and to continue our prosperity, and to meet the needs of our people.

Now, what is at stake is seven years of unparalleled prosperity. In those seven years, the real income of the average American, after taxes, rose by almost 30 per cent—a gain as large as that of the entire preceding 19 years.

So the steps that we must take to convince the world are exactly the steps that we must take to sustain our own economic strength here at home. In the past eight months, prices and interest rates have risen because of our inaction.

We must therefore now do everything we can to move from debate to action, from talking to voting, and there is, I believe—I hope there is—in both Houses of the Congress a growing sense of urgency that this situation just must be acted upon and must be corrected.

My budget in January, we thought, was a tight one. It fully reflected our evaluation of most of the demanding needs of this nation.

But in these budgetary matters, the President does not decide alone. The Congress has the power, and the duty, to determine appropriations and taxes.

The Congress is now considering our proposals, and they are considering reductions in the budget that we submitted.

As part of a program of fiscal restraint that includes the tax surcharge, I shall approve appropriate reductions in the January budget when and if Congress so decides that that should be done.

One thing is unmistakably clear, however. Our deficit just must be reduced. Failure to act could bring on conditions that would strike hardest at those people that all of us are trying so hard to help.

A PLEA TO CONGRESS

So these times call for prudence in this land of plenty. And I believe that we have the character to provide it, and tonight I plead with the Congress and with the people to act promptly to serve the national interest and thereby serve all of our people.

Now let me give you my estimate of the chances for peace—the peace that will one day stop the bloodshed in South Vietnam. That will—all the Vietnamese people will be permitted to rebuild and develop their land. That will permit us to turn more fully to our own tasks here at home.

I cannot promise that the initiative that I have announced tonight will be completely successful in achieving peace any more than the 30 others that we have undertaken and agreed to in recent years.

But it is our fervent hope that North Vietnam, after years of fighting that has left the issue unresolved, will now cease its efforts to achieve a military victory and will join with us in moving toward the peace table.

And there may come a time when South Vietnamese—on both sides—are able to work out a way to settle their own differences by free political choice rather than by war.

As Hanoi considers its course, it should be in no doubt of our intentions. It must not miscalculate the pressures within our democracy in this election year. We have no intention of widening this war. But the United States will never accept a fake solution to this long and arduous struggle and call it peace.

No one can foretell the precise terms of an eventual settlement.

Our objective in South Vietnam has never been the annihilation of the enemy. It has been to bring about a recognition in Hanoi that its objective—taking over the South by force—could not be achieved.

We think that peace can be based on the Geneva accords of 1954, under political conditions that permit the South Vietnamese—all the South Vietnamese—to chart their course free of any outside domination or interferences, from us or from anyone else.

MANILA PLEDGE REAFFIRMED

So tonight I reaffirm the pledge that we made at Manila: that we are prepared to withdraw our forces from South Vietnam as the other side withdraws its forces to the North, stops the infiltration, and the level of violence thus subsides.

Our goal of peace and self-determination in Vietnam is directly related to the future of all of Southeast Asia, where much has happened to inspire confidence during the past 10 years. And we have done all that we knew how to do to contribute and to help build that confidence.

A number of nations have shown what can be accomplished under conditions of security. Since 1966, Indonesia, the fifth largest nation in all the world, with a population of more than 100 million people, has had a government that's dedicated to peace with its neighbors and improved conditions for its own people.

Political and economic cooperation between nations has grown rapidly.

And I think every American can take a great deal of pride in the role that we have played in bringing this about in Southeast Asia. We can rightly judge—as responsible Southeast Asians themselves do—that the progress of the past three years would have been far less likely, if not completely impossible, if America's sons and others had not made their stand in Vietnam.

At Johns Hopkins University about three years ago, I announced that the United States would take part in the great work of developing Southeast Asia, including the Mekong valley, for all the people of that region. Our determination to help build a better land—a better land for men on both sides of the present conflict—has not diminished in the

least. Indeed, the ravages of war, I think, have made it more urgent than ever.

So I repeat on behalf of the United States again tonight what I said at Johns Hopkins—that North Vietnam could take its place in this common effort just as soon as peace comes.

Over time, a wider framework of peace and security in Southeast Asia may become possible. The new cooperation of the nations of the area could be a foundation stone. Certainly friendship with the nations of such a Southeast Asia is what the United States seeks—and that is all that the United States seeks.

One day, my fellow citizens, there will be peace in Southeast Asia: It will come because the people of Southeast Asia want it—those whose armies are at war tonight; those who, though threatened, have trus far been spared.

Peace will come because Asians were willing to work for it and to sacrifice for it—and to die by the thousands for it.

But let it never be forgotten: peace will come also because America sent her sons to help secure it.

It has not been easy—far from it. During the past four and a half years, it has been my fate and my responsibility to be Commander in Chief. I have lived daily and nightly with the cost of this war. I know the pain that it has inflicted. I know perhaps beter than anyone the misgivings it has aroused.

VITAL TO EVERY AMERICAN

And throughout this entire long period I have been sustained by a single principle: that what we are doing now in Vietnam is vital not only to the security of Southeast Asia but it is vital to the security of every American.

Surely, we have treaties which we must respect. Surely, we have commitments that we are going to keep. Resolutions of the Congress testify to the need to resist aggression in the world and in Southeast Asia.

But the heart of our involvement in South Vietnam under three different Presidents, three separate Administrations, has always been America's own security.

And the larger purpose of our involvement has always been to help the nations of Southeast Asia become independent, and stand alone self-sustaining as members of a great world community, at peace with themselves, at peace with all others. And with such a nation our country—and the world—will be far more secure than it is tonight.

I believe that a peaceful Asia is far nearer to reality because of what America has done in Vietnam. I believe that the men who endure the dangers of battle there, fighting there for us tonight, are helping the entire world avoid far greater conflicts, far wider wars, far more destruction, than this one.

The peace that will bring them home someday will come. Tonight, I have offered the first in what I hope will be a series of mutual moves toward peace.

I pray that it will not be rejected by the leaders of North Vietnam. I pray that they will accept it as a means by which the sacrifices of their own people may be ended. And I ask your help and your support, my fellow citizens, for this effort to reach across the battlefield toward an early peace.

Yet, I believe that we must always be mindful of this one thing—whatever the trials and the tests ahead, the ultimate strength of our country and our cause will lie, not in powerful weapons or infinite resources or boundless wealth, but will lie in the unity of our people.

Finally, my fellow Americans, let me say this:

Of those to whom much is given much is asked. I cannot say—and no man could say—that no more will be asked of us. Yet I believe that now, no less than when the decade began, this generation of Americans is willing to pay the price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, to assure the survival, and the success, of liberty.

Since those words were spoken by John F. Kennedy, the people of America have kept that compact with mankind's noblest cause. And we shall continue to keep it.

ORDER OF LOYALTIES LISTED

This I believe very deeply. Throughout my entire public career I have followed the personal philosophy that I am a free man, an American, a public servant and a member of my party—in that order—always and only.

For 37 years in the service of our nation, first as a Congressman, as a Senator and as Vice President, and now as your President, I have put the unity of the people first, I have put it ahead of any divisive partisanship. And in these times, as in times before, it is true that a house divided against itself by the spirit of faction, of party, of region, of religion, of race, is a house that cannot stand.

There is division in the American house now. There is divisiveness among us all tonight. And holding the trust that is mine, as President of all the people, I cannot disregard the peril of the progress of the American people and the hope and the prospect of peace for all peoples, so I would ask all Americans whatever their personal interest or concern to guard against divisiveness and all of its ugly consequences.

Fifty-two months and ten days ago, in a moment of tragedy and trauma, the duties of this office fell upon me.

I asked then for your help, and God's, that we might continue America on its course binding up our wounds, healing our history, moving forward in new unity to clear the American agenda and to keep the American commitment for all of our people.

United we have kept that commitment. And united we have enlarged that commitment. And through all time to come I think America will be a stronger nation, a more just society, a land of greater opportunity and fulfillment because of what we have all done together in these years of unparalleled achievement.

LIFE OF FREEDOM

Our reward will come in the life of freedom and peace and hope that our children will enjoy through ages ahead.

What we won when all of our people united just must not now be lost in suspicion and distrust and selfishness and politics among any of our people, and believing this as I do I have concluded that I should not permit the Presidency to become involved in the partisan divisions that are developing in this political year.

With American sons in the fields far away, with America's future under challenge right here at home, with our hopes and the world's hopes for peace in the balance every day. I do not believe that I should devote an hour or a day of my time to any personal partisan causes or to any duties other than the awesome duties of this office—the Presidency of your country.

Accordingly, I shall not seek, and I will not accept, the nomination of my party for another term as your President. But let men everywhere know, however, that a strong and a confident and a vigilant America stands ready tonight to seek an honorable peace; and stands ready tonight to defend an honored cause, whatever the price, whatever the burden, whatever the sacrifice that duty may require.

Thank you for listening. Good night and God bless all of you.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, under the Johnson administration our Nation has moved to correct social injustice, resist aggression abroad, and build a better America and a better world on a scale unprecedented in our history.

It has been the lot of the President to bear the criticism and even the personal abuse that befalls one who must take the responsibility for far-reaching and difficult decisions.

The remaining months of the Johnson administration will span a critical and dangerous period in our history. The President must have had great concern that whatever moves he must make during this period would be subject to partisan and political question and discord if he were a candidate. By denying himself renomination and reelection, the President has taken the most convincing step possible to prove that he is guided by no motive other than what is best for our country.

President Johnson has acted in the finest spirit of service and devotion to the duties of the President. He has acted as a great President, with sincerity and with determination, to achieve world peace, protect the vital interests of the United States, and secure domestic tranquillity. In these efforts he must have the support of all Americans.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I should like to respond to both our majority leader and the able Senator from Washington, on the other side of the aisle, in indicating that it is my deep and sincere feeling that the President's decision, which we all know was an exceedingly difficult decision for a man who has served his country for so long, was a wise decision, a realistic decision, and a generous decision, one that was based solely on his belief as to what was best for the United States of America.

I also believe that this decision will enable those factions which have been working to divide America to begin now the momentous job of uniting this country once again.

I was gratified by the President's initiative in reducing the bombing, and I hope it will move us toward a negotiated settlement of the war.

I also believe very deeply that the Republican Party, as it deliberates now on the policy it should take toward the war, in its platform—and I hope in the voice of its candidate to be nominated in Miami—will not offer this Nation the fruitless task of trying to find a military solution to what is essentially a political, economic, and social problem in Southeast Asia. I cannot imagine our nominating a candidate who would offer the endless road of trying to find some sort of elusive military victory or military solution to the problem.

I believe that today, with the President's clear-cut decision—which I accept in the seriousness and the earnestness with which he made it last night before the Nation—rather than dwelling on the failures of the past, we all have an opportunity and a responsibility to devise constructive solutions to the problems of the late sixties and the early seventies.

I reiterate a suggestion I made on the floor of the Senate last month, that if in our present crisis Congress is unable to move forward with dispatch, it might serve the national interest if the Presi-

dent would appear before a joint session of Congress to once again, in specific terms, show the willingness of this administration to reduce expenses, the willingness of this administration to recognize that the situation in Europe can be drastically altered by bringing back many of our European forces, and to show that we can reduce our balance-of-payments problem by a sacrifice on the part of the Government in certain programs that it has undertaken.

I hope Congress will move forward now with great dispatch to find a way to give us fair housing legislation in this country. I hope the Senate will move forward with the greatest possible dispatch to reduce expenses and to bring forth the tax increase that we know is necessary to restore fiscal sanity to our fiscal and monetary policy.

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

Mr. PERCY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted that the distinguished Senator from Illinois has raised that question; because, there again, the President laid it on the line last night, and he asked Congress to do something about reducing expenditures, reducing his budget, and granting a 10-percent surcharge tax. It is up to us now, because, as he indicated indirectly, all he can do is propose. It is up to us to dispose. I hope we do it and take heed of his warning.

Mr. PERCY. I trust, also, that the majority leader would agree that this certainly is not the time to start putting extraneous matters on his bill, to start loading it up at the time when we are trying to move ahead with a national policy, to have this bill the instrument for moving the foreign economic policy of this country back 30 years, by seeking to limit the importation of goods and merchandise flowing into this country, which will set us back through retaliation abroad.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I agree completely with the Senator, and I would hope that those matters could be considered on their own merits.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the action of President Lyndon Johnson in taking himself out of consideration for reelection was an act of selfless devotion to duty. The President has clearly placed his own personal interests in a position of secondary importance to the best interests of his country. I deeply regret that he will not be a candidate for reelection, but I salute him for his courage and for his patriotism.

Lyndon Johnson in my opinion, could have had the Democratic nomination for a second full term as President, if he had sought it. He has not bowed out for any fear that the prize might not be his. He has removed himself so that he may be free to use every means at his command, with any thought of self-interest put aside, to attain the objectives America has sought in this conflict and to bring an early and honorable peace, if that is possible.

I honor him for the decision he has made, and I hope his fellow Americans will recognize that in his announcement there is the stamp of greatness. It has been clear, from the moment he assumed the burdens of the Presidency in those dark days in November 1963, that Lyndon Johnson is a man in whom love of country is deeply ingrained. In a time when so many others seem to think patriotism passé Lyndon Johnson has never hesitated to articulate his faith in America and his deep devotion to his country and to his country's responsibilities wherever they might lie.

The course he has chosen now in Vietnam—the cessation of bombing in most of the country—should resolve once and for all the question of whether or not there can be genuine hope for any meaningful negotiation with the Communists. The President has offered Hanoi an honorable way to bring an end to the hostilities, while serving notice at the same time through the troop increase that the United States is acting from strength and not from weakness. The President is wavering neither in his search for peace nor in his resolve to honor America's commitments to stop Communist aggression and to help preserve freedom in the world wherever there is a desire for it.

President Johnson has pointed out to our people time and again that the United States is in Vietnam because three Presidents and three administrations have believed that our presence there is fundamental both for the preservation of freedom in Southeast Asia and for the protection of the vital national interests of the United States. While some have denounced this course and his perseverence in it, he has unswervingly held to what he believes to be the right course. By his willingness to step out of the presidency, he has done all that any man could do for a cause that he believes is in the best interests of America.

I hope that other nations will now redouble their efforts to bring peace to the world, and especially do I hope that the message of the President will be instrumental in exerting the Soviet Union to match his dedication to peace and thus hasten the day when Hanoi will move to the negotiating table.

Lyndon Johnson, I believe, will be counted among America's great Presidents. There is no doubt about his achievements on the domestic front. I have not always agreed with all of his proposals, but there can be no question about the forward-looking nature of many of the programs he has proposed and has seen enacted.

It is my opinion that he may be equally well known in years to come for the farsightedness and the soundness of his approach to the complex world problems that involve the Nation. To the solution of these problems he has now fully addressed himself in his final months in office.

From the moment I entered the U.S. Senate, Lyndon Johnson has been my friend, a fact in which I take great pride. I am honored to have served with him in its Chamber, and I am proud as I look back now that I supported him for the Presidency before the convention of 1960. When there have been differences between us they have usually been differences over methods and seldom disagreements over objectives or goals.

The unity of the American people now is of the utmost importance in the face of the external threat which Communist aggression poses for the whole free world. A nation divided as America has recently been divided by the more radical and reckless war dissenters cannot hope to prevail in its national purposes. Those who would divide and fragment America for their own ends have shaken our people's belief in our Nation's purposes and their faith in themselves, and they have tarnished the image of the United States. The President himself has been the target of much of this abuse.

Lyndon Johnson, recognizes that America's strength can come only from unity, and that the divisiveness that has been eating away at the national fabric can have only ruinous results. He has put this need for unity above everything else, even his own career. History, I believe, will accord him a high place indeed for his resolute determination to take all personal political considerations out of the conduct of the war and the efforts to bring peace.

I regard Lyndon Johnson as a great American. I hope that his desire for world peace will be realized.

COURAGEOUS DECISION

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the President's announcement last night may have taken us all by surprise, but it did not take long to realize what a courageous and truly-statesman-like move he has made.

In the tradition of this country's greatest leaders, President Johnson has placed national unity and devotion to world peace above personal ambition. In this time of foreign war and internal strife, he has elevated the Presidency above partisan politics into a position of objective and truly unbiased leadership.

President Johnson has fought for his country in war and in peace. By his announcement last night, he demonstrated beyond any doubt the sincerity of his intention to work for peace in Vietnam. The decision to stop the bombing north of the region immediately adjacent to the demilitarized zone is tangible evidence of the wise course the President is determined to follow. Let us hope that this course will evoke a favorable response from Hanoi. If it does not, the onus of continuing the war will surely not be with the President.

Lyndon Johnson's devotion to duty to country will earn him a place of high distinction in U.S. history. His announcement last night long will be remembered as the announcement of a brave and honest man.

Mr. President, newspapers across the country have published editorials today praising the President's action. Two particularly good editorials have appeared in the Baltimore Sun and the Washing-

ton Post. I ask unanimous consent that these editorials be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 1, 1968]

IN THE NAME OF UNITY

President Johnson, by his moving declaration that he will not seek nor accept the nomination of his party, has taken himself out of the presidential campaign, barring developments that at this juncture simply cannot be foreseen.

He has at the same time, by both his remarks on his candidacy and the suspension of bombing in nearly all Vietnam, taken the war out of the presidential campaign as far as it is in his power to do so.

He has made a personal sacrifice in the name of national unity that entitles him to a very special place in the annals of American history and to a very special kind of gratitude and appreciation.

Many public men have spoken in the name of national unity to advance their own cause and candidacy. The President last night put unity ahead of his own advancement and his own pride.

The shape of the forthcoming presidential campaign is obscure at this moment; but it ought to be, by any normal expectation, a campaign of less divisiveness and less bitterness than the one the country had expected. The President lanced the boil of faction and opened the abscess of partisanship on the body politic. It is to be hoped that his surgery will diminish the fever of public life and permit the Nation to pursue its political decisions in a climate of restraint and prudence.

The verdict of history remains to be written upon an Administration that has attacked the social and racial problems of America with skill and vigor. The judgment of the world remains to be pronounced upon the success or failure of foreign policies that will influence world affairs for generations.

Americans need wait no longer, however, to conclude that the man who spoke to them last night is a man who greatly loves his country and who deeply cherishes its unity.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Apr. 1, 1968]

THE PRESIDENT'S SPEECH

President Johnson's announcement last night that he will not accept his party's nomination for another term as President underscored his decision to stop the bombing in North Vietnam beyond the demilitarized zone and to move toward a de-escalation of the war. By removing himself as a political candidate in the midst of our divisive and rapidly developing election campaign, Mr. Johnson has given a tangible proof of his desire to bring the war to an end and to establish an honorable and lasting peace in Southeast Asia.

Mr. Johnson's speech thus was of the highest order—on a level with his solid performance of November, 1963, when he took over the Presidency with a sure, steady hand in one of the nation's most tragic moments. The United States is divided and in turmoil now—confused and doubtful about the progress of the war in Vietnam, beset by inflation and racial strife at home and trouble by the plight of the dollar abroad.

The President, like many other Americans, could foresee only more domestic strife, more bitter argument and more trouble if matters continued on the course of the past several weeks. He had been under strong military pressure to step up the whole level of the war, through a large increase in the number of our troops and through more intensive bombing—in short to press hard for a military victory. Such a decision, undoubtedly, would have increased our domestic turmoil.

The course the President decided upon in Vietnam is an earnest of the United States desire for prompt peace negotiations. By halting most of the bombing in North Vietnam and by holding down the increase in American forces to some 13,500 support troops, Mr. Johnson is deliberating slowing down the American operations, and urging North Vietnam to reciprocate. He wisely put no time limit on the bombing pause. This represents a real effort to limit the scale of the war and bring it under control.

Congress should now match the President's action promptly, and bring the budget under control through reduced spending and a tax increase. It can do no less, and it should delay no longer.

CONTROL OF UNFAIR TRADE RELATIONS TO AGRICULTURE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House on S. 109.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 109) to control unfair trade practices affecting producers of agricultural products and associations of such producers, and for other purposes, which was, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act shall be known as the Agricultural Fair Practices Act of 1967.

LEGISLATIVE FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. Agricultural products are produced in the United States by many individual farmers and ranchers scattered throughout the various States of the Nation. Such products in fresh or processed form move in large part in the channels of interstate and foreign commerce, and such products which do not move in these channels directly burden or affect interstate commerce. The efficient production and marketing of agricultural products by farmers and ranchers is of vital concern to their welfare and to the general economy of the Nation. Because agricultural products are produced by numerous individual farmers, the marketing and bargaining position of individual farmers will be adversely affected unless they are free to join together voluntarily in cooperative organizations as authorized by law. Interference with this right is contrary to the public interest and adversely affects the free and orderly flow of goods in interstate and foreign commerce.

It is, therefore, declared to be the policy of Congress and the purpose of this Act to establish standards of fair practices required of handlers in their dealings in agricultural products.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. When used in this Act—

(a) The term "handler" means any person engaged in the business or practice of (1) acquiring agricultural products from producers or associations of producers for processing or sale; or (2) grading, packaging, handling, storing, or processing agricultural products received from producers or associations of producers; or (3) contracting or negotiating contracts or other arrangements, written or oral, with or on behalf of producers or associations of producers with respect to the production or marketing of any agricultural product; or (4) acting as an agent or broker for a handler in the performance of any function or act specified in clause (1), (2), or (3) of this paragraph.

(b) The term "producer" means a person engaged in the production of agricultural products as a farmer, planter, rancher, dairyman, fruit, vegetable, or nut grower.

(c) The term "association of producers" means any association of producers of agricultural products engaged in marketing, bargaining, shipping, or processing as defined in section 15(a) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1929, as amended (49 Stat. 317; 12 U.S.C. 1141j(a)), or in section 1 of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize association of producers of agricultural products," approved February 18, 1922 (42 Stat. 388; 7 U.S.C. 291).

(d) The term "person" includes individuals, partnerships, corporations, and associations.

(e) The term "agricultural products" shall not include cotton or tobacco or their products.

PROHIBITED PRACTICES

SEC. 4. It shall be unlawful for any handler knowingly to engage or permit any employee or agent to engage in the following practices:

(a) To coerce any producer in the exercise of his right to join and belong to or to refrain from joining or belonging to an association of producers, or to refuse to deal with any producer because of the exercise of his right to join and belong to such an association; or

(b) To discriminate against any producer with respect to price, quantity, quality, or other terms of purchase, acquisition, or other handling of agricultural products because of his membership in or contract with an association of producers; or

(c) To coerce or intimidate any producer to enter into, maintain, breach, cancel, or terminate a membership agreement or marketing contract with an association of producers or a contract with a handler; or

(d) To pay or loan money, give any thing of value, or offer any other inducement or reward to a producer for refusing to or ceasing to belong to an association of producers; or

(e) To make false reports about the finances, management, or activities of associations of producers or handlers; or

(f) To conspire, combine, agree, or arrange with any other person to do, or aid or abet the doing of, any act made unlawful by this Act.

DISCLAIMER OF INTENTION TO PROHIBIT NORMAL DEALING

SEC. 5. Nothing in this Act shall prevent handlers and producers from selecting their customers and suppliers for any reason other than a producer's membership in or contract with an association of producers, nor require a handler to deal with an association of producers.

ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 6. (a) Whenever any handler has engaged or there are reasonable grounds to believe that any handler is about to engage in any act or practice prohibited by section 4, a civil action for preventive relief, including an application for a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order, may be instituted by the person aggrieved. In any action commenced pursuant hereto, the court, in its discretion, may allow the prevailing party a reasonable attorney's fee as part of the costs. The court may provide that no restraining order or preliminary injunction shall issue except upon the giving of security by the applicant, in such sum as the court deems proper, for the payment of such costs and damages as may be incurred or suffered by any party who is found to have been wrongfully enjoined or restrained.

(b) Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture has reasonable cause to believe that any handler, or group of handlers, has engaged in any act or practice prohibited by section 4, he may request the Attorney General to bring civil action in his behalf in the appropriate district court of the United States by filing with it a complaint (1) setting forth facts pertaining to such act or practice, and (2) requesting such preventive relief, including an application for a permanent or temporary

injunction, restraining order, or other order against the handler, or handlers, responsible for such acts or practices. Upon receipt of such request, the Attorney General is authorized to file such complaint.

(c) Any person injured in his business or property by reason of any violation of, or combination or conspiracy to violate, any provision of section 4 of this Act may sue therefor in the appropriate district court of the United States without respect to the amount in controversy, and shall recover damages sustained. In any action commenced pursuant to this subsection, the court may allow the prevailing party a reasonable attorney's fee as a part of the costs. Any action to enforce any cause of action under this subsection shall be forever barred unless commenced within two years after the cause of action accrued.

(d) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction of proceedings instituted pursuant to this section and shall exercise the same without regard to whether the aggrieved party shall have exhausted any administrative or other remedies that may be provided by law.

The provisions of this Act shall not be construed to change or modify existing State law nor to deprive the proper State courts of jurisdiction.

SEPARABILITY

SEC. 7. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

And, amend the title so as to read: "An act to prohibit unfair trade practices affecting producers of agricultural products, and for other purposes."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the bill was passed by the Senate unanimously; it was approved by the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives by a vote of 28 to 5, and it was passed by the House of Representatives by a vote of about three or four to one.

It appears that the House did not make any substantial change in the bill. It did give the court descretion with respect to requiring security from the applicant for a restraining order. The changes are immaterial.

I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

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

The motion was agreed to.

DECISION OF THE PRESIDENT NOT TO SEEK REELECTION

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I have long held the firm conviction that the civilized world could hope for no more earnest advocate of peace than the President of the United States. It is a conviction that has been rewarded time and again by a man whose sincerity and integrity will forever be a source of inspiration to the American people.

On Christmas Day 1948, President Truman said:

> I would rather have peace in the world than be President.

History will record that 20 years later another great President, Lyndon B. Johnson gave new dignity and nobility to these words by sacrificing the highest office in the land to devote his entire energies to the cause of peace.

Few men in our history have demonstrated an equal measure of courage and unselfishness, and few men can lay equal claim to the mantle of greatness. His place in history is secure. It will be guaranteed not by those who value the art of politics, but by those who revere human life and work for the survival of mankind.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business to consider a nomination on the Executive Calendar.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Wilbur H. Dillahunty, of Arkansas, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Edward Clark, of Texas, to be commissioner for the Federal exhibit at HemisFair 1968.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 1000.

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

WEATHER PREDICTIONS

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 67) requesting the President to take action to insure that the United States will derive maximum benefits from an expanded and intensified effort to increase the accuracy and extend the time range of weather predictions was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 67

Resolved by the Senate of the United States (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the United States should participate in and give full support to the world weather program which includes (1) a world weather watch—the development and operation of an international system for the observation of the global atmosphere and the rapid and efficient communication, processing, and analysis of worldwide weather data, and (2) the conduct of a comprehensive program of research for the development of a capability in long-range weather prediction and for the theoretical study and evaluation of inadvertent climate modification and the feasibility of intentional climate modification;

SEC. 2. That it is further the sense of Congress that the President should cooperate with other nations in (1) a program, utilizing proven technology, procedures, and techniques, for the immediate improvement of the capability of the existing international weather system to observe the global atmosphere and to communicate, process, and analyze worldwide weather data; (2) a program to develop new technology, procedures, and techniques for the observation of the global atmosphere and for the communication, processing, and analysis of worldwide weather data, so that the needs of operational weather forecasting may be adequately served; (3) a program of research on the global wind systems of the atmosphere and on the interactions between the atmosphere and the underlying earth and oceans, including the collection of the data that may be required for these research activities; (4) a program for the training and education of scientists, engineers, and technical personnel for the development, operation, and conduct of any system or program referred to in clauses (1), (2), and (3) of this section; and (5) a program to provide appropriate technical and training assistance and facilities to other nations and to international organizations so that they may effectively participate in an international system for the observation of the global atmosphere and the rapid and efficient communications, processing and analysis of worldwide weather data and so that they may fully utilize the data, charts, analyses, and other information provided by such a system.

SEC. 3. It is further the sense of the Congress that, on or before March 1 of each year, the President should transmit to the Congress a plan setting forth the proposed participation of the United States for the next fiscal year in international programs in meteorology. The plan should contain a statement of the activities to be conducted and specify the department or agency of the Government which would conduct the activity and seek appropriations therefor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the preamble is agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1020), explaining the purposes of the concurrent resolution.

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

BACKGROUND

This is an important program that had its origin in 1961, when, on the initiative of the U.S. delegation the United Nations adopted resolutions that all member states and the appropriate international agencies conduct studies on how they might cooperatively improve weather forecasting and encourage increased scientific atmospheric research.

With a view to improving forecasts the World Meteorological Organization evolved the concept of a world program of weather observation which it has designated as the World Weather Watch. The 128-member nation organization approved this program at its Fifth Congress, held in May 1967.

The International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU), a nongovernmental scientific body of great prestige, responding to the United Nations resolutions, concerned itself primarily with atmospheric processes and is projecting a global atmospheric research program. This is being implemented in cooperation with the World Meteorological Organization.

Objectives of the twin activities are the development of better long-range weather predictions and the systematic exploration of the feasibility of large-scale weather modification.

Here in the United States an Interagency Committee for International Meteorological Programs was established in October 1964. Early in 1966 the committee recommended that the United States support a world weather program through a coordinated multi-agency effort. Following this recommendation President Johnson directed that the Environmental Science Services Administration, which includes the Weather Bureau and the Coast and Geodetic Survey, coordinate U.S. agency activities in the international program. Other agencies with important roles include the National Science Foundation, Department of State, Coast Guard, and National Aeronautics and Space Agency.

The United States is well prepared to participate in the global meteorological endeavor and the concurrent resolution reported today constitutes a prospective congressional endorsement.

WORLD WEATHER WATCH

As developed by the World Meteorological Organization, the World Weather Watch will have five major components. They are:

(1) A global observing system utilizing artificial satellites, merchant ships, buoys and other floating stations, and ocean weather ships in addition to a greatly increased number of observation stations on land. At present 80 percent of the earth, principally in ocean areas or in developing nations, is gravely deficient in scientific weather observations or has none at all.

(2) A global data processing system so that results of observations may be centralized, recorded, analyzed, and made available for forecast use. It is contemplated that world, regional, and national data centers will be established, many of them to be equipped with computers. Presently designated centers are Washington, D.C., Moscow, U.S.S.R., and Melbourne, Australia. The United States also plans a center in the Caribbean area where hurricanes are not uncommon.

(3) A global telecommunications system is being organized to insure the rapid exchange of meteorological data. Telecommunications hubs and meteorological centers will be linked by an effective high-speed global main trunk circuit. Of great importance also the International Telecommunications Union, following representations by WMO and the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission, is making additional frequencies available for use in transmitting marine data.

(4) A global atmospheric research program is being developed both within the World Meteorological Organization and in appropriate bodies of the International Council of Scientific Unions. WMO and ICSU have established a joint organizing committee to carry out the program which will include extensive studies of air-sea interaction.

(5) The fifth element of the World Weather Watch plan is education and training to assure the availability of trained scientists to carry on the program in all parts of the world.

Mr. D. A. Davies, Secretary General of the World Meteorological Organization, has termed the World Weather Watch plan "an unprecedented project in meteorology, and in some ways perhaps in any international field of scientific endeavor."

U.S. PARTICIPATION

The Environmental Science Service Administration, in preparation for the international cooperative weather program, has established an Office of World Weather Systems which plans to initiate system-design studies of observing techniques, identify merchant ships to be equipped with meteorological instruments, and develop the detailed design of the international communication system.

One of ESSA's activities will be to make use of islands of the Pacific Islands Trust Territory for upper air observations, and the agency is developing equipment capable of adding wind data to upper air observations taken from merchant ships.

Plans call for instrumenting 32 U.S. merchant ships in addition to the 15 now taking upper air observations.

A communications link already has been established between Washington, D.C., and Offenbach, West Germany, and further links are contemplated between Washington and Brasilia and between Honolulu and Japan. Where links are established between the United States and another nation costs will be shared equally.

ESSA will continue to cooperate with NASA in development of techniques for remote sensing from a satellite and for satellite interrogation—location of observation platforms.

The Coast Guard is presently maintaining for the Weather Bureau four shipboard weather stations in the Atlantic and two in the Pacific. Five Atlantic shipboard stations are operated by West European nations.

In the Pacific in addition to the two shipboard U.S. weather stations, one between California and Hawaii and the other between Hawaii and Japan, the Dominion of Canada maintains an ocean weather station in the Gulf of Alaska, and Japan at least a part-time station south of the archipelago in the area where typhoons are prevalent.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 67 has been substituted by the Committee on Commerce for Senate Joint Resolution 116 which was, in substance, virtually identical. The committee had earlier invited comments from the appropriate departments and agencies on Senate Joint Resolution 116 and as these comments are equally applicable to Senate Concurrent Resolution 67 they are appended.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1316) to amend the Bankruptcy Act and the Civil Service Retirement Law with respect to the tenure and retirement benefits of referees in bankruptcy was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

THE 1868 TREATY OF PEACE

The bill (S. 2745) to provide for the observance of the centennial of the signing of the 1868 Treaty of Peace between the Navajo Indian Tribe and the United States was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is requested (1) to issue a proclamation designating the calendar year 1968 as the centennial of the signing of the 1868 Treaty of Peace between the Navajo Indian Tribe and the United States, and calling upon the Governors of the States, mayors of cities, and other public officials, as well as other persons, organizations, and groups, to observe such centennial by appropriate celebrations and ceremonies and (2) to provide, in such manner as he deems appropriate, for participation by Federal agencies and officials in such observance.

SEC. 2. The President of the Senate is authorized to appoint eight Members of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives is authorized to appoint eight Members of the House of Representatives, to represent the Congress in connection with observances and activities of the Navajo Indian Tribe commemorating the historic events that preceded, and are associated with, the signing of the 1868 Treaty of Peace between the Navajo Indian Tribe and the United States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1021), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to request the President of the United States to issue a proclamation designating the calendar year 1968 as the centennial of the signing of the 1868 treaty of peace between the Navajo Indian Tribe and the United States, and to authorize the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives to appoint eight Members from each body to represent the Congress in connection with observances and activities of the Navajo Indian Tribe.

STATEMENT

The year 1968 marks the 100th anniversary of the signing of the treaty of peace between the Navajo Tribe and the U.S. Government. This treaty, signed by 29 Navajo headmen and 10 officers of the U.S. Army on June 1, 1868, officially recognized the sovereignty of the Navajo Tribe. The treaty was ratified by the Senate of the United States on July 23, and proclaimed by President Andrew Johnson on August 12, 1868. The mutual acceptance of this treaty brought to an end a tragic 4-year period of suffering, hardship, deprivation, and exile at Fort Sumner on the banks of the Pecos River.

During the intervening century, the Navajo people have witnessed a substantial population increase and have undergone drastic and far-reaching changes in their economy, self-government, social status, education, and living conditions. In many areas they have begun to solve some of the problems of poverty, land depletion, lack of modern utilities, and chronic unemployment. There is still much work yet to be done.

The Navajos now number about 100,000, are the largest Indian tribe on the largest reservation (about 12 million acres of tribal and allotted land) in the United States. Their forest industries, oil and mineral wealth, agriculture, arts and crafts, and their most recent welcome to the reservation of nationally known manufacturing firms, make them an outstanding example of a people who have moved with the new century while still holding fast to the best of their ancient beliefs and creeds.

The centennial of the signing of the Treaty of Peace and the centennial of the recognition of the sovereignty of the Navajo Tribe will be celebrated with appropriate ceremonies under the auspices of the Navajo Centennial Commemoration Committee during the year 1968. The appointment of eight Members of the Senate and eight Members of the House of Representatives to represent the Congress in connection with the observances and activities of the Navajo Indian Tribe commemorating the historic events that preceded and are associated with the

signing of the 1868 Treaty of Peace between the Navajo Indian Tribe and the United States would demonstrate the interest of the people of the United States in the Navajo Tribe and their accomplishments during the past century.

The committee is of the opinion that it would be appropriate for Congress to recognize this tribe centennial, and accordingly the committee recommends favorable consideration of S. 2745, without amendment.

CHARLOTTE, N.C., DAY

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 131) to designate May 20, 1968, as "Charlotte, N.C., Day" was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That May 20, 1968, is hereby designated as "Charlotte, North Carolina Day" in commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of such city, and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation inviting the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1022), explaining the purposes of the joint resolution.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of the joint resolution is to designate May 20, 1968, as "Charlotte, N.C., Day," in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of that city.

STATEMENT

The year 1968 will mark the 200th anniversary of the establishment of the city of Charlotte, N.C., by the State Assembly of North Carolina.

Charlotte, called the Queen City, was for the wife of George III, King of England, and the county of Mecklenburg which embraces Charlotte was taken from the name of the Queen's Royal House in Germany.

Throughout 1968 the people of Charlotte have planned an elaborate celebration of their bicentennial. During the year, Charlotte will present an outdoor drama by one of the State's most gifted literary talents, Legette Blythe. The drama will be given throughout the summer months in a 4,000-seat amphitheater now under construction. Several souvenir magazines will be published and a book has been written—"Charlotte, Queen of Carolinas" by Kenneth and Blanche Marsh.

The general chairman of the Charlotte bicentennial is Mr. John M. Belk, an outstanding citizen of the Queen City. He is attempting to have the State Culture Week held this year in Charlotte and a jazz festival, similar to the one in Newport, R.I., is expected to be held with many famous North Carolina jazz musicians returning to the State to participate.

Charlotte has become the center of the largest concentration of population in the southeastern United States. It is second only to Chicago as a major national trucking center, and because of its busy air, bus, and rail industry, Charlotte is a major distribution center for the entire Southeast.

Since 1930 Charlotte's population has grown by almost 150 percent and a 90-percent increase has been forecast from 1960 to 1980. Not only is the growth in Charlotte's population expected to continue at this phenomenal rate of increase; the growth of the surrounding market area served by Charlotte is expected to be substantial.

The city of Charlotte has contributed greatly to the heritage of our Nation, and the committee believes that during this bicentennial year it would be most fitting to focus national attention on Mecklenburg County and the city of Charlotte and appropriate for our country to recognize Charlotte's anniversary in this way, because in so many instances the historical background and dynamic growth of Charlotte are typical of our Nation. Accordingly, the committee is of the opinion that this resolution has a meritorious purpose and therefore recommends favorable consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 131, without amendment.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2658) to amend section 127 of title 23 of the United States Code relating to vehicle weight and width limitations on the Interstate System, in order to make certain increases in such limitations, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2884) to amend the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955 so as to recommend to the several States that its absentee registration and voting procedures be extended to all citizens temporarily residing abroad was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A COMMISSION ON BALANCED ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND CREATION OF NORTHWEST REGIONAL SERVICE CORPORATION

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 64) authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Hearings on the Establishment of a Commission on Balanced Economic Development and the Creation of a Northwest Regional Service Corporation was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on Government Operations one thousand additional copies of its hearings of the Ninetieth Congress, first session, on S.J. Res. 64, to establish a Commission on Balanced Economic Development, and S. 1602, to create a Northwest Regional Services Corporation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1028), explaining the purposes of the concurrent resolution.

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

Senate Concurrent Resolution 64 would authorize the printing for the use of the Senate Committee on Government Operations of 1,000 additional copies of its hearings of the 90th Congress, first session, on Senate Joint Resolution 64, to establish a Commission on Balanced Economic Development, and S. 1602, to create a Northwest Regional Services Corporation.

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

Printing-cost estimate

Back to press, 1,000 copies..... $1,735.55

RESEARCH NEEDS IN AGING

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 66) to print, for the use of the Senate Special Committee on Aging, additional copies of its hearings on long-range program and research needs in aging was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 66

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Special Committee on Aging six thousand additional copies of its hearings of the Ninetieth Congress, entitled "Long-Range Program and Research Needs in Aging and Related Fields."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1029), explaining the purposes of the concurrent resolution.

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

Senate Concurrent Resolution 66 would authorize the printing for the use of the Senate Special Committee on Aging of 6,000 additional copies of its hearings of the 90th Congress, entitled "Long-Range Program and Research Needs in Aging and Related Fields."

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

Printing-cost estimate

6,000 additional copies, at $825.34 per thousand..... $4,952.04

THE OZARKS REGIONAL COMMISSION REPORT

The resolution (S. Res. 255) to print as a Senate document the First Annual Report of the Ozarks Regional Commission, for the period from September 7, 1966, to December 31, 1967, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 255

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document the First Annual Report of the Ozarks Regional Commission, for the period from September 7, 1966, to December 31, 1967, pursuant to section 510 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-136); and that there be printed for the use of the Committee on Public Works one thousand additional copies of such document.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1030), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

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

Senate Resolution 255 would authorize the printing as a Senate document of the First Annual Report of the Ozarks Regional Commission, for the period from September 7, 1966, to December 31, 1967, pursuant to section 510 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-136). The resolution also would provide 1,000 additional copies of such document for the use of the Committee on Public Works.

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

Printing-cost estimate

To print as a document (1,500 copies)	$278.97
1,000 additional copies, at $28.98 per thousand	28.98
Total estimated cost, S. Res. 255	307.95

HISTORY OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The resolution (S. Res. 258) to print the "History of the Committee on the Judiciary Together With Chairmen and Members Assigned Thereto, 1816–1967" as a Senate document was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 258

Resolved, That there be printed with illustrations as a Senate document a compilation of materials entitled "History of the Committee on the Judiciary Together With Chairmen and Members Assigned Thereto, 1816–1967", and that there be printed ten thousand additional copies of such document for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1031), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

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

Senate Resolution 258 would authorize the printing with illustrations as a Senate document of a compilation of materials entitled "History of the Committee on the Judiciary Together With Chairmen and Members Assigned Thereto, 1816–1967," and further would authorize the printing of 10,000 additional copies of such document for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

Printing-cost estimate

To print as a document (1,500 copies)	$1,636.96
10,000 additional copies, at $114.13 per thousand	1,141.30
Total estimated cost, S. Res. 258	2,778.26

FEDERAL ARCTIC RESEARCH

The resolution (S. Res. 259) to print as a Senate document a report entitled "Federal Arctic Research" was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 259

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document a report entitled "Federal Arctic Research", prepared according to the instructions of Senator E. L. Bartlett, chairman, Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee, Committee on Appropriations, by George A. Doumani, Science Policy Research Division, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed one thousand additional copies of such document for the use of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1032), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

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

Senate Resolution 259 would authorize the printing as a Senate document of a report entitled "Federal Arctic Research," prepared according to the instructions of Senator E. L. Bartlett, chairman, Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee, Committee on Appropriations, by George A. Doumani, Science Policy Research Division, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress. There would be printed 1,000 additional copies of such document for the use of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Printing-cost estimate

To print as a document (1,500 copies)	$6,593.79
1,000 additional copies, at $417.31 per 1,000	417.31
Total estimated cost, S. Res. 259	7,011.10

AIR POLLUTION BY FEDERAL FACILITIES

The resolution (S. Res. 261) to print as a Senate document "Air Pollution by Federal Facilities" was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 261

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document the report of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, entitled "Air Pollution by Federal Facilities," in compliance with the provisions of title I, section 111(b) of the Clean Air Act, Public Law 90–148, as amended; and that there be printed two thousand five hundred additional copies of such document for the use of the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1033), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

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

Senate Resolution 261 would authorize the printing as a Senate document of the report of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, entitled, "Air Pollution by Federal Facilities," in compliance with the provisions of title I, section 111(b) of the Clean Air Act, Public Law 90–148, as amended. There would be printed 2,500 additional copies of such document for the use of the Committee on Public Works.

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

Printing-cost estimate

To print as a document (1,500 copies)	$507.98
2,500 additional copies, at $50.97 per thousand	127.43
Total estimated cost, Senate Resolution 261	635.41

SENATE REPORT NO. 1006, 90TH CONGRESS

The resolution (S. Res. 269) authorizing additional printing of Senate report No. 1006, 90th Congress, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 269

Resolved, That there be printed, for the use of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, three thousand additional copies of the 1968 report of its Subcommittee on Migratory Labor entitled "The Migratory Farm Labor Problem in the United States" (Senate Report Numbered 1006, Ninetieth Congress).

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1034), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

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

Senate Resolution 269 would authorize the printing for the use of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of 3,000 additional copies of the 1968 report of its Subcommittee on Migratory Labor entitled "The Migratory Farm Labor Problem in the United States" (S. Rept. No. 1006, 90th Cong.).

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

Printing-cost estimate

Back to press, first 1,000 copies	$719.34
2,000 additional copies, at $239.01 per thousand	478.02
Total estimated cost, Senate Resolution 269	1,197.36

CEREMONIES AT UNVEILING OF BUST OF CONSTANTINO BRUMIDI

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 657) providing for ceremonies in the rotunda of the Capitol in connection with the unveiling of the bust of Constantino Brumidi was considered and agreed to, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 657

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the bust of Constantino Brumidi procured by the Joint Committee on the Library pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 70, Eighty-ninth Congress, second session, to be placed in the corridor, known as the Brumidi Corridor, on the first floor of the Senate wing of the Capitol, is hereby authorized to be placed temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol; and that ceremonies are authorized to be held in the rotunda on said occasion; and that the Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized to make the necessary arrangements to carry out the purposes of this concurrent resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1035), explaining the purposes of the concurrent resolution.

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

PURPOSE OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 657

House Concurrent Resolution 657 would provide (1) that the bust of Constantino Brumidi (procured by the Joint Committee on the Library pursuant to S. Con. Res. 70, 89th Cong., second sess., to be placed in the corridor, known as the Brumidi corridor, on the first floor of the Senate wing of the Capitol) be authorized to be placed temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol; (2) that ceremonies be authorized to be held in the rotunda on said occasion; and (3) that the Architect of the Capitol be authorized to make the necessary arrangements to carry out the purposes of this concurrent resolution.

While the Brumidi corridor would be an appropriate place for the dedication ceremonies, it is considered too small to accommodate the number of persons expected to attend.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS IN CONNECTION WITH UNVEILING OF BUST OF CONSTANTINO BRUMIDI

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 658) providing for the printing of the proceedings in connection with the unveiling of the bust of Constantino Brumidi was considered and agreed to, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 658

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed as a House document, with illustrations and bound in such style as may be directed by the Joint Committee on Printing, the program and proceedings in Congress at the unveiling in the rotunda, together with such other matter as the joint committee may deem pertinent thereto, of the bust of Constantino Brumidi; and that there be printed thirteen thousand five hundred and fifty additional copies of which two thousand five hundred and seventy-five copies shall be for the use of the Senate, and ten thousand nine hundred and seventy-five copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. The Joint Committee on Printing is hereby authorized to have the copy prepared for the Public Printer and shall provide suitable illustrations to be bound with these proceedings.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1036), explaining the purposes of the concurrent resolution.

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

House Concurrent Resolution 658 would authorize the printing as a House document, with illustrations and bound in such style as may be directed by the Joint Committee on Printing, of the program and proceedings in Congress at the unveiling in the rotunda, together with such other matter as the joint committee may deem pertinent thereto, of the bust of Constantino Brumidi. There would be printed 13,550 additional copies of such documents, of which 2,575 would be for the use of the Senate (25 per Member) and 10,975 for the use of the House of Representatives (25 per Member). A printing-cost estimate is not obtainable at this time.

DR. CRAWFORD H. GREENEWALT

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 142) to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Crawford H. Greenewalt as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 142

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, which will occur by the expiration of the term of Doctor Crawford H. Greenewalt, of Wilmington, Delaware, on April 6, 1968, be filled by the reappointment of the present incumbent for the statutory term of six years.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1037), explaining the purposes of the joint resolution.

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

Senate Joint Resolution 142 would provide that the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, occasioned by the expiration of the term of Dr. Crawford H. Greenewalt, of Wilmington, Del., on April 6, 1968, be filled by the reappointment of Dr. Greenewalt for the statutory term of 6 years.

The Board of Regents, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 42, is composed of the Vice President, the Chief Justice of the United States, three Members of the Senate, three Members of the House of Representatives, and six other persons other than Members of Congress. The six Citizen Regents, two of whom shall be residents of the District of Columbia and four of whom shall be inhabitants of some State (but no two of the same State), are appointed by joint resolution of Congress and serve 6-year terms.

At the recent annual meeting of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution it was unanimously resolved that the reappointment of Dr. Crawford H. Greenewalt be recommended to the Congress.

DR. CARYL P. HASKINS

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 143) to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Caryl P. Haskins as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 143

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress which will occur by the expiration of the term of Doctor Caryl P. Haskins, of Washington, District of Columbia, on April 6, 1968, be filled by the reappointment of the present incumbent for the statutory term of six years.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report, No. 1038, explaining the purposes of the joint resolution.

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

Senate Joint Resolution 143 would provide that the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, occasioned by the expiration of the term of Dr. Caryl P. Haskins, of Washington, D.C., on April 6, 1968, be filled by the reappointment of Dr. Haskins for the statutory term of 6 years.

The Board of Regents, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 42, is composed of the Vice President, the Chief Justice of the United States, three Members of the Senate, three Members of the House of Representatives, and six other persons other than Members of Congress. The six Citizen Regents, two of whom shall be residents of the District of Columbia and four of whom shall be inhabitants of some State (but no two of the same State), are appointed by joint resolution of Congress and serve 6-year terms.

At the recent annual meeting of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution it was unanimously resolved that the reappointment of Dr. Caryl P. Haskins be recommended to the Congress.

DR. WILLIAM A. M. BURDEN

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 144) to provide for the reappointment of Dr. William A. M. Burden as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 144

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, which will occur by the expiration of the term of Doctor William A. M. Burden, of New York, New York, on July 2, 1968, be filled by the reappointment of the present incumbent for the statutory term of six years.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1039), explaining the purposes of the joint resolution.

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

Senate Joint Resolution 144 would provide that the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, occasioned by the expiration of the term of Dr. William A. M. Burden, of New York, N.Y., on July 2, 1968, be filled by the reappointment of Dr. Burden for the statutory term of 6 years.

The Board of Regents, pursuant to 20 United States Code 42, is composed of the Vice President, the Chief Justice of the United States, three Members of the Senate, three Members of the House of Representatives, and six other persons other than Members of Congress. The six Citizen Regents, two of whom shall be residents of the District of Columbia and four of whom shall be inhabitants of some State (but no two of the same State), are appointed by joint resolution of Congress and serve 6-year terms.

At the recent annual meeting of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution it was unanimously resolved that the reappointment of Dr. William A. M. Burden be recommended to the Congress.

FIRST ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NEW ENGLAND REGIONAL COMMISSION

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 254) to print as a Senate document the First Annual Report of the New England Regional Commission, fiscal year 1967 which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, in line 1, after the word "printed" insert "with illustrations", and in line 4, after the word "section" strike out "509" and insert "510"; so as to make the resolution read:

S. RES. 254

Resolved, That there be printed with illustrations as a Senate document the First Annual Report of the New England Regional Commission, for fiscal years 1967, pursuant to the provisions of section 510, of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-136); and that there be printed for the use of the Committee on Public Works one thousand additional copies of such document.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No.

1040), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

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

Senate Resolution 254 would authorize the printing as a Senate document of the First Annual Report of the New England Regional Commission for fiscal year 1967, pursuant to the provisions of section 510 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-136); and the printing for the use of the Committee on Public Works of 1,000 additional copies of such document.

The amendments, pro forma in nature, adopted by the Committee on Rules and Administration, would (1) provide authority for reproducing certain illustrations in the document, and (2) change an incorrect reference in the statutory citation.

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

Printing-cost estimate

To print as a document (1,500 copies)	$461.28
1,000 additional copies, at $50.97 per thousand	50.97
Total estimated cost, S. Res. 254	512.25

"ELECTION LAW GUIDEBOOK"

The resolution (S. Res. 271) authorizing the printing of a revised edition of the "Election Law Guidebook" as a Senate document was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 271

Resolved, That a revised edition of Senate Document Numbered 91 of the Eighty-ninth Congress, entitled "Election Law Guidebook", be printed as a Senate document and that there be printed one thousand additional copies of such document for the use of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1027), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

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

Senate Resolution 271 would authorize the printing as a Senate document of a revised edition of Senate Document 91 of the 89th Congress, entitled "Election Law Guidebook"; and further would authorize the printing of 1,000 additional copies of such document for the use of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

To print as a document (1,500 copies)	$992.82
1,000 additional copies, at $248.64 per thousand	248.64
Total estimated cost, S. Res. 271	1,241.46

JANE W. BELL

The resolution (S. Res. 272) to pay a gratuity to Jane W. Bell was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 272

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Jane W. Bell, widow of J. Heywood Bell, Junior, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to one year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

ANNE M. CRAIG

The resolution (S. Res. 273) to pay a gratuity to Anne M. Craig was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 273

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Anne M. Craig, widow of Rupert T. Craig, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to three months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LANDS

The bill (H.R. 7325) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange Federal lands for certain lands owned by Mr. Robert S. Latham, Albany, Oreg., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1041), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

This bill, H.R. 7325, which was introduced by Representative Ullman of Oregon, passed the House, October 18, 1967. It authorizes acceptance for the United States by the Secretary of the Interior of a small triangular-shaped piece of land consisting of approximately 2,315 square feet, owned by Mr. Robert S. Latham of Albany, Oreg., in exchange for an adjacent tract of similar shape owned by the Federal Government containing approximately 2,892 square feet.

BACKGROUND

The lands involved are located within the city limits of Albany, Oreg. The privately owned parcel is part of residential property now owned by Mr. Latham while the Federal tract is part of the land used by the Bureau of Mines as a buffer zone to its Albany Metallurgical Research Center. The exchange would permit Mr. Latham to square up his backyard: It would also give the Bureau of Mines somewhat better street frontage and a more adequate buffer zone for the Metallurgical Research Center.

The parcels involved in the exchange are of equal value, and have been privately appraised at $1,275. However, as an additional 90 linear feet of fencing would be needed by the Bureau of Mines to properly fence the newly acquired tract, the cost of this fencing, which is estimated at $500, will be borne by Mr. Latham by payment of this amount. There are no improvements of either tract. Under the terms of proposal, the offer to exchange must be made within 1 year from the date of enactment.

COST

No increase in budgetary requirements is involved in enactment of H.R. 7325.

RECOMMENDATION

Enactment of H.R. 7325 is recommended by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

BILLS PASSED OVER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that Calendar Order No. 1024, H.R. 5785; 1025, H.R. 14367; 1026, Senate Resolution 113; and 1027, S. 2409, be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be passed over.

JACK L. GOOD

The bill (H.R. 11254) for the relief of Jack L. Good was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1064), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to authorize and direct the Commissioner of Patents to accept late payment of the final issue fee in the application for United States letters patent of Jack L. Good, serial No. 381,830, filed July 10, 1964, and allowed July 28, 1966, for a stump pulverzing apparatus, as though no abandonment or lapse had ever occurred, and to authorize the Commissioner to issue the patent if such fee is paid within three months from the date this legislation is enacted.

STATEMENT

Information submitted to the committee in the form of affidavits and additional information indicates that on July 10, 1964, Jack L. Good, of Palestine, Ark., filed a patent application for a stump pulverizing apparatus through his general attorney, F. C. Harrelson, of Forrest City, Ark. Mr. Harrelson, not being a patent attorney and, therefore, unable to represent Mr. Good before the Patent Office, had the application prepared and prosecuted by his patent associates, the law firm of Kimmel & Crowell of Washington, D.C. On July 28, 1966, the Patent Office sent a notice of allowance to Kimmel & Crowell, the attorneys of record, stating that the application had been approved and would be issued upon payment of the final issue fee. The notice of allowance was not sent to Mr. Good because the rules of the Patent Office require that all communications intended for the applicant be sent to the attorney of record and not to the individual applicant.

In accordance with the procedure established by Mr. Harrelson and Kimmel & Crowell for communicating with Mr. Good, the latter firm sent the notice of allowance to Mr. Harrelson on July 29, 1966, for forwarding to Mr. Good. As no response was received to this letter, the Washington firm sent another letter to Mr. Harrelson on September 30, 1966, reminding him that the final fee had to be paid by October 28, 1966, or the application would lapse. Again, Mr. Harrelson did not respond. Therefore, on October 29, 1966, the application lapsed for nonpayment of the final issue fee.

On March 16, 1967, approximately 7½ months after the notice of allowance was sent to Kimmel & Crowell, Mr. Good telephoned the Washington firm to inquire about the status of his application. During this inquiry, he learned for the first time of the events that had transpired. Immediately thereafter, Mr. Good conducted an investigation to determine why Mr. Harrelson had not sent him the notice of allowance. This investigation revealed that in February 1967, the probate court of St. Francis County, Ark., had found Mr. Harrelson of unsound mind and had committed him to the veterans' hos-

pital in North Little Rock, Ark., for treatment. The investigation also disclosed that Mr. Harrelson had apparently not answered any mail, maintained a telephone service, nor transacted any business since the summer of 1966, the time at which he had been sent the notice of allowance.

On April 6, 1967, approximately 8¼ months after the notice of allowance was issued and approximately 3 weeks after Mr. Good first learned that his application had lapsed, he filed a petition to revive the application and tendered the final issue fee. This petition was considered by the Patent Office in view of 35 U.S.C. 151, which provides that an issue fee be paid within 3 months after a notice of allowance is sent, and further provides that—

"If any payment required by this section is not timely made but is submitted with fee for delayed payment within 3 months after the due date and sufficient cause is shown for the late payment, it may be accepted by the Commissioner as though no abandonment or lapse had ever occurred."

In interpreting section 151, the Patent Office held that it authorized the Commissioner of Patents to accept payment of the final issue fee only if it is tendered within 6 months from the date the notice of allowance is sent. Since Mr. Good had not tendered the final issue fee within the time required by section 151, the Patent Office denied the petition on the ground that it lacked statutory authority to grant it.

Mr. Good has advised the committee that his invention has been in public use for more than 1 year. As a result, the issuance of a patent on a new application filed by him is prohibited by section 102(b) of title 35 United States Code, which provides in part that an application for a patent must be filed within 1 year from the date the invention was first used by the public.

As a general rule, the committee is opposed to special legislation providing for private relief from the general patent laws. In this particular case, however, the committee feels that the circumstances justify creating an exception to the time limit established by 35 U.S.C. 151. If this relief is not granted to Mr. Good, he will lose all rights in his invention because of conditions completely beyond his control, a situation that the committee feels would be most inequitable.

For the foregoing reasons, the committee is in agreement with the House of Representatives that H.R. 11254 be favorably considered. Accordingly, the committee recommends the enactment of this legislation without amendment. Enactment of the legislation will entail no cost to the U.S. Government.

The Department of Commerce in its report to the committee on S. 2046, a companion bill to H.R. 11254, states that it has no objection to the enactment of S. 2046.

JACK NAM YEE

The bill (S. 1000) for the relief of Jack Nam Yee was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1000

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jack Nam Yee shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1044), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Jack Nam Yee. The bill provides for an appropriate quota deduction and for the payment of the required visa fee.

DR. ENRIQUE JOSE CATASUS SOTO

The bill (S. 1749) for the relief of Dr. Enrique Jose Catasus Soto was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1749

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Enrique Jose Catasus Soto shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of May 24, 1963.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1045), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

DR. ALFREDO AUCAR

The bill (S. 1960) for the belief of Dr. Alfredo Aucar was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1960

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled. That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Alfredo Aucar shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of October 19, 1962.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1046), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Dr. Alfredo Aucar as of October 19, 1962, thus enabling him to file a petition for naturalization.

DR. HUGO VICENTE CARTAYA

The bill (S. 2250) for the relief of Dr. Hugo Vicente Cartaya was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2250

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Hugo Vicente Cartaya shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of June 28, 1961.

DR. EVELIO FRANCISCO DIAZ

The bill (S. 2311) for the relief of Dr. Evelio Francisco Diaz was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2311

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled. That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Evelio Francisco Diaz shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of August 2, 1962.

DR. HERMAN J. LOHMANN

The bill (S. 2371) for the relief of Dr. Herman J. Lohmann was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2371

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled. That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Herman J. Lohmann shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of July 10, 1957.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1049), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

DR. JULIO P. AMABLE

The bill (S. 2378) for the relief of Dr. Julio P. Amable was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Julio P. Amable shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of June 15, 1961.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1050), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

DR. FRANCISCO J. MENENDEZ

The bill (S. 2383) for the relief of Dr. Francisco J. Menendez was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Francisco J. Menendez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of February 28, 1961.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an except from the report (No. 1051), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2448) for the relief of Dr. Gilberto Hedesa de la Campa was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

DR. CARLOS HERNANDEZ

The bill (S. 2469) for the relief of Dr. Carlos Hernandez was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2469

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Carlos Hernandez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of September 11, 1961.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1053), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Dr. Carlos Hernandez as of September 11, 1961, thus enabling him to file a petition for naturalization.

DR. ANTONIO PINERA

The bill (S. 2491) for the relief of Dr. Antonio Pinera was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Antonio Pinera shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of July 11, 1961.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1054), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Dr. Antonio Pinera as of July 11, 1961, thus enabling him to file a petition for naturalization.

DR. FERNANDO RAFAEL BOUDET-ESTEBAN

The bill (S. 2501) for the relief of Dr. Fernando Rafael Boudet-Esteban was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Fernando Rafael Boudet-Esteban shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of March 23, 1961.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1055), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

DR. MARTINIANO L. ORTA

The bill (S. 2504) for the relief of Dr. Martiniano L. Orta was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Martiniano L. Orta shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of March 25, 1961.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1056), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

DR. EDMEE SERANTES

The bill (S. 2581) for the relief of Dr. Edmee Serantes was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dr. Edmee Serantes shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of December 21, 1961.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, an excerpt from the report (No. 1057), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

D. CHUNG CHICK NAHM

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1069) for the relief of Dr. Chung Chick Nahm which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 6, after the word "of" strike out "August 30, 1954, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available" and insert "September 1, 1954"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Chung Chick Nahm shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of September 1, 1954.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1058), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization. The bill has been amended in accordance with established precedents and to reflect the proper date upon which he first entered the United States.

RENE E. MONTERO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2165) for the relief of Rene E. Montero which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in line 6, after the word "of" strike out "the date of February 13, 1962, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer

to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available" and insert "February 9, 1962"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Rene E. Montero shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of February 9, 1962.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1059), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization. The bill has been amended in accordance with established precedents and to reflect the proper date upon which he was paroled into the United States as a refugee.

DR. JULIO EPIFANIO MORERA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2506) for the relief of Dr. Julio Epifanio Morera which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 6, after the word "of" strike out "December 31, 1961" and insert "December 5, 1961"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Julio Epifanio Morera shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of December 5, 1961.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1060), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization. The purpose of the amendment is to reflect the proper date upon which he was paroled into the United States.

KIM KAP RAI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2585) for the relief of Kim Kap Rai which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, section 204(c), relating to the number of petitions which may be approved in behalf of adopted children, shall be inapplicable in the case of petitions filed in behalf of Kap Rai Kim and Young Nam Kim by the Reverend and Mrs. Elwood John Culp, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That no brothers or sisters of the beneficiaries shall thereafter, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Kap Rai Kim and Young Nam Kim."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1061), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to facilitate the entry into the United States in an immediate relative status of two orphans to be adopted by citizens of the United States, notwithstanding the fact that the prospective adoptive parents have previously had the maximum number of petitions approved. The bill has been amended in accordance with established precedents. In addition, the bill has been amended to add the beneficiary of S. 2586, since both orphans are being adopted by the same parents. A further amendment places the names in proper sequence.

HENG LIONG THUNG AND YVONNE MARIA THUNG

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2720), for the relief of Heng Liong Thung and Yvonne Maria Thung which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, in line 4, after the name "Thung" strike out "and Yvonne Maria Thung have" and insert "has"; and in line 5, after the word "and" strike out the word "were" and insert "was"; so as to make the bill read:

S. 2720

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the periods of time Heng Liong Thung *has* resided and *was* physically present in the United States or any State since September 4, 1962, shall be held and considered as compliance with the residence and physical presence requirement of section 316 of said Act.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Heng Liong Thung."

BILLS PASSED OVER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar Order Nos. 1048, S. 2986; 1049, H.R. 15398; 1050, H.R. 11527; 1051, S. 1975; and 1052, S. 1401, be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be passed over.

TIWA INDIANS OF TEXAS

The bill (H.R. 10599) relating to the Tiwa Indians of Texas was announced as next in order.

TIGUA (TEWA) TRIBE OF PUEBLO INDIANS WHO LIVE AT YSLETA DEL SUR, THE CITY OF EL PASO, TEX., ARE RECOGNIZED AS A TRIBE OF INDIANS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Tigua Indians who now live in the far western part of my State are not so well known as they should be. It is not generally known, for example, that in the year 1682 they established the first permanent settlement in what is today the State of Texas. Few Americans know what a rich contribution the Tiguas and their tribal predecessors have made to our neighboring State of New Mexico, long before statehood.

Since 1682, a group of Tigua Indians have lived at Ysleta, El Paso County, Tex.—now surrounded by the city of El Paso. In the Pueblo revolt of 1680, the Spaniards were driven out of New Mexico and back to El Paso—present, Juarez, Mexico. One group of Indians speaking the Tewa language—Tigua or Tihua is the Spanish spelling—had been Christianized and retreated southward with the Spaniards to the present location at Ysleta.

The Tigua Indians who came with the Spaniards south in 1682 were a Pueblo Indian language group, speaking the Tewa language. They are known locally as the Tigua Indians. The Tiguas at Ysleta—El Paso—Tex., are a displaced branch of the Tewa-speaking Pueblo Indians of central New Mexico.

These Indians have been at this location near El Paso since approximately the year 1682 and did not return to New Mexico when the Spaniards reconquered it about 1691. During the Apache Indian Wars of the 1870's and 1880's, some of the Tiguas of the Ysleta, Tex., Pueblo settlement enlisted as Indian scouts with the American Army, marched with the American Army, fought as scouts, and some lost their lives fighting the hostile Apaches.

A marker in Presidio County, Tex., 10 miles from Valentine, states:

In the vicinity, June 12, 1880, the Apache made their last stand in Presidio County, when 4 Pueblo Indian Scouts of General Benjamin Grierson, USA, fought and defeated 20 Apache warriors. Erected by State of Texas, 1936.

These Pueblo Indians were the Tiguas of Ysleta, El Paso, Tex. Under a Mexican census of 1814, 226 Tiguas lived in Ysleta, Tex. Today there are fewer than 167 Tiguas left, but they still beat their ancient drums, use paint, colored feathered rattles, some ancient articles of clothing, and ancient chants.

Mr. President, these people represent a very distinctive culture in our Nation, and they are the bearers of a noble heritage that has contributed so much to the Southwestern United States. In a monograph published in 1966 by the National Congress of American Indians Fund, Inc., there appeared two exceptionally good articles that relate the history and culture of these proud people. I ask unanimous consent that the article by Tom Diamond, entitled "Jornada del

Muerto: A Story of the Tigua Indians," and the article by J. Walter Fewkes, entitled "The Pueblo Settlements Near El Paso, Tex.," written in 1904, be printed in the RECORD.

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

JORNADO DEL MUERTO: A STORY OF THE TIGUA INDIANS

(By Tom Diamond)

There is a tribe or Pueblo of Indians near the Ysleta Church in El Paso, Texas who refer to themselves and are known locally as the "Tigua Indians". Their story of survival is within parallel in the annals of Indian lore, its telling however, makes some terminological comments of first importance:

Tiwa: A Pueblo Indian language or group of Indian Tribes or pueblos speaking the Tiwa language. The Spanish spelling is Tigua or Tihua.

Piro: A Pueblo Indian language. Piro speaking pueblos were south of the Tiwa speaking pueblos in the Rio Grande valley.

Tompiro: A language dialect of Piro spoken by the Pueblo Indians east of the Rio Grande valley from Gran Quivara in the south to Chilili in the north. The range of this language group was coterminous with a 17th Century geographical area of New Mexico known as Salinas Province.

Isleta Socorro, Senecu: Refer exclusively to the corresponding communities in New Mexico. In New Mexico, Isleta is spelled with an "I".

Ysleta del Sur, Socorro del Sur, Senecu del Sur: Refer exclusively to the communities of Ysleta, Socorro and Senecu located in or near El Paso, Texas. Ysleta is now within the city limits of El Paso, Texas. Socorro is a small farming community located southeast of El Paso and Senecu is located on the outskirts of Juarez in the Mexican State of Chihuahua. In Texas, Ysleta is spelled with a "Y", and "del Sur" means of the South.

Cauique: The chief of the Tiguas. Originally the spiritual leader or native Priest of Tiwa speaking pueblos. The title originated with the Spanish who borrowed it from the Arawak Indians of the West Indies.

The Tiguas are a displaced branch of the Tiwa speaking Pueblo Indians of central New Mexico. Tiwa Pueblos are located in the Rio Grande valley from Taos on the north to Isleta, New Mexico on the south. The Tiwa Pueblo Indians are believed to have migrated from the Wetherill Mesa country of southern Colorado, an area famous for its Indian artifacts and ruins including the famous cliff dwelling of Wetherill Mesa. The Indians who originally resided there are referred to as the Anasazi by the modern day Navajos. Archeologists date their initial occupation of the Wetherill Mesa at approximately 200 A.D. and the Indians that inhabited the area at the time were referred to as Basket Makers because of their weaving skills. These Indians enjoyed rapid cultural advancement and current excavations indicate an extreme preoccupation with religion, typified by extensive construction of Kivas. Sometime between 1100 and 1200 A.D. these Indians moved from the Mesa tops to the famous Cliff Dwelling which were occupied until late in the 13th Century when a prolonged drought probably forced their abandonment and migration of the Indians to the Pueblos of central New Mexico and Arizona. The tools and construction techniques of the Anasazi Indians are strikingly similar to those of the modern day Pueblo Indians of New Mexico.

While there were various other Pueblo groups of Indians located in the New Mexico area, the Tiwa speaking group occupies essentially today the same area they occupied when the Spaniards first visited central New Mexico. Other speaking groups such as the Piro and the Tomiro Indians have ceased to exist entirely. The Tiwa's strong, ingrained spirit of survival and retention of ancient culture could not be better illustrated than by the Tiguas, who still exist today as an intact group of Indians with many families of pure Indian strain living in a small community in the City of El Paso.

The mature adult member of the Tigua Pueblo speaks little or no English and though their general spirit and disposition, cling almost fanatically to their Tiwa culture. This, in spite of their almost complete withdrawals from modern day civilization and its comforts. Each year they faithfully perform their Indian ritual dancing in the front of the Ysleta Mission Church which their forebears constructed, as wards of the early day Padres, almost 300 years ago. They still maintain the tribal civil organization given to them by the early Spanish explorers and the missionaries and their dancing. Indian chants, and the few words of the Tiwa language that they still retain have been verified as authentic by Mr. Andy Abieta, the Governor of the Isleta Pueblo in New Mexico.

The story of how these courageous people came to be in El Paso starts with the intrusion of Spanish explorers into central New Mexico. The first of these was Cabese de Vaca who, in the 1530's traveled vast areas of the southwest including portions of New Mexico and returned to Old Mexico with magnificent tales of wealth and the fabeled city of Cibola (legendary seven Cities of Gold). The next visitor was Coronado, who traveled through central New Mexico in the 1540's and crossed the Rio Grande at or near the present day site of the Isleta Pueblo. The third Spanish thrust occurred when Frey Agustin Rodriquez, with two other Franciscan Fathers and a handful of Spanish soldiers and Indian servants left San Bartholomae in Old Mexico June 5, 1551. The Rodriguez party followed the Rio Conchos in Old Mexico north of the present day Rio Grande and then along the Rio Grande to the Pass of the North, where the modern day City of El Paso, Texas, and Juarez, Chih, are located. The party then moved northward along the Rio Grande River into the central New Mexico area as far as the Province of the Tiwa Indians where the Friars elected to remain and began their task of converting the local Indian population. The soldiers returned to San Bartholomae and all record of the Friars disappeared except for evidence of their violent death at the hands of the Indians they had come to convert.

Next, Padre Bernadino Beltran, with 14 soldiers and Indian servants and 115 horses departed from San Bartholomae again to spread Spanish influence to the north and search for a trace of the missing Friars. This party followed the Rodriguez trail as far as the Tiwa Indian Pueblo of Puara, near the site of the modern day New Mexico community of Bernalillo, where they verified to their satisfaction that the Friars had indeed been murdered. Before returning to Old Mexico, they claimed to have visited 74 Pueblos with a population of 253,000 Indians, a figure that may be excessive. They also brought back with them more tales and rumors of Cibola, the mythical City that spurred most of the Spanish exploration on the new frontier.

On January 26, 1598, the first Spanish expedition with serious intent to colonize left Mexico headed by Don Juan de Onate. Accompanying him were 130 soldiers who were also colonists, their families, a large contingent of Indian servants and a band of Friars. This group was accompanied by 83 wagons and several thousand head of cattle. They reached the Rio Grande River at or near the present day town of San Elizario, Texas, on the 20th day of April, 1598. Ten days later on the 30th, Onate took official possession of New Mexico. Proceeding westward on the south bank of the Rio Grande, he crossed the river at "El Paso del Norte", a name bestowed by him on what is now the city of Juarez. The name, of course, survives today in the American city of El Paso, Texas.

Onate crossed the river and proceeded through the Pass of the North and with the river, bent northward, traveling from pueblo to pueblo and in a bloodless conquest, brought civil organization to the tribes. The name of the civil office holders he created such a Cacique, Alguacil, Capitan and Major Domo are the very names of the office holders of the Tiguas at this time. Strangely enough, the Pueblos of central New Mexico for many of their office holders, no longer use these ancient Spanish titles but instead use names common to office holders in the United States; such as Governor, Lt. Governor, Sheriff and so on. The Onate expedition besides bringing Christianity and civil organization and colonists, also established lines of communication and trade between New Mexico and Old Mexico.

Following the Onate expedition, a Mission important later on to our story was established by Padre Garcia de Zuniga, accompanied by Frey Juan de Salazar and 10 families of Christian Indians who opened a church mission for the Mansos Indians. The Church was dedicated to the most Holy Virgin of Guadalupe on December 8, 1659 and is a present day site of the vigorous Mexican metropolis of Juarez. The foundation and corner stone of the Church were layed on April 2, 1662.

The Isleta Pueblo in New Mexico was named by the Spanish due to its location on a small island in the Rio Grande River formed by the main river channel and a tributary. The main channel filled with alluvial deposits over the years and the present day pueblo is situated entirely on the west bend of the Rio Grande and the main channel now passes east of the Pueblo. In 1670 and 1680 it became a place of refuge for scattered groups of Piro and Tompiro speaking Pueblo Indians fleeing from increasing inroads from the fierce, warlike Comanche and Apache tribes east of the Manzano Mountains. There is evidence that refugees from the Mission Churches at Gran Quivera, Quari and Abo in the Salinas Province came to Isleta. However, the Tuva culture continued to predominate and all trace of these Tompiro speaking Indians has vanished.

There is not much written historical evidence of the civil affairs of the Isleta Pueblo between 1613 and 1680. In 1680, the first substantial repulse of the Spaniards in the New World occurred when an Indian Cacique named Pope, who had been ill-treated by the Spaniards in their attempt to reduce the influence of the Indian Priests and their political powers successfully organized a Revolt against the Spaniards from his stronghold in the Taos Pueblo. The Revolt spread southward and the Spanish officials and colonists along with the Catholic Missionaries were forced to retreat in a blood path that claimed more than 400 victims, including 21 missionaries and 73 men capable of bearing arms. The Spaniards quickly fell back with the Governor of New Mexico, Otermin, to the Isleta Pueblo and then further southward to a camp called La Salenita, which may have been in the vicinity of the present day town of Canutillo, Texas, where a camp was established while the refugees cared for their wounds and considered returning to the North to recapture their lost holdings. Accompanying the Spaniards southward were several groups of Indians including a few Tiwas. Whether these Indians came as refugees or as bearers of burden is not certain. In any event, it is known that most of the Indian population at Isleta Pueblo remained when the Spaniards left and enjoyed a brief period of freedom.

The Isleta Pueblo as a whole, did not join in the great Indian Revolt and some attri-

bute this to evidence that the Isleta Pueblo Indians were loyal to the Cross and Spain. It is equally plausable that being the southern most Tiwa Pueblo and the natural gathering point for all of the refugees from the North, that the Spaniards were in such strength that the Indians were not so foolhardy as to resist them.

When the survivors arrived at La Salenita, there were already three Pueblo Missions in the vicinity of El Paso; the Mansos at the San Francisco, (near present day Fabens, Texas); and Sumas and Humanas at the Mission of La Soledad (seventy leagues southeast of Guadalupe). The Humanas had probably come from the Pueblo and ment operated by the National Park Service. These Indians had earlier fled from the Apache and Commanche depredations in the Salinas Province with some coming South to El Paso and others, as previously mentioned, to the Isleta Pueblo.

Gov. Otermin finally decided to abandon any attempt at reconquest in 1680 and proceeded south to the safety of the Mission of Guadalupe at Juarez. Once there, three camps for the Indians accompanying the retreating Spaniards were established. The Sacramento Camp was established with the first Priest being Father Alvaro de Zavalata. This camp was located at or near the present Mission Church at Ysleta, Texas and the first Church was constructed of logs. A second camp called St. Pedro de Alcantarra was established and the first Priest was Frey Antonio Guerra. This camp was probably located south of the present day town of Socorro, Texas and later moved to Socorro. A third camp Seneca del Sur was established near Socorro. At this time, a very interesting entry was made in the records and archives of the present day Ysleta Mission Church to the effect that in addition to the camps established by the Spaniards, "a few Tihua (Tiwa) try to found Ysleta del Sur in a nearby place". A nearby place referring to a place near Sacramento Camp.

In 1681, Otermin determined to recapture the lost territories, mounted an expedition northward and successfully surprised the Isleta Pueblo under the cover of darkness and captured substantially all of its inhabitants, numbering possibly as many as 500. The Spaniards moved northward but were repulsed by the other Pueblos and once again fell back towards El Paso. As many as 100 of the Isleta Pueblo Indians captured by the Spaniards escaped on the journey southward and with a few others who had evaded capture at the time of the Spanish raid, possibly took refuge with the Hopi Indians of Arizona, with whom the Tiwa speaking Pueblos had always maintained friendly contact. The majority of the Isleta Pueblo Indians accompanied the Spanish southward and no doubt, many perished crossing the dread Jounada del Muerto, a trackless waste of 60 miles, void of water and shelter.

Upon the return of the expedition to the Pass of the North, an interesting note appears in the archives of the Ysleta Church mission in February, 1682, to the affect that "305 Tihua Indians coming from Isleta, New Mexico failed to stay in Ysleta del sur the camp the Tihuas themselves had tried to found. In 1683, another notation in these records is worthy of note, to the effect that "the Tihua Indians joined the Camp of Sacramento and it is now called Sacramento de los Tihuas de Ysleta, with Sacramento and San Antonio as Patron Saint". This entry undoubtedly referred to the Sacramento Camp, established by the Spaniards. It is interesting to note that the Spanish records at this time do not refer to Ysleta as Ysleta del Sur and that it may have been the Indians themselves who gave this name to their new location, which is the name they are today genetically and historically known by.

In 1684, the records of the Ysleta Church indicate that Gov. Cruzle organized the *new* (emphasis added) pueblos of Sacramento de los Tihuas del Ysleta and St. Pedro de Alcantarra de los Piros de Socorro. This same year, the Mansos Indians in Juarez revolted and the Ysleta and Socorro Pueblos were, along with other settlements, closer to the control of the military garrison in Juarez following a series of abortive Indian Revolts.

These church archives further record that in 1691 Governor Diego de las Vargas, in the name of King Carlos II gave Friar Joaquin de Hinojosa official responsibility for the Missions with the new name of "Mission of Corpus Christi de los Tehuas de Ysleta" and "Mission de Nuestra Senora de Limpia Concepcion de los Piros de Socorro" and that the construction of new Churches was authorized.

There are two other notations of note in these records, pertaining to the Ysleta del Sur Pueblo, indicating that in 1749, the new Church of Ysleta was constructed, the walls of which are incorporated in the presently existing Church and that in 1760 Bishop Tamaron from Durango visited the Pueblo and noted that the inhabitants consisted of "425 Tihuas and 135 Spanish".

Meanwhile, back at the Isleta, New Mexico Pueblo, there is evidence that the pueblo remained vacant for a time after 1681. The Pueblo was reoccupied sometime between 1709 and 1719, at which time Tiwa speaking Indians repopulated the pueblo, perhaps returning from the Hopi country along with Hopi Indians, with whom they had intermarried and possibly by Tiwas moving from neighboring Tiwa Pueblos, either forced by drouth or religious differences.

There is still today in Isleta, New Mexico evidence in the names of outlying communities of the presence for a time of Hopi Indians, although their culture has, either disappeared or they themselves returned to their homelands. In any event, a Tiwa Pueblo was re-established over the years.

In 1863, the Isleta Pueblo at New Mexico, after making claim with the United States Government, based on a Spanish Land Grant, was recognized as an Indian tribe and given a reservation. The Spanish Grant was made some 31 years prior to the claiming of New Mexico as a Colony of Spain, and set forth a grant to each pueblo of 4 leagues, measured 1 league in each cardinal direction from the door of the pueblo Church.

President Lincoln sent to the Isleta Pueblo, as a symbol of sovereignty authority over their reservation, a silver headed cane. The sovereignty of the modern day inhabitants of the Isleta Pueblo, New Mexico and those of the other pueblos of central New Mexico is unique in that they have never formally signed a peace treaty with the Federal Government but have handled their affairs through contracts and Congressional Acts.

The distinction here is more technical than practical but does have a bearing on the present day inhabitants of Ysleta del Sur, who have never signed a peace treaty nor entered into any contractual relations with any governmental agency other than one or two Indians having attended Indian School. The Isleta Pueblo in New Mexico is a comparatively prosperous community with 2,600 souls, a poverty program, a Federally sponsored water and sanitation system and their reservation now contains 209,880.33 acres.

But what happened to the Ysleta del Sur pueblo in El Paso all those many years after the visit of Bishop Cameron? Precious little is known of their activities other than that they did stay around the Ysleta Church Mission. On September 21, 1880, two Tiguas from Ysleta, Texas were discharged from the United States Army, having served with Lt. Hellill's detachment of Pueblo Indian Scouts 10th Cavalry and their conduct was reported as good. Grandchildren of these two Indians state that their grandfather recounted that they had scouted for the Army in an attempt to capture the fierce Apache Chieftain, Victorio. An old Sharp's rifle carried by one of these Indians is still in the possession * * * met and defeated a band of 20 Apaches under Victorio on the 12th and 13th of June, 1880 at Sierra Vieja Pass in Presidio County, Texas. For a brief moment in 1936, the Tiguas received nationwide publicity when their Cacique, in ceremonies at the Dallas Cotton Bowl during the Texas Centennial Celebration named Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, as honorary Cacique of the Tigua Indian Nation.

The tribal organization today consists of the Cacique, Jose Granillo; the Assistant Cacique, Salvador Granillo the Capitan Major, Trinidad Granillo, also known as the Capitan de Guerro; and Capitans Antonio Silver, Rudolpho Silvas; the Alguacil or Sheriff, Santiago Bustamente; and Major Domos, Johnny Hiza and Rudolpho Silvas.

It is interesting to note that a branch of the El Paso Tiguas is a thriving community in Las Cruces, New Mexico, having journeyed there sometime around 1900, according to the El Paso Indians, in search of work as farm laborers. The community numbering some 40 Tigue families and a like number of Mansos still holds it's religious celebrations and performs Indian dances. These Indians live in the small community of Tortugas on the southern outskirts of Las Cruces.

A Catholic Church is located upon lands with title held in the name of a religious corporation established by the Indians and there has been difficulty between the Indians and the church in recent years involving the continuation of Indian rites in front of the church. This group of Indians retains some knowledge of the Tiwa language and significant culture including ritual dancing and, once again, they are fiercely proud of their Indian ancestry. Present day inhabitants of Tortugas recall some of their parents and grandparents attending Indian schools in the 20's and 30's and recall visits by Indians from Ysleta, who walked the 50 miles along the Rio Grande from Ysleta to Tortugas to visit with some of their old friends and cronies. These visits are also remembered by the decendants of the visiting Indians from Ysleta del Sur.

The establishment of this colony of Tiwa Indians in Tortugas could not have been many years prior to 1900, as the residents of Tortugas have no recollection of any church attended by the group prior to the 20th Century and considering the strong religious inclination of these people and the fact there is no old Church located in or near the Las Cruces area with any Indian history, it is doubtful they migrated there long before 1900. One member of the Ysleta Pueblo in El Paso recalls his grandfather starting the move was made in 1906. At the present time in Ysleta, Texas, there are some 20 families of pure Indian strain. These families contain approximately 150 people and there are 500 additional inhabitants of the Ysleta area of varying degrees of Indian-Mexican mixture. Every year they religiously observe their Indian ceremonials and they still retain their Patron, St. Anthony, which was the Saint originally given to them as their Patron by the Spaniards in Isleta, New Mexico in the year 1613.

Governor Andy Abieta of the Isleta Pueblo visited El Paso on the 13th and 14th days of November, 1965 and went to several of the legal rights of this tribe, which must be the only group of Indians in the United States of America who have never received assistance of any kind from any Governmental Agency. Governor Abieta, incidentally, is the same Indian Governor who earlier in 1965, forceably ejected a handcuffed Priest from the Isleta Mission Church because he had planted cactus in the courtyard patio of the Church so as to prevent the Indians holding their ritual dances there.

At the home of Miguel Pedrazza, located on Old Pueblo Road, a very interesting event

occurred. The Governor asked Mr. Pedrazza if he knew any Indian words, any Indian chants or the dances. Mr. Pedrazza said no, that he had forgotten them all but that his grandfather had been a Pueblo Indian Scout and spoke the Tiwa language fluently. Mr. Pedrazza went into a back room and returned with an ancient drum with a beautiful Indian painting on its face, representing the moon with human features superimposed. Governor Abieta identified the drum as a typical Tiwa drum but stated that the present day Isleta, New Mexico Indians do not paint their drums. Upon first being handed the drum, the Governor shook it and there was a rattling noise, as if several small objects were being tumbled about. Mr. Pedrazza smiled and told the Governor, "they are still in there". Later, the Governor said that this was in reference to objects of a religious nature which he could not further discuss.

The Governor placed the drum between his knees and began to beat and sing an Indian chant. Mr. Pedrazza leaned forward intently and finally began to join the Governor in his chant. Next, Mr. Pedrazza stood up along with Mrs. Silvas and the two of them performed a Tiwa ritual dance. Governor Abieta identified the dancing as being identical to those performed by the Tiwa Indians in Isleta, New Mexico.

Mr. Pedrazza and Mrs. Silvas, then, upon urging by the Governor, spoke a few words of Tiwa, which they recalled from their childhood days as being phrases they knew as being from the Tiwa language. Mr. Pedrazza then brought forth one of the discharge papers being that of his grandfather previously discussed. Upon leaving the Pedrazza house later on, the front yard, Mr. Pedrazza told Governor Abieta how happy he had been because of his visit. He then stated: "I don't tell many people I'm an Indian because they only laugh". Governor Abieta then embraced Mr. Pedrazza and with arms about each other and tears beginning to run down their cheeks, Governor Abieta said: "You were born an Indian and you will die an Indian". Later that same day, we visited with other Indian families in the same area. In one household we found 10 people living in a single room with no utilities other than a butane cooking stove and by the light of a kerosene lantern, examined another discharge document of a Tigua Indian who had served with Mr. Pedrazza's grandfather in the 10th Cavalry.

Later the same day, we visited the home of Pueblo Carbajal and Governor Abieta talked with Mr. Carbajal's grandmother, Sra. Marguerita Pedrazza who is 93 years of age. Mrs. Pedrazza, although blind, has an extremely sharp memory and is quite alert. She recalled that her uncle, Agripito Granillo had married a Tiwa Indian woman from Isleta, New Mexico pueblo by the family name of Chihoho. Governor Abieta was acquainted with the family which still resides in Isleta, New Mexico and this suggests that there has been some communication between the Isleta, New Mexico pueblo and the pueblo of Ysleta, Texas. The Tiguas today, however, have little recollection of their origin and a common myth among them is they originated at the Hueco Tanks area in El Paso County, Texas. They tell a story that one day a brave, while out hunting, discovered the Rio Grande River and that the Pueblo was then moved to its present day site in Ysleta, to be near the river. Perhaps Hueco Tanks was a "nearby place" mentioned in archives of the Ysleta Mission Church. More likely, the myth originated from the fact that a group of Tigua Indians were taken to Hueco Tanks some years ago to perform a ritual dance. While there, they observed the Indian pictographs found in the Hueco Tanks caves and possibly misinterpreted these signs of Indian life as evidence of their origin.

On a recent visit to the Tortugas community in New Mexico with a group of El Paso Tiguas, a member of the Tortugas group recounted a story told by his elders that the Tortugas had arrived in Las Cruces after crossing the Oregon Mountains from White Sands, and that this group had been part of a larger group which was lost in the White Sands area and out of water. The legend went on to say that the Indians at White Sands had divided into two groups, that a second group went south and located in El Paso. One of the Tiguas with us readily accepted the story and concurred in its authenticity. This legend seems highly unlikely, as all of the travel in the Rio Grande valley by the Spaniards and Indians followed the River with the exception of the section known as Jornada del Muerto, where narrow and precipitous river gorges forced travel across parched and burned wastes.

The present day Tigua Indians live, for the most part, in circumstances that can only be described as conditions of most dire poverty. Many of the Indians are facing tax foreclosures on their small adobe homes. Only a few enjoyed the luxury of modern utilities. The cacique, Jose Granillo, shares a small one room adobe building with his brother, Salvador Granillo. Each brother has an old double bed draped with what must be the oriental linens. Between the beds is an ornate homemade shrine that they have built over the years. The walls are covered with religious pictures and few photographs of them and their family. In one corner, there is a small, wood burning stove upon which they cook and heat their home. On one wall are hung rolls of paper sacks filled with herbs with which they treat their ills. Cacique Jose Granillo states that he has only visited a doctor once in his 67 years, and then, when he was a young man. Few of the adult members of the tribe over 50 years of age have ever voted or held a social security card. Their principal sources of living is from picking cotton two months of the year and most have had no formal education. Almost invariably, the younger member of the tribe are dropouts.

The patriotism of these people is well demonstrated by the home of Pablo Silvas, who is one of the tribe's officers, where the American flag is displayed 365 days a year; again, evidence of the deeply ingrained loyalty of the Tiguas.

The Tiguas have never made a formal application to the Government of the United States for recognition, and for 300 years, they have lived in El Paso and no one has thought to act on their behalf, with the exception of an inquiry by the Mayor of El Paso in the year 1961, which was rejected by the Indian Bureau on the basis that the fare. It would appear today that only recourse these Indians have for reparation is to entreat with the President and Congress to recognize their entitlement to the same basic rights as all other Indians.

Were it not for an expansion of the City of El Paso on March 15, 1955, when the Ysleta area was annexed to the City of El Paso, it is doubtful that the Tiguas would be making a claim at this time and would probably be continuing their proud and independent ways. The annexation, however, raised the taxes on their small homesites from $6.00 to $10.00 per year to over $100.00. With family incomes averaging less than $1,000.00 per year, the additional tax burden had been too much to bear.

While the Tiguas survived the Jornada del Muerto and 300 years of struggle to survive in what is to them in many respects, an alien community, their will is fast fading and their culture is in danger of disappearing with that of their Piro and Tompiro neighbors.

CRECITE AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

(By Tom Diamond, in lieu of footnotes to his foregoing paper)

(NOTE.—Page numbers refer to original paper, not to place in RECORD.)

(Page 3) Terminological comments, courtesy of Douglas H. Scovill, Archeologist, U.S. Dept. of the Interior, National Park Services, Gran Quivira Nat. Monument, Route 1, Mountainair, N.M. 87036.

(Pp. 3, 4) Origin of Tigua Indians, suggested by Douglas Osborne, Ph. D., "Solving the Riddles of Wetherill Mesa," National Geographic Magazine, Vol. 125, No. 2, Fed. 1964.

(Page 4) The account of the early Spanish exploration of central New Mexico is based largely on Eugene O. Porter's "The Spanish Occupation of West Texas and New Mexico," in Password, quarterly of the El Paso County Historical Society, Vol. X, No. 3, Fall 1965, p. 79.

(Page 6) Discussion of Ysleta Pueblo, from Handbook of American Indians of North America, Bureau of American Ethnology.

(Page 6) Origin of Humanas Indians, from pamphlet "Gran Quivira National Monument" by U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1963.

(Pp. 6, 7) First church; first, second and third camps, etc., from "Short History of Ysleta Mission Founded in 1680" by Gerardo Decorme, S.J. Published by Our Lady of Mt. Carmel Parish, Ysleta, Texas. No date.

(Pp. 6, 7) History of the Isleta Pueblo, as compiled by the Isleta Pueblo Tribe, Isleta, New Mexico (Unpublished).

(Page 8) Original documents in the possession of Tigua Indian descendants of the Scouts.

(Page 8) Legend on marker located in Sierra Vieja Pass on the Clay Miller Ranch in Presidio County, 10 miles from Valentine, Texas.

"In the vicinity, June 12, 1880, the Apache made their last stand in Presidio County, when 4 Pueblo Indian Scouts of General Benjamine Grierson, USA, fought and defeated 20 Apache warriors. Erected by State of Texas, 1936.

General Grierson commanded the 10th U.S.A. Cavalry, which was composed of Negro troops. The following is an account of the battle as told to Antonio Granillo Silvas by his grandfather, one of the four Tiguas participating.

"Tigua Indian's important event. When the Tigua Indians were at Ysleta, New Mexico, for certain reasons decided to come to Ysleta, Texas. Reasons such as because Victorio, Chief of the Apache at that time wanted the Tigua Tribe to join together with them, but Tigua Indians did not like the idea because they were different in ways. First because Tigua Indians were Catholic and the Apache did not believe in that. So, Tigua Indians came to Ysleta, Texas and reunion with Spaniards, they started to build Temples. Temples that are very well known to our history. Three of them are Socorro Mission at Socorro, Texas; San Elizario Mission at San Elizario, Texas and Nuestra Senora Del Carmen at Ysleta, Texas.

"After being here, they were molested by the Apache Tribe. They were obligated to fight with them at "Sierro Waco" but Tigua Indians ran the Apache off the Waco Territory. Then, Victorio sent word to the Tigua Indians, that he wanted to fight with them, because he believed the Tigua Indians to be very brave. He wanted to fight with them on clean territory. So then Tigua Indians sent notice to the government, because they did not have rifles and ammunition. The government then sent them rifles, ammunition and all necessaries. The government also sent colored soldiers for help to the Tigua Indians.

"So the Tigua Indians sent word to Victorio that they were ready for war. So on the 12th of June, at late evening, they arrived at Sierra de la Vieja. Victorio was also ready at Sierra de la Vieja.

"So on the 13th of June, as soon as daylight was seen, they started to fight. At those same hours, men of the Tigua Indians had to go back for more ammunitions. At those

same hours, only one Tigua Indian was killed. So by the time the men that had gone to get ammunition returned the war was over. It ended at around 12:00 that same morning. So Victorio lost this war. When Tigua Indians and soldiers went to the top of Sierra de la Vieja, Victorio was gone. Then only found branches of stuffed grass, used for their wounds. Victorio went to Mexico. It is known that Victorio did not let his people down. He showed them to have courage. Victorio mounted a White horse and he wore a red band around his chest to his waist. Victorio had white complexion and blue eyes. Victorio never returned. He died at a place named "Tres Castillos" at Mexico. This is one of the most important events to the Tigua Indians."

(Page 8) Contemporary newspaper accounts described Tigua Indian award to President Franklin D. Roosevelt as Honorary Cacique, 1936.

(Page 8) Personal recollection of Pablo Silvas, regarding Las Cruces colony of Tiguas.

THE PUEBLO SETTLEMENTS NEAR EL PASO, TEX.

(By J. Walter Fewkes, 1903)

On a map of the "reino de la Nueva Mexico," made by Father Menchero about 1747, five puebloes are figured on the right bank of the Rio Grande, below the site of the present city of El Paso, Texas. One of these, called in the legend, Presidio del Paso, is situated where Juarez, in Chihuahua, now stands, just opposite El Paso. The other four are designated on this map as Mission d Sn Lorenzo, Mision d Cenecu, Mision d la Isleta, and Mision del Socorro. Each is indicated by a picture of a church building with surrounding lines representing irrigation canals, as the legend "riego de las misiones" states. All of these lie on the right bank of the river, or in what is now the state of Chihuahua, Mexico. It is known from historical sources that Indians speaking at least four different dialects, and comprising three distinct stocks, inhabited these five towns. The Mansos lived in El Paso, the Suma in San Lorenzo, the Tiwa in Ysleta, and the Piros in Senecu and Socorro; there were also other Indians—Tano, Tewa, and Jemez—scattered through some of these settlements. All the abovementioned villages had been founded in historic times, or since Onate first founded the Rio Grande at the Pass of the North in 1598. From documentary sources we learn that Tiwa and Piros were colonized in this region at the end of the seventeenth century, having come down the river with Otermin in 1680, and that the Mansos and Suma were settled in pueblos near the ford almost a century before.

During an exploration of certain ruins in central New Mexico in the summer and autumn of 1901, under the auspices of the Bureau of American Ethnology, the author studied the ancient habitations of the Piros Near Socorro, Texas, where the survivors now live, in order to gather any current traditions concerning them that might be found to survive. He had also in mind the forming of an acquaintance with the remnants of the Tiwa whose ancestors lived in New Mexico about the northern boundary of the old Piros range. The present article considers especially the Tiwa of Ysleta and Piros of Senecu and Socorro.

These Indians have practically become "Mexicanized" and survivals of their old pueblo life which still remain, such as their dances before the church, have long lost the meaning which they once had or that which similar dances still have in the pueblo higher up the Rio Grande. The southern Tiwa and Piros are good Poma Catholics, and their old dances are still kept up not from a lingering belief of the Indians in their old religion as is the case with certain pueblos in which Christianity is merely a superficial gloss over aboriginal beliefs, but as survivals which have been worn down into secular customs. They cannot give an intelligible explanation of the meaning of these dances, because they do not know their significance. Interest in them on the part of the ethnologist is purely as folklore, for they represent a stage through which the dances of the Pueblos ultimately go when the complexion of the population changes from Indian to Mexican. Ysleta is an instructive example of a Pueblo Indian settlement which has become a Mexican town, the number of Americans settled there not being large enough to affect materially the population. It is therefore instructive to a pueblo in this stage of transformation.

The notes which serve as the basis of this article were collected on a brief visit to El Paso, in October, 1901. While the author lays no claim to an exhaustive study of the survivors of the Pueblos, he would call attention to a field which offers much to the ethnologist, folklore, and archeologist. The object of the article in a general way, a few facts regarding the Tiwa of Ysleta and the Piros of Senecu. Since the former are more numerous and their customs less changed, he will begin with them.

YSLETA

The pueblo of Ysleta, Texas situated on the left bank of the Rio Grande, about fourteen miles below El Paso, is a small village with a mixed population of the Indians, Mexicans, and Americans. The Indian name of the village is Chiawipia, or practically the same as that of the pueblo of Isleta in New Mexico, a name which the Hopi also give to the latter village, in which, they say, are settled certain Tiwa whose ancestors once lived in their territory. The name "Ysleta" would indicate its site on an island, and the fact that on Menchero's map it is placed on the right bank of the Rio Grande, while its present site is on the left, may be harmonized by supposing that the course of the river has changed since the map was made.

The most striking building in Ysleta is the church, dedicated to Nuestra Senora del Carmen, the beautiful bell-tower of which can be seen for several miles.

Several references to the settlement and early history of Ysleta may be found by consulting the valuable contributions of Bancroft and Bandeliever. The author has taken the liberty of quoting a few lines from the former to account for the existence of Tiwa and Piros colonies in this section. "With the 385 natives", writes Bancroft, "That had crime with Otermin from Isleta, a few who had accompanied the original refugees of 1680, and some who came later, the padres proceeded to found three new mission pueblos in the south. These were Senecu, Socorro, and Isleta."

The author has seen a manuscript copy of a document, dated May 19, 1692, in possession of Father Cordovas, a priest at Ysleta, who claims that the original, now in Mexico, is the earliest existing record of the Church. The following legend found on a photograph by the same priest refers to this manuscript: "This document in the name of the King of Spain gives charge of the church of Corpus Cristi de los Tiguas en el Reimo de la Nueba Mexico de el Distrito de el Paso Canton Bravos, to Fray Joaquin Ynojosa. Years after, the titular saint of the church was changed to St. Anthony, the patron of the Indians, Ysleta being then a Tigua village. Later on a petition was sent to the Bishop to change the second titular saint; this request being granted, the church was dedicated to Nuestra Senora del Carmen."

The oldest portion of the present church building is that in which the altar now stands, the tower and facade being of much later construction. The open space before the church is surrounded by a low adobe wall. This enclosure, in which stands a cross, is called the cemetery, and was formerly a burial place, as its name implies, but it is no longer used for that purpose. Here certain dances—survivals of pagan ceremonies dating back in the history of the pueblo to a time it was practically a Tiwan village—occur after mass of feast days elsewhere mentioned.

The site of the old pueblo adjoins this cemetery, from which it is now separated by a street. The cacique remembers that formerly Indian houses were arranged on that site in rectangular form about a plaza, each building a small one-story habitation made of upright logs chinked and plastered with abode, forming a type of building called by the Meivans *jacal*. There still remain a few houses of this kind in the neighboring hamlet of Socorro that are reputed to be among the oldest in the pueblo. Piarote, the present cacique of Ysleta, lives in an adobe house standing not far from what was once a corner of the former pueblo, and other houses in the neighborhood belong to Indians who likewise have dwellings and traces of land scattered in small directions from the church.

In late years several Tiwa families have moved away from Ysleta to Las Cruces, New Mexico, and other localities along the railroad where they find profitable employment. The governor, Mariano, claims that the town of Tulerosa, near the Mescalero Apache reservation, was setled by Tiwa families from Ysleta, but others deny this. The Ysletenos formerly hunted bison in Pecos valley, and one of the masks used at Christmas in the Baile de Tortuga, elsewhere referred to, is made of bison hide. They were therefore well acquainted with the Mescalero reservation, and the springs there were probably favorite camping places.

Many of the Tiwa have served in the army as scouts against the Apache, and among the names of some twenty men recorded by the writer several have discharge papers setting forth the value of their services; others were killed while in the service of the United States. None of the former receives a pension or rations. They have no resident agent or missionary, and although poor, they are industrious, self-respecting, law-abiding citizens.

In addition to the Tiwa living at Ysleta, there are one or two families in a neighboring hamlet called Zaragosa, across the river in Mexico. About twenty-five persons, whose name are appending, can conduct a conversation in the Tiwa language, and there are as many more who understand the idiom but cannot converse in it.

Men: Jose Tolino Pirote, Tomal Graneo, Tebebucio Oligin, Jose Maria Montoya, Ponciano Olgin, Patricio Perea, Manuel Ortega, Sebastiano Duran, Alvino Aquiar, Cristobal Aquiar, Pasqual Piarote, Maleno Marques, Robel Trujillo, Reyes Trujillo, Crecencio Marques.

Women: Cornelia Colinero, Andrea Piarote, Estefana Montoya, Valentina Ortega, Augustina Olin, Patricia Montoya, Nestora Piarote, Dolores Graneo, Andrea Marques, Juana Duran Graneo.

Social organization

The Tiwa of Ysleta still retain a survival of their tribal organization, which is set forth in two documents drawn up before a notary, Dr. Wahl, a few years ago. These documents, formally signed and sealed, are written in Spanish. The author obtained a copy, a free translation of which follows:

"Pueblo of San Antonio de Ysleta, Texas. January 6, 1895.

"We, the undersigned, comprising natives, have assembled for the purpose of making the following regulations, and complying with those duties which our ancestors observed and which we wish to transmit to our children.

"We solemnly bind ourselves, in the first place, to celebrate in the best manner we are able, the festival of our patron, Saint Anthony.

"In the second place, we bind ourselves to respect the native authorities which we ourselves nominate and elect, and also to submit to such punishment as the same native authorities may impose, without complaint

or appeal to any other authority regarding matters, personal or domestic, pertaining to us, without prejudice to the general laws of the remaining citizens.

"In the third place, we decree that every failure to respect our native authorities shall be punished, for the first offense, with twenty hours' arrest; leaving the punishment, however, to the prudence of the same native authorities, should the same person repeat his offense. That this regulation may have force and authority, all desirous of doing so have freely affixed their signatures."

This first document closed with the signatures of the Indians, all in the same handwriting, and the notary's acknowledgment of the notary, enumerated the duties of the officers. Freely translated it is as follows:

Duties of the Cacique

First Duty: Every year, on New Year's eve, the Cacique Major shall assemble all his people and advise the meeting to nominate native authorities to hold power for the forthcoming year. The same Cacique Major shall give the badges of office in the following order: To the Governor, to the Lieutenant-Governor, to the Alguacil, to the Capitan Major, to the four subordinate Capitans. Indeed all these officials are subject to the Cacique, as likewise all sons of the pueblo of San Antonio, according to the laws and conditions of the tribe. This dependence extends to the Cacique Major to look after his life and the maintenance of his family.

Duties of the governor

This officer, with the badge of his office in his hand as a symbol of administering justice, represents a Justice of the Peace in minor matters, such as civil offenses; he shall punish lack of respect to the sons of the pueblo of San Antonio, and shall give permission for customary dances which are lawfully permitted to the sons of the tribe.

In addition, the Governor is requested to see that fathers of families comply with the sacred duty of teaching the Christian doctrine to their sons, and of celebrating annually the festival of our patron, San Antonio. Lastly, the Governor shall see to it that the sons of the tribe perform, in such manner as may be possible, the marriages and funerals of the natives.

In conformity with the third clause the Governor has not authority to impose punishment exceeding three days in prison.

Lieutenant-governor

The Lieutenant-Governor is clothed with the same power as the Governor when the duties of the Governor devolve on him.

Duties of the Capitan Major and the Subordinate Capitans.

To direct the dances in the public plaza and to preserve order during the dance; also to well regulate everything pertaining to hunts of deer, rabbits, and hares, but always after consultation with, and notification of such diversions to, the Cacique Major, who shall never permit them on Sunday or on those days when they are obliged to hear the holy mass as in the Christian faith universal.

Regarding the dances, it is recognized that they are permitted on the following days only: Christmas, St. Anthony's, St. John's, St. Peter's, St. James', St. Ann's and St. Andrew's (if the days does not fall at the time of the hunt).

Lastly, it is the duty of the Capitan Major, aided by his subordinates, to remove from the pueblo of San Antonio every kind of witchcraft and belief contrary to our Holy Catholic Apostolic and Roman religion. No son of the Pueblo of San Antonio is obligated to accept, for example, if so commanded, any sorcery or false belief. It is the duty of all who follow the regulations of the sons of the Pueblo of San Antonio to sign this enactment. On the other hand, those who do not wish to sign it, by the same wish do not regard themselves as sons of San Antonio."

This second document is signed by the same persons as the former, and may be regarded as a constitution of the Tiwa of Ysleta. It embodies certain aboriginal customs, but it is practically of modern character and origin.

The present Indian Officers of Ysleta are as follows:

Title, Native Title, and Spanish Name:

Cacique: Aikamede, Jose Tolino Piarote;

Governor: Tuwatabode, Mariano Manero;

Lieutenant-Governor: (no native title given) Felipe Cruz;

War Capitain: Wilawekamede, Tomal Graneo;

Subordinate Captain: (no native title given) Blas Gominero, Blas Graneo, Cristobal Aquiar, and Aniseto Graneo.

Insignia of Office

Each of the chief officials above mentioned has a baton, or staff of office, known as a kikawee, which is help in such high esteem that the cacique spoke of his as "mother," which reminds one of the reverance paid by the Hopi to their so-called *tipni*. The author has examined the staffs of the cacique, governor, and lieutenant-governor, finding them to be similar; and he has been told that those of the remaining officers have the same general form. They are all said to be old, and to have been in possession of the tribe from the time the pueblo was settled; but such assertion is hardly borne out by close examination.

The cacique's staff of office consists of a baton the length of the forearm and diameter of an ordinary walking-cane. It is made of black wood, and is provided with a silver cross set in the head and two metal tips, one inside the other. There is a silver cross set in the head, and midway of its length is a hole in which a thong is tied by which it may extended. The governor's baton is like that of the cacique, except that is made of chestnut-colored wood. The lieutenant-governor's baton is black: it was broken but has been mended with sinew. These badges, as referred to in the documents setting forth the duties of the officers, are insignia of rank and are used as symbols in elections, dances, and races.

Dances

The most interesting survivals of the old cermonies of the Tiwa of Ysleta are the dances which are performed in front of the church at the celebration of the festival of their patron, St. Anthony, at Christmas, and on the days of St. John, St. Andrew, St. Peter, and St. James, as mentioned in the document above given. These dances differ but little from the secular dances, or *bailes*, which occur in winter and at other times.

Shiafura, the Rattle Dance

This dance, which occurs after mass in the festival of the patron saint, is one of the most important of their ceremonies. It consists of two parts—the first with two male and two female participants, the other with many men who carry rattles from which it takes its Tiwa name.

These dances are first performed in the old cemetery before the church, after which the dancers visit in turn the houses of the majordomo, Manuel Otero, George Piarote, and Patricio Perea. It closes with a feat at the house of the majorodme, after which all return to the church.

Newafura, the Mask Dance

The dance in which two men are masked is celebrated on Christmas afternoon and is sometimes called *Baile de Tortuge* from the turtle shell rattle employed. A drum is used in this dance, and the men carry gourd-rattles in their hands. The dance is first performed before the church, and then in the houses of the cacique, governor, lieutenant-governor, sheriff (capitan de guerra), and other officers, on the three following days. It is danced on the fourth day by children, who imitate their elders. The two participants wear masks, and one of them represents a male, the other a female personage. The mask of the latter is made of buffalo-skin and is painted red and yellow. These men are called *abuelos* (Spanish, "grandfathers," "ancestors", and they function as clowns, frightening little children. A little girl, to whom the author showed the mask, called it a *coco*, a Spanish term for "boggy".

Poafura, the Red Pigment Dance

This dance, which occurs on the festival of St. John, was thus described to the author by the "cacique." Twelve women, forming two lines, stand facing each other, and between them passed another, singing "Ha-wi-na-a-e!" In this festival, food and other stuffs are thrown to the spectators. One of the women wears two feathers in her hair. The dance lasts one day and is called Baile de la Flecha. The same song, "Ha-wi-na-a-e"—is sung in the Hopi harvest festival, when food and other objects are also thrown to spectators.

Kufura, the Scalp Dance

In this old war dance, which is no longer celebrated, both men and women formed a ring around one of their number—a woman who held aloft a scalp tied to a stick. A warrior beside her, and at the close of the dance ran to the river and plunged his head under the water four times.

Fura-shuite

This dance occurs during the time of the carnival, and in it the participants are divided into two parties, each having a drum. It takes place in the houses of the cacique and other Indians.

Nakupura, the House Dance

While the author was at Ysleta, several secular dances were performed by the Indians in one or another of their houses. These dances were characteristically aboriginal and closely resembled those celebrated on festival days before the church. Permission for them is obtained from the governor, who in fact, gave one of those witnessed by the author in his own house. The dance began about 9 o'clock, but for some time before that hour a young man sat at the entrance to the house, violently beating a drum made of an earthen jar, and singing a song with monosyllabic words. Later this youth went inside, where he was joined by other singers, forming a chorus. Several of his companions clapped their hands in time with the songs as in certain characteristic Spanish dances.

There were two distinct figures, or rather two kinds of dances practically differing in the number of participants. In the first kind, two persons, a man and a woman, took positions facing each other on opposite sides of the room. These began the dance by beating time with their feet, at the same time almost imperceptible swaying their bodies to the beat of the drum. As the druming continued, the two dancers approached each other, and the man put first one hand, then the other, on the woman's shoulder, at the same time one hand, dancing with a sort of shuffle, like that of the Bison dance at Hano. Spectators and those not taking part in this dance were seated about the room.

Several men and as many women participated in the second figure of the dance. Two lines, one of men, the other of women, faced each other and opened the dance with slight movements of their bodies. Both lines then turned faced the dancer, and marched around the room to the opposite side, as in the well-known "Virginia Reel". The step, song, and drum accompaniment recall the solemn religious *Katcina* dance of the Pueblo, but unlike them, is secular and accompanied with meriment.

Foot-race (Kivehwewehim)

The Ysletenos have a foot-race strictly comparable with that of their northern

kindred. It occurs at midday, on Palm Sunday, and in it the contestants divide into two groups of about half a dozen men each, distinguished by facial painting. The course is from the house of the cacique, past the church, and along the main street. The cacique stands at the place of starting, holding a bow and arrow, and calls out three times. First he shouts, "We-va!" When all get ready; the second signal is "We-cho!" when he shoots the arrow in the direction of the course and the runners start.

In awarding the prized, the cacique received the first prize and the winners the second; but other participants are also rewarded. The object of the race, they say is for rain, and the shooting of the arrow a symbolic act to aid the runners as well as to indicate the course.

Rabbit-Hunt (Shaiaito)

Both the Tiwa of Ysleta and the Piros at Senecu still have rabbit-hunts in which aboriginal elements survive. The war-chief is leader of the hunts, but permission for them is always asked of the cacique or the governor. The hunters having assembled in the field, a fire is first built and a section of country surrounded by the huntsmen. The men, forming a ring, close in, shouting "Hotcha-pe-we-a-newa!" at the same time killing the rabbits with sticks and other weapons.

When the hunters return home with their rabbits, the women rush out to meet them and to seize the game. If, as sometimes happens, two women grasp the same rabbit, the war chief divided it between them. In old times, they say, the dead rabbit was sprinkled with sacred meal (tluka), which, however, is not now made or used at Ysleta.

Language of the Ysletenos

Ysleta affords a good opportunity for the collection of material for a knowledge of the Tiwa idiom; but such work must be done at once, as a speaking knowledge of this variant, if such it be, of the Tiwa, will probably not survive the present generation. No Ysleta child can at present speak the language, and those adults who can converse in it are old men and women. It is imperative that philological studies among these people be made at once, for it will soon be too late.

The special interest attached to a study of the Ysleta Tiwa is, of course, for comparison with the Tiwa of the Pueblos of Sandia and Isleta in New Mexico. It has been known that the idiom of the pueblos of Taos and Picuris has Tiwan affinities, but the Ysletanos say that it is very different from their language. Several years ago an old man went from Taos to Ysleta to live, but he later settled in Senecu, where he died recently. His speech was incomprehensible, his native tongue differing greatly from that spoken at Ysleta. Some of the southern Tiwa have visited Isleta, New Mexico, and claim, as one would expect, that the language of the two pueblos is practically identical, differing only in minor details. During his visit to Ysleta, the author recorded a considerable Tiwa vocabulary, which he hoped later to compare with the northern Tiwa. These words were obtained during several councils with the chiefs, which generally lasted late into the afternoon, when the angelus sounded from the bell tower of the neighboring church. At the close of these councils, the cacique, Piarete, repeated a long Tiwa formula, or prayer, with other Indians were familiar. It would be interesting for one who seriously takes up the linguistics of the Ysletenos to transcribe this prayer as a specimen of their language. All these Indians at present speak "Spanish", but when together the old men converse in their native language. The more aged, in fact a majority of the adults, can neither speak English nor write their own names.

There still remain in Ysleta survivals of the former clan system of the Tiwa, in which the descent was matriarchal. All have Spanish baptismal names, and a few have Tiwa names. They assert that when the latter was given them, an aboriginal rite in which water was used was performed. The Tiwa name of Piarote, the cacique, is Shiu-tusan (Eagle-tusan); the governor, Mariano, Yekaptusan (Corntassel-tusan). Another man is called Yen-tusan (Mountain-tusan); and still another, Thuwirpo-tusan (Rainbow-tusan). None of the children now have Tiwa names.

The Ysleta Tiwa have several very suggestive folktales, to which the author can only refer at this time. He listened to several, but it was said that there were many more, all of which are well worth collecting. They retain traditions of the *Shipapu* or *Shipapunai,* the ancestral opening in the earth out of which the races of men originally emerged, and they declare it to be a lake in the far north.

So far as their clothing is concerned, it is impossible to distinguish the men and women of Ysleta from their Mexican neighbors; even the want of a beard not being always a distinguishing trait among the men. One man was seen with long hair, but it was not tied in the usual Pueblo fashion. Several wore moccasins, and one a leather wristguard.

The houses are not characteristic, and exteriorly there is nothing in the present appearance of the village to lead one to suspect that it was once a purely Indian pueblo or that at present any people of Indian blood inhabited it.

One or two old Pueblos customs are still kept up by the Ysleta Tiwa. They know how to use the fire-drill and the fire-stock (fukrisla), and how to kindle fire with them, although they generally use flint-and-steel or matches. Of their weapons several bows and arrows were shown the author, and he has also seen rabbit sticks, a lance, and a drum of aboriginal manufacture. One or two women know how to make paper-bread, which they call pahnshave, and to color it into various tints. They at times grind corn (ae) on matates which have an ancient appearance, and one of the old women said that this sucrom was common in her childhood. She added that while the women are thus at work over a mealing-stone the men sang, beating a drum or folded sheep-skin. A diligent search for aboriginal pottery in Ysleta was not successful; a few old pieces were found, but they were very crude and probably Mexican; nevertheless, all said that in former times the Tiwa women were good potters and made black ware like that of the Santa Clara Indians.

THE PIROS SETTLEMENTS NEAR EL PASO

The survivors of the Piros live in the hamlets of Socorro and Senecu, the former situated in Texas, about three miles below Ysleta, and the latter on the opposite or right bank of the Rio Grande, about six miles from Juarez, in Mexico. The settlement at Socorro is small and while there are at present only a few families that claim to be of Indian blood, none of them speak the Piros idiom. They have no tribal organization, and the town is throughly Mexicanized.

It is commonly said in Ysleta that the Indians of Socorro are descended from Piros and other tribes, and that their ancestors spoke differently from the Tiwa—in fact more like the Senecu people. Piarote, the Ysleta cacique, states that in his youth the irrigation ditches of Socorro was called "acequia de los Piros", implying that Piros Indians were settled in this pueblo in old times. The fact that the native language has vanished, and that Jemez and Tanos Indians were among those colonized there, partially explains the total disappearance of their language. The author visited one or two old men who claimed to be pure Indians, but they could utter not a word of Piros, and one of them apologetically said that even his father was totally ignorant of any language but Spanish.

SENECU

The pueblo of Senecu in which the Piros who once lived in New Mexico were colonized at the close of the seventeenth century, is situated in Chihuahua, about six miles from Juarez, on the right bank of the Rio Grande. It consists of a small cluster of adobe houses, in the midst of which rises an old church containing many ancient *santos,* a few old paintings, and interesting altar paraphernalia.

The following names of Piros Indians were obtained at Senecu: Augustin Allegro (cacique), Pablo Gonzales, Jose Maria Podraqua, Vicente Paiz, Caspio Paiz, Dolores Allejo, Juan Delgado, Nicasio Alban, Thomas Ortiz, Toredo Podraqua. In addition to these there are many women names were not recorded, making in Senecu fully fifty persons who may be called Piros Indians.

The Senecu Piros perform dances in the open space before the church building and are accompanied by a drum and rattles. They are practically secularized pagan dances which have lost all their aboriginal significance. These occur after mass on the festival of their patron, St. Anthony, at Christmas, and on the festivals of their St. Ann, and others.

The old drum used in these processions and dances is still preserved in one of the houses not far from the church. It consists of a hollow log with a piece of rawhide stretched over each end, closely resembling those used for the same purpose by the Pueblos higher up the Rio Grande. The drum employed in their secular dances, of which they have many, consists of a jar with skin stretched over the top.

The author saw in the village several hand rattles and one or two bows and arrows. It was not learned whether masks were worn in their dances, inquiry sufficient to decide that point not being pursued. The Senecu Indians have rabbithunts and footraces similar to those of other Pueblos.

The Piros language, as a means of conversation, has practically disappeared, as no one at Senecu or Socorro now converses in it, but there are still remembered many words which, if recorded, would form a larger vocabulary than any known to exist. There may be other Piros living in other pueblos, who know more of the language than do the Senecu people. The governor of Senecu claims that there are Piros living at a place in Mexico called Ajotitian, but the author does not know the situation of the settlement.

The writer visited the church of San Lorenzo, about two miles from Senecu, but was not successful in finding ethnological traces of the Sumas. The present church building is a new one, the fourth of its name, the others, at least the last, the Ysletenos declare, having been destroyed by freshets.

An instructive survival of Indian customs at San Lorenzo is a dance which occurs before the church, when a masked personage, called Malinche, appears. Malinche is a common modern name of a masked dancer, occurring throughout the Nahua region of Mexico, and its existence at San Lorenzo, as well as in some of the New Mexican pueblos, is significant. About the middle of November fires were kindled at night on the hills near El Paso and Juarez. The explanation given the author was that these fires were to guide Moctezuma, a Messiah, who, folklore has it, will come down the Rio Grande and cross the river at this point.

It is suspected that there may still be traces of Suma blood, and perhaps survivals of their customs, at Samalauca, in Chihuahua, where these Indians were early colonized, but he was not to visit that place.

No studies were made of the survivors of the Mansos near Juarez.

The treatment adopted in the preceding pages is intended to be ethnological rather than historical. Fortunately these pueblos have been studied from both these aspects by Bandelier to whose valuable researches the writer refers with great respects. As there still remain many important data to be gathered regarding both the history and the ethnology of the El Paso pueblos, the author hopes that in these pages he had done something to attract attention to the immediate necessity of additional studies in this locality.

CREDITS AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

(In lieu of footnotes to foregoing paper by J. Walter Fewkes)

(NOTE.—Page numbers given refer to original paper, and do not refer to place in RECORD.)

Page 1: A copy of Father Mencheros map was published in 1892 by the Kartographisches Institute of Berlin. Although not dated, the legend reads that it was prepared during the administration of Don Juan Francisco Guemes y Orcasitas, who was Governor of New Mexico during 1747.

Page 1: A special account of the ruins (paragraph 2) near this town, especially those of the "pueblo" visited by Vargas in 1692, is in preparation.

Page 2: Chiawipia or Chipiya. Note the similarity of this term with Cipia, an historic name of former puebla dwellers along the Little Colorado.

Page 2: Note in Bancroft, Arizona and New Mexico, p. 191: "S. Ant. de Senecu, of Piros and Tompiros, 2 leagues below El Paso (or Guadalupe); Corpus Christi de Isleta (Bonilla, Apuntes, MS., 2, calls it S. Lorenzo del Realito), of Tiguas 1½ leágues east of Senecu; and Nra del Socorro, of Piros, Tanos, and Jemes, on the Rio del Norte 7 leagues from Isleta and 12 leagues from El Paso." If Socorro was then 7 leagues from Ysleta, it was not on its present site, if the distance given is correct. "In '83," according to Bancroft (p. 191), on account of a plot in Socorro to kill Padre Antonio Guerra, the pueblo was "moved to a site nearer Isleta." evidently to its present location.

Page 3: This mask was obtained by the author.

Page 5: Kikawee (staff of office). The church is called kikawee-missatu, signifying "house containing sacred objects of the mass," a compound of Tiwa and Spanish in which appears the name of the chieftain's staff.

Page 6: *Shiafura*, the Rattle Dance: *Shia*, rattle. Danced in two parts, called *Shopisane* and *Shiafura*. Name of the mask dance from Newa-de, mask. The children of the Hopi also have a masked dance in imitation of their elders. Name of the Red Pigment Dance from *Poaputa*, red pigment.

Page 6: Name of the House Dance from *Naku*, house.

Page 7: In the foot race, the words used by the cacique are apparently those for "one, two, three," respectively. The numerals and the method of formation of the larger numbers may be seen by a study of the following:

One, wima; Two, wisi; Three, pachowin; Four, wiran; Five, patowa; Six, matle; Seven, weede; Eight, whang; Nine, tetehem; Ten, te; Eleven, tewin; Twelve, tweisi; Twenty, wete; Twenty-five, wete-pantowa; Thirty, pachoate; Forty, wiante; Fifty, pantoate; One Hundred, shute.

Page 8: Names given at baptism: The root *thus* meaning sun, occurs in *thusaina*, sunrise; tathuakin, sunset. Apparently the idiom of Ysleta differs somewhat from that of their kindred in Isleta, and Sandia, as would be expected from the two centuries of separation. If the termination *tusan* means people, or clan, its phonetic relation to "Tusayan" is highly significant.

Page 9: Paper-bread, *pahnshave;* apparently related to the Spanish, *pan*.

Page 9: The Ysletanos speak of Socorro in New Mexico as *Socorrito*, "Little Socorro."

Page 9: Piros settlements: later information reached the author that there is an old man living near Socorro who speaks the Piros dialect. The word *Sececu* is of Piros origin, and was formerly applied to a New Mexican pueblo where San Antonio now stands.

Page 10: The Bureau of American Ethnology has a small vocabulary of Piros words recorded by John Russell Bartlett.

Page 10: Reference to Bandelier, from Final Report; Archaeological Institute of America, American Series LLI.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, another monograph was published in 1953 by Cleofas Calleros, one of the great historians of the Tiguas and one of the very few men to bear the honorary title of adelantado. I ask unanimous consent that his outstanding study, entitled "Tigua Indians: Oldest Permanent Settlers in Texas," be printed in the RECORD.

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

TIGUA INDIANS—OLDEST PERMANENT SETTLERS IN TEXAS [1]

(By Cleofas Calleros, in collaboration with Marjorie F. Graham)

(AUTHOR'S NOTE.—Historical high lights of El Paso and vicinity: Alvar Nuñez Cabeza de Vaca passed through Big Bend country in 1536. Fray Augustin Rodriguez, O. F. M., alone, reached El Paso del Norte in 1578. Francisco Sánchez (Chamuscado) and Fray Agustin Rodriguez led expedition, through El Paso to New Mexico in 1581. In 1582 Antonio de Espejo passed through El Paso seeking Fray Rodriguez and learned of his death. Don Juan Oñate took possession of this region as New Mexico in the name of the King of Spain, on "The day of the Ascención of the Lord," April 30, 1598 in the neighborhood of present Socorro, Texas. On the same day Captain Farián presented a comedy, the first play in the United States. At Ciudad Juárez, in 1683 was established the Presidio de Nuestra Señora del Pilar y el Gloriosо San José which was moved in 1773 to the East side of the river, and named San Elzcario, now known as San Elibario, Texas.)

The stern Indian, standing high on a windswept hill, his taut, muscular body silhouetted against a brilliant, sky, suggests, to any with imagination, a colorful, romantic bygone era.

For in modern mind an Indian epitomizes the brilliant pageant of Southwestern history, the mighty epoch of the opening of the West. His stern face lifted toward the sun, the methodic beat of his tom-tom breaking the stillness over the desert, the rise of smoke signals, are all those small remnants of a post regime out of which men today make movies.

In El Paso del Norte one may recapture, rub shoulders only slightly, with those whose ancestors constructed the past. If he will listen carefully, he may hear the faint echo of an Indian chant, the slow shuffle of an ancient tribe observing its traditional dance. These will be Tiguas, oldest and perhaps most venerable residents of the State of Texas. Here, in the quaint historic towns of Tigua and Ysleta, one may be a guest in their crude homes, at their small mission, and an observer of their peaceful, simple, agrarian way of life.

Who are these people? From where did they come? And why? These are, for the most part, the direct descendants of those savage natives to which Coronado referred in relating his expedition of 1540. Coronado, in quest of the fabulous cities of gold, found, on the contrary, a primitive group of tribes, occupying twelve pueblos in the vicinity of Isleta, Nueba México, eating corn and beans and melons; covering their bodies with animal skins. These resented the Spanish conquerors, avenged their conquest by staging a bloody attack. The Spaniards retaliated, burning two hundred of their captives at the stake, assaulting the women.[2]

These people are the colorless leftovers of barbarians who once massacred Frailes Rodriguez, López, and Santa María, the first among the heroic missionaries who had come to Christianize them. Then in 1583, motivated by their fear of being punished for having killed, the Tiguas fled to the mountains from the approaching Antonio de Espejo Expedition, and remained in hiding, out of which they would not be coaxed.[3]

By 1629 this same nation, in need of protection, had consolidated, reducing their pueblos in both sides of the Río del Norte (Río Grande) from sixteen to eight. Fierce Apaches—Rulers of the Kingdom of New México—were their destructive, predatory rivals, already having wiped out seven pueblos of other Indian nations in the Kingdom.

But the howling hordes of the Popé Rebellion in 1680 turned the tide of Tigua history. On August 10th the revolt against Spanish control, master minded by the notorious Popé, an Indian of the Tewa tribe, broke in all of its fury. The screaming savages wrought havoc, desolation and destruction, abolishing an entire civilization and Christian efforts of a century.[4]

Tiguas, however, who had gradually responded in great numbers to the efforts of the missionaries, among them the famous Padre Fray Alonso Benavides, O. F. M., fled in panic from their ancient pueblos. Some remained, preferring to resume their pagan practices, but these were few.[5]

Pouring into the Misión Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe del Paso del Norte, the frightened wounded, homeless Indians and missionaries presented a difficult problem to Governor Don Antonio de Otermín. These, he knew, needed refuge, and there was none for them.[5a]

Governor Otermín was a man of initiative and action. By two years later, in 1682, he and the Rev. Fray Francisco Ayeta, O. F. M., had founded Misión de Corpus Christi de la Ysleta del Sur, some three and a half leagues below the Paso del Norte Mission, and had established their wandering Tigua charges there. This, too, was one further preliminary step toward drawing back the cloak of ignorance which shrouded the valley.[6]

The Mission. Tigua home now for three centuries, is steeped in their history as well as in the historical record of this region.

---

[1] Cleofas Calleros, Series of articles (*four*) published in *El Paso TIMES: Tom-Toms Call Tigua Indians to Celebrate Annual Fiesta*, June 10, 1952. *Indians Release Intense Emotions In Strange Dance*, June 11, 1952. *Time, Modern World Deal Harsh Blow To Tigua Race*, June 12, 1952. *Tigua Tribe Holds Dances, Honors Patron*, June 14, 1952.

[2] Joseph I. Driscoll, *El Paso the Land of Romance on its 400th birthday*, in *Diocese of El Paso Centennial Celebration* booklet, Edited by Cleofas Calleros, El Paso, 1936.

[3] Carlos E. Castañeda, *Our Catholic Heritage in Texas 1519–1936*, in VII Vols. Austin, Texas, 1932–1952.

[4] Cleofas Calleros, *La Antorcha de El Paso del Norte*, El Paso, American Printing Co., 1951.

[5] Frederick Webb Hodge, George P. Hammond and Agapito Rey, *Fray Alonso de Benavides Revised Memorial of 1634*. Coronado Cuarto Centennial Publications, 1540–1940. Vol. IV, 1945.

[5a] Cleofas Calleros, *Queen of the Missions*, El Paso, 1952.

[6] Cleofas Calleros, *The Mother Mission*, El Paso, 1952.

During the vicious New México tribal wars which ensued the 1680 Rebellion, the tribe offered protection to the early settlers and Franciscan missionaries. When abuses were shown against the settlers, Tiguas would spring to their aid, engaging in tribal wars with the Mansos of El Paso del Norte, the Piros and Tompíros of Senecú, and with their nearby neighbors, the Thanos and Gemex of Socorro.[7]

They have been for three centuries now a docile, exemplary tribe, and a credit to the mission, which may well stand as a monument to their accomplishments. They have been neither war-mongers nor troublemakers, preferring to live in peace, cultivating the land around them. One of their tangible deeds most readily recognizable today is a farm, laid out west of the mission in 1682, and continually cultivated until the present time. It annually harvests rich fruits and vegetables, and is, of course, the oldest farm in the present United States.[8]

History records that the Tiguas were neither sociable nor conventional. Other El Paso del Norte Indians chose to walk nakedly about while the Tigua has always covered his body. And it is highly probable that women's rights was a social and political issue among them, since men, as well as women, worked. However, a man has never been known to do household chores, such being below his masculine station. There is, consequently, no record of the Tigua "man of the house" donning an apron to do the dishes.

The Tiguas retain a deep respect for their tribal organization, faithfully observing the traditional Tigua feasts and holidays which were the customs of their ancient ancestors.[9]

Today the rhythmic beat of the great Cacique's tom-tom still bids the Tigua to the feast in honor of Saint Anthony, patron saint of his tribe. On June 13th this Indian observes the most important time of the religious year, although the feasts of St. John, June 24th; Sts. Peter and Paul, June 29th; St. James, July 25th; St. Ann, July 26th; St. Andrew, November 30th; Christmas Day; New Year's Day; Feast of the Kings of Epiphany, January 6th; and Feast of the Holy Innocents, December 28th, are also given special attention.

However, with the dawn of St. Anthony's Day, which is the most significant to him, the Tigua rises early, dresses hurriedly, and attends high Mass at the Mission. Afterwards he and his squaw go as guests to the governor's house, where, as is expected of him, he dances the traditional "Baile Primero" and "La Figura." This is a strange, awe-inspiring medium of expression, and he performs it well.

For by his dancing he is paying tribute to St. Anthony, acknowledging favors past granted or pleading for additional ones. This Indian, by physical expression, is releasing his strong emotional feelings, portraying ancestral ideals and tribal motivations, and he is not aware of giving a performance.

Spectators are somewhat disappointed by the dancing. The movements are monotonous, the meaning vague. But it matters not at all to the Tigua that an observer enjoys or is bored by his weird antics.

Throughout the day ancient Indian traditions continue to be faithfully observed. The sun sets on another Day of St. Anthony, and there is peace in the Tigua's heart. Only a few leagues away the modern world, which has dealt his people so harsh a blow, races by, but the beat of the tom-tom is heard far into the night.

And it is unquestionable that time and the modern world have dealt the pure Tigua race severe blows. Their young generation has, and inevitably so, displayed its obvious disrespect for the tribe's continuity and ancient customs. Intermarriage with Mexicians and Anglos has alienated them from their fathers, and many, now entirely modernized, renounce or ignore their former association, refusing to participate in tribal ceremonials.[10]

Still, the few remaining Tiguas, now reduced to five pure blood families and some sixty persons who have a large percentage of straight lineage, have proven that they are forward looking and intelligent people, capable of grasping modern trends. The tribe participated in the dedication of Elephant Butte Dam in 1916; at two Texas State Expositions; and in the Texas Centennial Cavalcade opening the National Folk Festival, in Dallas on June 12, 1936.[10a]

At that time President Franklin D. Roosevelt was invested with the title of "Honorary Cacique," or chief, of the tribe.[11] This marked the first and only time that a President of the United States had been honored by an Indian tribe west of the Mississippi River. At that celebration, the Most Rev. Joseph P. Lynch, DD, Bishop of Dallas, was invested with the honorary title of "Fraile." Two others, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt and Mrs. Sarah Gertrude Knott, executive secretary of the National Folk Festival, Association, were named "honorary squaws."[12]

Others who have been conferred with honorary titles for outstanding tribal services are the following: Cleofás Calleros, honorary adelantado; Joseph I. Driscoll, honorary historiador; Leslie Reed, honorary indio; Charles J. Perry, honorary fotógrafo; and Marjorie F. Graham, honorary india.[13]

To commemorate the 273rd anniversary of the coming of the Tiguas to Paso del Norte, and on the Novena period of their patronal feast, the Most Rev. Sidney M. Metzger, D. D., Bishop of El Paso was conferred the honorary title of "Fraile de los Tiguas."

Still, regrettably, the Tigua Indian nation is disappearing. And it is doing so with frightening rapidity. Friction, disbandment, intermarriage and fundamental differences are the results. They are dying out, and in the near future will be only history recorded on a page. One day soon the beat of the tom-tom bidding Tiguas to assemble will be only an echo.

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

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in 1936, during the centennial of Texan independence when President Franklin D. Roosevelt and his wife, Eleanor Roosevelt, visited Texas, a delegation of the Tigua Indians of El Paso met the Roosevelts in Dallas and conferred upon President Roosevelt the title of Cacique and upon Mrs. Roosevelt, Squaw of the Cacique of the Tigua Indians.

In El Paso this year, the Tiguas were generous enough to confer upon me the title of Honorary Governor, the only white man ever so designated by this Honorary Governor title in this southern Tigua tribe. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD S. 1958, the bill that I introduced to recognize the Tigua Indians of Ysleta, Tex., as a tribe.

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

S. 1958

Whereas Indians now living in El Paso County, Texas, are descendants of the Tiwa Indians of the Ysleta (Isleta) del Sur Pueblo, a branch separated in 1682 from the Tiwa-speaking Isleta Pueblo of central New Mexico; and

Whereas the Ysleta del Sur Pueblo founded the first permanent Tiwa settlement in Texas at Ysleta in 1682, where the tribe still lives today; and

Whereas the Tiwa Indians of Ysleta del Sur today, known as the Tigua Indians, have a distinctive speech, appearance, and culture and a well-organized tribal civil organization, all of which can be traced to the original Tiwa Indians of the Ysleta del Sur Pueblo; and

Whereas these people are naturally and understandably proud of their heritage and desirous of establishing their social status and preserving their racial history: Now, therefore,

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Indians now living in El Paso County, Texas, who are descendants of the Tiwa Indians of the Ysleta (Isleta) del Sur Pueblo settling in Texas at Ysleta in 1682 shall, from and after the ratification of this Act, be known and designated as Tiwa Indians of Ysleta, Texas, and shall continue to enjoy all rights, privileges, and immunities enjoyed by them as citizens of the State of Texas and of the United States as they enjoyed before the enactment of this Act, and shall continue to be subject to all the obligations and duties of such citizens under the laws of the State of Texas and the United States.

SEC. 2. Responsibility, if any for the Tiwa Indians of Ysleta del Sur is herewith transferred to the State of Texas. Nothing in this Act shall make such tribe or its members eligible for any services performed by the United States for Indians because of their status as Indians nor subject the United States to any responsibility, liability, claim, or demand of any nature to or by such tribe or its members arising out of their status as Indians, and none of the statutes of the United States which affect Indians because of their status as Indians, shall be applicable to the Tiwa Indians of Ysleta del Sur. Nothing herein shall preclude the application to the people of the Tiwa Indians of any program arising under the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I went to El Paso, Tex., in 1927, as a young lawyer. As I reached there, the Tiguas were having their fall harvest dance. I learned at that time, as most Texans do not know, that there was a tribe of Tiguas there and that they have been

---

[7] Cleofas Calleros, *El Paso's Missions and Indians*, McMath Co., El Paso, 1953.

[8] El Paso County Centennial Celebration 1850–1950 Official Program. *Oldest Cultivated Plot of Ground in the United States*, El Paso, Dec. 1950.

[9] J. Walker Fewkes, *The Pueblo Settlements near El Paso, Texas, in* American Anthropologist, New Series, Vol. 4, No. 1, January-March 1902.

[10] Author's private archives. Material assembled for future publication of "History of the Tigua Nation."

Gerardo Decorme, *The Oldest Towns of Texas "Socorro, 1680–1688; Isleta, 1682–1684"*. MSS unpublished (copy in Calleros' archives, together with correspondence with Carlos E. Castaneda, regarding dates and establishments of Missions, Presidios, etc.)

[10a] See Author's scrap book entitled: *"Tigua Indians at Texas Centennial Celebration."*

[11] The Dallas Morning News, *City Edition*, 51st year, No. 257, Dallas, Texas, June 13, 1936.

[12] Third Annual National Folk Festival Program, Texas Centennial Exposition at Dallas, Texas, June 14–21, 1936.

[13] El Paso Times, June 14, 1952.

there ever since 1682, when they came from Mexico to Texas.

I became acquainted with the Tigua Indians and have retained an interest in that tribe ever since.

The ancient Tiguas, who came to Texas through loyalty to the Spaniards, are finally receiving the recognition as a tribe that has, in fact, existed for nearly 300 years of their displacement from their ancient homes in central New Mexico. They have maintained a cultural difference from the surrounding Mexican or Anglo-American population during this nearly three-century period. Though their numbers are decreasing, their pride and their ancient heritage have not diminished. This recognition by the Congress of the United States will give them the juridical status that is their just due.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a portion of the report of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Report No. 558, 90th Congress, including the U.S. Department of Interior departmental report of July 28, 1967, concerning the Tigua Indians.

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

NEED

The present-day Tiwa (or Tigua) Indians resident in El Paso County are the descendants of a band of Indians who moved there in 1682 from the Isleta Pueblo in New Mexico. The New Mexico Tiwas, in turn, are believed to have been descendants of prehistoric inhabitants of the Wetherill Mesa in southern Colorado who settled there in the third century A.D.

The Tiwas at Ysleta, currently numbering 167, have maintained their cultural identity—their customs, songs, dances, political organization, folk medicine, and, to some extent, speech—notwithstanding their long years of residence in the midst of a white population and notwithstanding their conversion to Christianity two or more centuries ago.

Considering how many other tribes, groups, and bands of Indians in the country have been recognized by the United States, it is virtually impossible to explain how the Tiwas have been missed up to this time. The most plausible explanation is that the Texas Tiwas, unlike most other tribes, never had occasion to enter into a treaty with the United States, that they never occupied land which was subject to Federal jurisdiction, that they were far removed from other known Indian groups, that at the time recognition was being extended to the other Pueblo Indians the Tiwas were resident in Texas and Texas was in the Confederacy, and that they have been both too retiring and too proud to ask for what they think others might regard as favors from any person or any government.

The development of El Paso and the extension of its boundaries to include the little land that they occupy have brought their poverty, their lack of any except the most primitive housing, and their lack of education, and many of the other decencies of life to public attention and have made it urgent that some forms of relief from these conditions be afforded them. During its last session the Legislature of Texas enacted laws extending to the Tiwas the services of the State's commission for Indian affairs, authorizing the Governor to accept a transfer of responsibilities from the United States such as is proposed in H.R. 10599, and appropriating $35,000 to finance in a modest way certain assistance programs for them. The attorney general of the State has advised that Federal recognition and a transfer of trust responsibility to the State is necessary before these acts can be implemented. It is this that makes necessary enactment of H.R. 10599.

It will be noted that the bill specifically provides that its enactment shall not make the "tribe or its members eligible for any services performed by the United States for Indians because of their status as Indians" but that this does not "preclude the application to the people of the Tiwa Indians of programs undertaken pursuant to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964." The latter reference is included in the bill by way of emphasis and not to indicate that other Federal programs which are available for the public at large, as distinguished from the Indian population of the country, will not be available for the Tiwas.

DEPARTMENTAL REPORT

The favorable report of the Department of the Interior dated July 28, 1967, follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., July 28, 1967.

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ASPINALL: Your committee has requested a report on H.R. 10599, a bill relating to the Tiwa Indians of Texas.

We have no objection to the enactment of the bill.

The bill provides that a group of Indians in El Paso County, Tex., shall be known and designated as the Tiwa Indians of Ysleta, Tex., but that their status as citizens will not be affected by the designation.

The bill also provides that the responsibility, if any of the United States for these Indians is transferred to the State of Texas. The Indians will not be eligible for any special Federal services because of their status as Indians; Federal statutes which affect Indians because of their status as Indians will not be applicable to them; and the enactment of the bill will not subject the United States to any liability or claim arising out of their status as Indians.

The Tiwa Indians consist of about 160 persons who are descendants of a group that was separated from the Pueblo of Isleta about 300 years ago. They reside in a suburb of El Paso under very poor economic conditions. They have never been recognized by the United States as Indians entitled to special Federal services, and such recognition is not contemplated by this bill.

We understand that the State of Texas has enacted a statute authorizing the Governor to accept on behalf of the State a transfer of trust responsibility of the United States with respect to these Indians, and that such transfer of trust responsibility is regarded as necessary before the State may provide trust services to them. We are not informed of the basis for this latter conclusion.

The bill purports to transfer to the State the responsibility of the United States, if any, for these Indians. The United States does not have any responsibility, and the bill clearly provides that its enactment will not create any responsibility. It is therefore not clear, at least to us, how the enactment of the bill will help the State assert a trust responsibility for the group. If it will have that effect, however, we certainly have no objection to its enactment. Before the bill is enacted, however, we suggest that a letter be obtained from the appropriate State official indicating that enactment of the bill will accomplish its purpose.

The bill is modeled after the act of June 7, 1956 (70 Stat. 254), which relates to the Lumbee Indians of North Carolina.

The last sentence of the bill states that "Nothing herein shall preclude the application to the people of the Tiwa Indians of any program arising under the Office of Economic Opportunity." We understand that the purpose of the sentence is to give the Office of Economic Opportunity the basis for formulating a program for this ethnic group. You may wish to consult that Office for advice regarding the adequacy and the desirability of the language.

Time considerations have not permitted the Bureau of the Budget to advise us of the relationship of this bill to the program of the President.

Sincerely Yours,

STANLEY A. CAIN,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the pending bill to give the Tiguas congressional recognition as an authentic American Indian tribe, was guided through the House of Representatives by Representative RICHARD C. WHITE, of El Paso, will bring the remaining 20 families of pure Tigua blood and their kin of mixed blood the benefits from the Texas State government which they rightly deserve.

I urge Senate approval today of the proposed legislation, which is so important to the Tigua people of my State.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1070), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The purposes of H.R. 10599 are to recognize the Tiwa people of the pueblo of Ysleta del Sur in El Paso County, Tex., as a band of American Indians and to transfer to the State of Texas any responsibility that the United States may have for them. A similar bill, S. 1958, introduced by Senator Yarborough, was also considered by the committee.

NEED

The Texas constitution contains no express authority for the recognition of or assistance to Indian tribes. The Legislature of the State of Texas has enacted legislation for the benefit of the Tiwa Indians. In order to overcome the lack of authorization in the State constitution to treat Indians differently than other citizens, the enactment of H.R. 10599 is necessary.

The Tiwa Indians of Ysleta, El Paso County, Tex., numbering approximately 160 individuals, separated about 300 years ago from the pueblo of Isleta in what is now the State of New Mexico. Through the years they have maintained their identity as an ethnic group although they have never had recognition by the United States as Indians entitled to special Federal services. Today they reside within a suburb of the city of El Paso, Tex., under extremely poor economic conditions.

The committee understands that the State of Texas enacted a statute on May 23, 1967, authorizing the Governor to accept on behalf of the State a transfer of trust responsibility of the United States with respect to these Indians. The State regards the transfer of trust responsibility as necessary before the State may provide trust services to them. The United States does not have any responsibility, and the bill clearly provides that its enactment will not create any trust responsibility. As precedent the bill is modeled after the act of June 7, 1956 (70 Stat. 254), which relates to the Lumbee Indians of North Carolina.

It is expected that by enactment of H.R. 10599 certain benefits provided for by the Legislature of the State of Texas will be made available to members of the Tiwa Tribe.

COST

No expenditure of Federal funds will be required as a result of the enactment of H.R. 10599.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendments to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S DECISION NOT TO SEEK REELECTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, President Johnson has made his supreme effort to get our country's policies moving toward an honorable peace in Vietnam.

For 11 years I have known the President well, both as majority leader of the Senate and as President. And I have never known a man who has sought or used power with more force or determination. The power of leadership flowed to him more naturally than to any other American of our time.

And, of course, as President of the United States, he has occupied the most powerful position on earth.

For this reason his decision to relinquish the Presidency without a fight is stunning. I think it shows how very deeply the President wants to bring this divided country together again on the central issue of Vietnam. He has decided that in his view his candidacy frustrates the possibility of negotiating for a just peace in Vietnam. So he has renounced that candidacy and the Presidency.

This startling action by President Johnson is unquestionably the most dramatic development in a presidential campaign year that has already experienced more earth-shakers than any I can recall.

Whether Americans like or dislike President Johnson, they must admire the amazing demonstration of his desire for unity and peace which this dramatic renunciation represents.

AAUW JOURNAL MARCH ISSUE FEATURES SENATOR PROXMIRE'S ARTICLE ON HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, recently I had the honor of writing an article on the Human Rights Conventions for the March issue of the American Association of University Women Journal.

The outstanding work of the American Association of University Women in public service is already known to all Members of this body. The AAUW testified before the Dodd subcommittee in support of the Human Rights Treaties. They have continued to work most diligently for the adoption of these conventions.

Mr. President, 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:

THE UNITED STATES AND THE HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS

On June 26, 1945 at the time of the signing of the United Nations Charter in San Francisco President Harry S. Truman said:

Under this document we have good reason to expect the framing of an international bill of rights, acceptable to all the nations involved. That bill of rights will be as much a part of international life as our Bill of Rights is dedicated to the achievement and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms. Unless we can attain those objectives for all men and women everywhere—without regard to race, language or religion—we cannot have permanent peace and security.

Only a month later on July 28, 1945 the United States Senate gave its advice and consent to the United Nations Charter by a vote of 89 to 2.

Article 55 of the U.N. Charter states clearly the duty of the United Nations to promote "universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to sex, language, or religion." In Article 56, all members of the United Nations "pledge themselves to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the organization for the achievement of the purposes set forth in Article 55."

In 1948, with the memory of the 12 years of Nazi barbarism still fresh in mind, the United Nations General Assembly, at American initiative and through American advocacy, unanimously adopted the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. Simply stated, this Convention declared the systematic extermination of a racial, ethnic, or religious group is a crime under international law.

When President Truman submitted the Genocide Convention to the Senate for its advice and consent in 1949, only five nations had ratified the Convention. During the intervening 19 years another 66 nations have ratified the Genocide Convention. But with the exception of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee hearings in 1950, *the Senate has taken no action on this first, great Human Rights Convention of the United Nations.*

Since 1948 the United Nations, in cooperation with the International Labor Organization, has adopted and opened for ratification eight other Human Rights Conventions which attempt to establish minimum universal standards of human dignity. Four of these Conventions—Freedom of Association, Political Rights of Women, Forced Labor, and Supplementary Slavery—have been submitted by American Presidents to the Senate for action. President Truman submitted the Freedom of Association Convention in 1949. The other three Conventions were submitted by President Kennedy in 1963.

President Kennedy said of these three Conventions when he sent them to the Senate:

They will stand as a sharp reminder of world opinion to all who may seek to violate the human rights they define. They also serve as a continuous commitment to respect these rights. There is no society so advanced that it no longer needs periodic commitment to human rights. The United States cannot afford to renounce responsibility for support of the very fundamentals which distinguish our concept of government from all forms of tyranny.

President Kennedy believed devoutly that human rights and peace are intimately related and historically interdependent. He stated this belief so very well in his magnificent American University speech when he asked, "And is not peace, in the last analysis, basically a matter of human rights?"

Twice in this century the United States has been drawn into world wars. Twice we watched helplessly while unchecked domestic oppression in another nation grew into unprovoked foreign aggression. Aggression in recent history has been almost the exclusive practice of those regimes which first deprived their own citizens of basic human freedoms.

The conclusion, I believe, is inescapable. Where human rights are secure, peace is attendant. Where the human right of any people are threatened, peace itself is threatened.

For 23 years the people of the United States have given generously of their resources and energies to the United Nations. A great majority of the American people, and I among them, believe that the United Nations serves the interests of the United States and all mankind, because the United Nations serves the cause of world peace.

Yet the United States Senate has given its advice and consent to only one Human Rights Convention, and Supplementary Convention on Slavery, which is undeniably the least controversial of all the human rights treaties. In fact, this Convention is called "supplementary," because it is basically a postscript to the Slavery Convention signed by the United States during the Administration of Calvin Coolidge and ratified by the United States during the administration of Herbert Hoover.

I frankly question whether the Senate giving its advice and consent to a Convention on Slavery in 1967, 102 years after the adoption of the 13th Amendment, qualified as either a bold departure or an historical act.

By giving its advice and consent to the Supplementary Convention on Slavery, the Senate enabled the United States to become the seventy-first nation to ratify that particular human rights convention.

Just consider what an unpardonable insult and a grievous disservice the Senate's failure to approve the Human Rights Conventions constitutes to both the United Nations and the United States.

By failing to become a party to the Human Rights Conventions, the United States Senate is reneging on the solemn promise this Nation made 23 years ago when we helped to found the United Nations.

I am most reluctant to admit that the American people and their elected representatives subscribe to the thoroughly discredited notion that human rights are merely a matter of state law or royal edict, to be alternately granted or grabbed at some despot's whim. I refuse to believe Hegel's cynical observation that "peoples and governments have never learned anything from history, or acted on principles deduced from it."

I am encouraged by the fact that at the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee hearings last March on the so-called "Kennedy package" (the Convention on Forced Labor, Political Rights of Women, and Slavery), 23 witnesses representing 74 organizations (including, not incidentally, the American Association of University Women) testified in support of United States ratification of the Human Rights Conventions. Only two witnesses representing one organization—the American Bar Association—appeared in opposition to United States ratification.

The American Bar Association was silent on the subject of the Human Rights Conventions for four years after President Kennedy submitted them to the Senate. But last August at that organization's convention in Honolulu, the A.B.A., by a vote of 115–92 out of the more than 300,000 lawyers in the United States, went on record against the Political Rights of Women Convention and made no recommendation on the Forced Labor Convention.

The central thrust of the A.B.A. argument was that the subject matter of conventions were matters of domestic political concern.

I respectfully suggest that one of the fundamental purposes of the United Nations is to convince the world that human rights are not simply a matter of domestic concern. Human rights transcend national boundaries. Human rights must be truly universal if we are ever to have a truly peaceful world.

I do not believe that any rational observer seriously proposes United States abdication from the international stage. The question we face is not whether the United States accepts an international role but whether we

have the courage to determine, for ourselves, a role commensurate with our unique opportunities and grave obligations.

In the continuing struggle for universal human rights, the United States cannot indefinitely ignore our opportunities nor permanently postpone our obligations.

We cannot continue indifferent to the battle for human rights. If we fail to lead, mankind will be the victim and history will be our final judge. Recalling the words of Dante: "The hottest places in Hell are reserved for those who in a time of moral crisis remained neutral."

THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS ON VIETNAM, REELECTION, AND NATIONAL UNITY

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, last night a great American gave a great American speech.

President Lyndon B. Johnson spoke to us of Vietnam and peace, and the effort this world demands of our Nation.

But he spoke to us even more of America and democracy, and the sacrifices our Nation demands of its leaders.

He began by announcing new initiatives in the name of peace in Vietnam. And he ended by announcing the end of his political career in the name of unity in America.

Lyndon B. Johnson has made his reputation in American politics through the art of consensus. His years as majority leader of this body speak for themselves, and so do his years of bringing major legislation into reality as President of the United States.

He has always understood a fundamental truth of American democracy—that we can accomplish almost anything when we work with each other and we can accomplish almost nothing when we work against each other. And so he took two steps:

He acted to deescalate a military conflict which threatened the American consensus without which we cannot progress as a nation;

And he acted to protect the great leadership position of the American political system from the threat which was posed by divisive conflict in a political year.

He defended the commitments which we have made and still must make as a leader of the free world. He promised no easy solutions to the war, and he predicted no immediate end to our problems at home.

But he said:

> I cannot disregard the peril to the progress of the American people and the hope and the prospects of peace to all peoples.

He said:

> What we won when all our people united must not now be lost in suspicion, distrust and selfishness or politics among any of our people.

And so he said he would not seek or accept a nomination for another term as President.

He saw that America needed still another initiative to cool down the military conflict in Vietnam. He saw that America needed still another initiative to cool down the political conflict at home.

And so he took both initiatives. As the Nation requires of its greatest men, he placed the Nation ahead of his personal and political career. And the Nation will remember that he truly understood what leadership must be in a Nation like ours.

Mr. President, the Washington Post paid a fitting tribute to the President in an editorial this morning. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial and the text of the President's message of last evening be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

IN THE NAME OF UNITY

President Johnson, by his moving declaration that he will not seek nor accept the nomination of his party, has taken himself out of the presidential campaign, barring developments that at this juncture simply cannot be foreseen.

He has at the same time, by both his remarks on his candidacy and the suspension of bombing in nearly all Vietnam, taken the war out of the presidential campaign as far as it is in his power to do so.

He has made a personal sacrifice in the name of national unity that entitles him to a very special place in the annals of American history and to a very special kind of gratitude and appreciation.

Many public men have spoken in the name of national unity to advance their own cause and candidacy. The President last night put unity ahead of his own advancement and his own pride.

The shape of the forthcoming presidential campaign is obscure at this moment; but it ought to be, by any normal expectation, a campaign of less divisiveness and less bitterness than the one the country had expected. The President lanced the boil of faction and opened the abscess of partisanship on the body politic. It is to be hoped that his surgery will diminish the fever of public life and permit the Nation to pursue its political decisions in a climate of restraint and prudence.

The verdict of history remains to be written upon an Administration that has attacked the social and racial problems of America with skill and vigor. The judgment of the world remains to be pronounced upon the success or failure of foreign policies that will influence world affairs for generations.

Americans need wait no longer, however, to conclude that the man who spoke to them last night is a man who greatly loves his country and who deeply cherishes its unity.

TEXT OF JOHNSON SPEECH ON VIETNAM, DECISION NOT TO RUN

Tonight I want to speak to you of peace in Vietnam and Southeast Asia.

No other question so preoccupies our people. No other dream so absorbs the 250 million human beings who live in that part of the world. No other goal motivates American policy in Southeast Asia.

For years, representatives of our Government and others have traveled the world—seeking to find a basis for peace talks.

Since last September, they have carried the offer I made public at San Antonio.

It was this:

That the United States would stop its bombardment of North Vietnam when that would lead promptly to productive discussions—and that we would assume that North Vietnam would not take military advantage of our restraint.

Hanoi denounced this offer, both privately and publicly. Even while the search for peace was going on, North Vietnam rushed their preparations for a savage assault on the people, the government, and the allies of South Vietnam.

Their attack—during the Tet holidays—failed to achieve its principal objectives.

It did not collapse the elected government of South Vietnam or shatter its army—as the Communists had hoped.

It did not produce a "general uprising" among the people of the cities.

The Communists were unable to maintain control of any city. And they took very heavy casualties.

But they did compel the South Vietnamese and their allies to move certain forces from the countryside, into the cities.

They caused widespread disruption and suffering. Their attacks, and the battles that followed, made refugees of half a million human beings.

The Communists may renew their attack. They are, it appears, trying to make 1968 the year of decision in South Vietnam—the year that brings, if not final victory or defeat, at least a turning point in the struggle.

NATION WILL SUFFER

This much is clear: If they do mount another round of heavy attacks, they will not succeed in destroying the fighting power of South Vietnam and its allies.

But tragically, this is also clear; many men—on both sides of the struggle—will be lost. A nation that has already suffered 20 years of warfare will suffer once again. Armies on both sides will take new casualties. And the war will go on.

There is no need for this to be so.

There is no need to delay the talks that could bring an end to this long and bloody war.

Tonight, I renew the offer I made last August—to stop bombardment of North Vietnam. We ask that talks begin promptly, and that they be serious talks on the substance of peace. We assume that during those talks Hanoi would not take advantage of our restraint.

We are prepared to move immediately toward peace through negotiations.

Tonight, in the hope that this action will lead to early talks, I am taking the first step to de-escalate the conflict. We are reducing—substantially reducing—the present level of hostilities.

And we are doing so unilaterally, and at once.

Tonight, I have ordered our aircraft and naval vessels to make no attacks on North Vietnam, except in the area north of the demilitarized zone where the continuing enemy build-up directly threatens allied forward positions and where movements of troops and supplies are clearly related to that threat.

The area in which we are stopping our attacks includes almost 90 per cent of North Vietnam's population, and most of its territory. Thus there will be no attacks around the principal populated areas, and in the food-producing areas of North Vietnam.

Even this limited bombing of the North could come to an early end—if our restraint is matched by restraint in Hanoi. But I cannot in conscience stop all bombing so long as to do so would immediately and directly endanger the lives of our men and our allies. Whether a complete bombing halt becomes possible in the future will be determined by events.

A REDUCTION IN VIOLENCE

Our purpose in this action is to bring about a reduction in the level of violence that now exists.

It is to save the lives of brave men—and of innocent women and children. It is to permit the contending forces to move closer to a political settlement.

Tonight, I call upon the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union—as co-chairmen of the Geneva Conference, and as permanent members of the United Nations Security Council—to do all they can to move from the unilateral act of de-escalation I have just announced toward peace in Southeast Asia.

Now, as in the past, the United States is ready to send its representatives to any forum, at any time, to discuss the means of bringing this war to an end.

I am designating one of our most distinguished Americans, Ambassador Averell Harriman, as my personal representative for such talks. In addition, I have asked Ambassador Llewellyn Thompson, who returned from Moscow for consultations, to be available to join Ambassador Harriman at Geneva or any other suitable place—just as soon as Hanoi agrees to a conference.

I call upon President Ho Chi Minh to respond positively, and favorably, to this new step toward peace.

But if peace does not come now through negotiations, it will come when Hanoi understands that our common resolve is unshakable, and our common strength is invincible.

Tonight, we and other allied nations are contributing 600,000 fighting men to assist 700,000 South Vietnamese troops in defending their country.

Our presence there has always rested on this basic belief: the main burden of preserving their freedom must be carried by the South Vietnamese themselves.

We and our allies can only help to provide a shield—behind which the people of South Vietnam can survive and develop. On their efforts—on their determination and resourcefulness—the outcome will ultimately depend.

That small, beleaguered nation has suffered terrible punishment for more than 20 years.

I pay tribute once again to the great courage and endurance of its people. South Vietnam supports armed forces of almost 700,000 men today—the equivalent of more than 10 million in our own population. Its people maintain their firm determination to be free of domination by the North.

There has been substantial progress in building a durable government during the past three years. The South Vietnam of 1965 could not have survived the enemy's Tet offensive of 1968. The elected government of South Vietnam survived that attack—and is rapidly repairing the devastation it wrought.

FURTHER EFFORTS REQUIRED

The South Vietnamese know that further efforts are required: to expand their armed forces, to move back into the countryside, to increase their taxes, to select the very best men they have for civil and military responsibility, to achieve a new unity within their constitutional government, and to include in the national effort all those groups who wish to preserve South Vietnam's control over its own destiny.

Last week President Thieu ordered the mobilization of 135,000 additional South Vietnamese. He plans to reach—as soon as possible—a total military strength of some 800,000 men.

To achieve this, the government of South Vietnam started the drafting of 19-year-olds on March 1. On May 1, the government will begin drafting 18-year-olds.

Last month, 10,000 men volunteered for military service—two and a half times the number of volunteers during the same month last year. Since the middle of January, more than 48,000 South Vietnamese have joined the armed forces—nearly half of them volunteers.

All men in the South Vietnamese armed forces have had their tours of service extended for the duration of the war, and reserves are now being called for active duty.

President Thieu told his people last week: "We must make greater efforts and accept more sacrifices because, as I have said many times, this is our country. The existence of our nation is at stake, and this is mainly a Vietnamese responsibility."

He warned his people that a major national effort is required to root out corruption and incompetence at all levels of government.

We applaud this evidence of renewed determination on the part of South Vietnam. Our first priority will be to support their effort.

REEQUIPPING SOUTH VIETNAM

We shall accelerate the re-equipment of South Vietnam's armed forces—to meet the enemy's increased firepower. This will enable them progressively to undertake a larger share of combat operations against the Communists.

On many occasions I have assured the American people that we would send to Vietnam those forces that are required to accomplish our mission there. With that as our guide, we have previously authorized a force level of approximately 525,000 men.

Some weeks ago, however—to help meet the enemy's new offensive—we sent to Vietnam about 11,000 additional Marine and airborne troops. They were deployed by air in 48 hours, on an emergency basis. Artillery, tank, aircraft, medical and other units needed to work with and support these infantry troops in combat did not accompany them.

In order that these forces may reach maximum combat effectiveness, we should prepare to send—during the next five months—support troops totalling approximately 13,500 men.

A portion of these men will be made available from our active forces. The balance will come from reserve component units which will be called up for service.

Actions we have taken since the beginning of the year—to re-equip the South Vietnamese forces—to meet our responsibilities in Korea, as well as in Vietnam—to meet price increases and the cost of activating and deploying reserve forces—to replace helicopters and provide the other military supplies we need, will require additional expenditures.

The estimate of those additional expenditures is $2.5 billion in this fiscal year, and $2.6 billion in the next fiscal year.

These projected increases in expenditures for our national security bring into sharper focus the nation's need for immediate action: To protect the prosperity of the American people and the strength and stability of the dollar.

DEFICIT OF $20 BILLION

On many occasions I have pointed out that, without higher taxes or decreased expenditures, next year's deficit would again be around $20 billion. I have emphasized the need to set strict priorities in our spending. I have stressed that failure to act—promptly and decisively—would raise strong doubts throughout the world about Amercia's willingness to keep its financial house in order.

Yet Congress has not acted. And today we face the sharpest financial threat in the postwar era—a threat to the dollar's role as the keystone of international trade and finance.

Last week, at the monetary conference in Stockholm, the major industrial countries took a big step toward creating a new international monetary asset that will strengthen the international monetary system.

But to make this system work the United States must bring its balance of payments to—or close to—equilibrium. We must have a responsible fiscal policy. Enactment of a tax increase now, together with expenditure control, is necessary to protect our security, continue our prosperity, and meet the needs of our people.

What is now at stake is seven years of unparalleled prosperity—in those seven years, the real income of the average American—after taxes—rose by almost 30%—a gain as large as that of the preceding 19 years.

The steps we must take to convince the world are exactly the steps we must take to sustain our economic strength at home. In the past eight months, prices and interest rates have risen.

We must move from debate to action. There is, I believe—in both Houses of the Congress—a growing sense of urgency that the situation must be corrected.

My budget in January was a tight one. It fully reflected an evaluation of our most demanding needs.

But in these budgetary matters, the President does not decide alone. The Congress has the power and the duty to determine appropriations and taxes.

REDUCTIONS IN BUDGET

The Congress is now considering proposals for reductions in our national budget.

As part of a program of fiscal restraint that includes the tax surcharge, I shall approve appropriate reductions in the January budget when and if Congress so decides.

One thing is unmistakably clear: Our deficit must be reduced. Failure to act could bring on conditions that would strike hardest at those people we are striving to help.

The times call for prudence in this land of plenty. I believe we have the character to provide it, and I plead with the Congress to act promptly to serve the national interest, and all the people.

Now let me give you my estimate of the chances for peace: the peace that will one day stop the bloodshed in South Vietnam, allow that people to rebuild and develop their land, and permit us to turn more fully to our tasks at home.

I cannot promise that the initiative I am announcing tonight will be any more successful in achieving peace than the more than 30 others we have undertaken and agreed to in recent years.

It is our hope that North Vietnam, after years of fighting that has left the issue unresolved, will now cease its efforts to achieve a military victory and join us in moving toward peace.

And there may come a time when South Vietnamese—on both sides—are able to work out a way to settle their differences by free political choice rather than by war.

As Hanoi considers its course, it should be in no doubt of our intentions. It must not miscalculate the pressures within our Democracy in this election year.

We have no intention of widening this war. But the United States will not accept a fake solution to this long an arduous struggle and call it peace.

No one can foretell the precise terms of an eventual settlement.

Our objecitve in South Vietnam has never been the annihilation of the enemy. It has been to bring about a recognition in Hanoi that its objective—taking over the South by force—could not be achieved.

PEACE BASED ON GENEVA

Peace can be based on the Geneva Accords of 1954—under political conditions that permit the South Vietnamese—all the South Vietnamese—to chart their course free of any outside domination or interference.

Tonight I also reaffirm the pledge we made at Manila—that we are prepared to withdraw our forces from South Vietnam as the other side withdraws its forces to the North, stops infiltration, and the level of violence thus subsides.

Our goal of peace and selfdetermination in Vietnam is directly related to the future of Southeast Asia—where much has happened to inspire confidence during the past 10 years. We have done all that we could to contribute to that confidence.

A number of its nations have shown what can be accomplished under conditions of security. Since 1966 Indonesia, the fifth largest nation in the world, has had a government dedicated to peace with its neighbors and improved conditons for its own people. Political and economic cooperation between nations has grown rapidly.

Every American can take pride in the role we have played in Southeast Asia. We can rightly judge—as responsible Southeast

Asians themselves do—that the progress of the past three years would have been far less likely—if not impossible—if America and others had not made the stand in Vietnam.

At Johns Hopkins University, three years ago, I announced that we would take part in the great work of developing Southeast Asia, including the Mekong Valley—for all the people of the region. Our determination to help build a better land—for men on both sides of the present conflict—has not diminished. Indeed, the ravages of war have made it more urgent than ever.

I repeat tonight what I said at Johns Hopkins—that North Vietnam could take its place in this common effort just as soon as peace comes.

Over time, a wider framework of peace and security in Southeast Asia may become possible. The new cooperation of the nations of the area could be a foundationstone. Certainly friendship with the nations of such a Southeast Asia is what we seek—and all that we seek.

One day, my fellow citizens, there will be peace in Southeast Asia.

It will come because the people of Southeast Asia want it—those whose armies are at war today, and those who though threatened, have thus far been spared.

Peace will come because Asians were willing to work for it—to sacrifice for it—to die for it.

But let it never be forgotten: Peace will come also because America sent her sons to help secure it.

It has not been easy—far from it. During the past four-and-a-half years, it has been my fate and responsibility to be Commander-in-Chief. I have lived—daily—with the cost of this war. I know the pain it has inflicted and the misgivings it has aroused.

Throughout this period, I have been sustained by a single principle: That what we are doing now, in Vietnam, is vital not only to the security of Asia, but to our own security.

Surely we have treaties which we must respect, and commitments we must keep. Resolutions of Congress testify to the need to resist aggression in Southeast Asia.

But the heart of our involvement in South Vietnam has always been America's security. And the larger purpose of our involvement has always been to help the nations of Southeast Asia become independent, self-sustaining members of the world community.—At peace with themselves and with all others.

With such an Asia, our country—and the world—will be far more secure than it is tonight.

I believe that a peaceful Asia is far nearer to reality because of what America has done in Vietnam. I believe that the men who endure the dangers of battle there are helping the entire world avoid far greater conflicts than this one.

The peace that will bring them home will come. Tonight I have offered the first in what I hope will be a series of mutual moves toward peace.

I pray that it will not be rejected by the leaders of North Vietnam. I pray that they will accept it as a means by which the sacrifices of their own people may be ended. And I ask your support, my fellow citizens, for this effort to reach across the battlefield toward an early peace.

RENOUNCES NOMINATION

"Finally my fellow Americans, let me say this:

"Those to whom much is given, much is asked. I cannot say—no man could say—that no more will be asked of us. Yet I believe that now—no less than when the decade began, this generation of Americans is willing to 'pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, to assure the survival and the success of liberty.' "

Since those words were spoken by John W. Kennedy the people of America have kept that compact with mankind's noblest cause. "We shall continue to keep it. Yet I believe we must always be mindful of this one thing:

"Whatever the trials and tests ahead, the ultimate strength of our country and our cause will lie not in powerful weapons or infinite resources or boundless wealth, but in the unity of our people.

"This, I believe very deeply.

"Throughout my public career, I have followed the personal philosophy that I am a free man, an American, a public servant, and a member of my party—in that order, always and only. For 37 years in the service of our Nation—first as Congressman, as Senator, as Vice President, and now as your President, I have put the unity of the people first, ahead of any divisive partisanship.

In these times, as in times before, it is true that a house divided against itself—by the spirit of faction, of party, of region, of religion, of race—is a house that cannot stand.

A HOUSE DIVIDED

There is a division in the American house now. There is divisiveness among us all tonight. Holding the trust that is mine—as President of all the people—I cannot disregard the peril to the progress of the American people and the hope and the prospects of peace for all peoples. I would ask all Americans, whatever their personal interest or concern, to guard against divisiveness and all of its ugly consequences.

Fifty-two months and ten days ago, in a moment of tragedy and trauma, the duties of this office fell upon me. I asked then for "your help and God's" that we might continue America on its course, binding up our wounds, healing our history, moving forward in new unity to clear the American agenda and to keep the American commitment for all our people.

United, we have kept that commitment, and united, we have enlarged that commitment.

Through all time to come, America will be a stronger nation, a more just society, a land of greater opportunity and fulfillment because of what we have done together in these years of unparalleled achievement.

Our reward will come in the life of freedom and peace and hope that our children will enjoy through ages ahead.

What we won when all our people united must not now be lost in suspicion, distrust and selfishness or politics among any of our people.

I SHALL NOT SEEK NOMINATION

Believing this as I do, I have concluded that I should not permit the Presidency to become involved in the partisan divisions that are developing in this political year. With America's sons in the field far away, with America's future under challenge here at home, with our hopes and the world's hopes for peace in the balance every day. I do not believe that I should devote an hour or a day of my time to any personal partisan causes or to any duties other than the awesome duties of this office, the Presidency of your country.

Accordingly, I shall not seek and I will not accept the nomination of my party for another term as your President, But, let men everywhere know, however, that a strong and a confident, a vigilant America stands ready to seek an honorable peace and stands ready tonight to defend an honored cause, whatever the price, whatever the burden, whatever the sacrifice that duty may require.

Thank you for listening. Goodnight, and God bless all of you.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED ADDITIONS TO NATION'S WILDERNESS SYSTEM

A communication from the President of the United States, urging the Congress to consider making 26 additions to the Nation's wilderness system (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE LEGISLATION

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the several governments of Central America in the prevention, control, and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease or rinderpest (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL RESERVE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense (Installations and Logistics) transmitting, pursuant to law, the 20th annual report to the Congress on the National Industrial Reserve (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

NUCLEAR-POWERED GUIDED-MISSILE FRIGATES

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the President's determination with respect to nuclear-powered guided-missile frigates (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE

A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of a military department or the head of a Defense agency to sell production equipment to contractors and subcontractors (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF AIR FORCE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS AWARDED WITHOUT FORMAL ADVERTISING

A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Air Force military construction contracts awarded by the Department of the Air Force without formal advertising for the period July 1, 1967, through December 31, 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Armed Services.

NAVAL RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING PROGRAM

A letter from the Deputy Chief of Naval Personnel, Department of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the list of principal and alternate candidates selected for the 1968 Regular Naval Reserve officers training program (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROCUREMENT FROM SMALL AND OTHER BUSINESS FIRMS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for the period July 1967–January 1968 (with an accompanying report and paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the first annual report of the Board to the Congress, covering the last 9 months of calendar year 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft

of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the rendering of direct assistance to and performance of special services for the Inaugural Committee (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, prospectuses of proposed public buildings projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITION

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the petition of A. J. Porth, of Wichita, Kans., praying for a redress of grievances, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S. 3265. A bill to authorize the erection of a monument to honor the war veterans of the Oneida Tribe of Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 3266. A bill for the relief of Theodora Kontoulis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3265—INTRODUCTION OF BILL AUTHORIZING THE ERECTION OF A MONUMENT HONORING THE ONEIDA INDIAN WAR VETERANS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am introducing a bill today to authorize the erection of a monument honoring the war veterans of the Oneida Tribe.

The Oneida Indians have a long history of valiant deeds in the service of our country. I think it is only fitting that we show our appreciation.

Although the monument may be small in size, it expresses our great gratitude to the Oneidas for all that they have contributed to our country. Let us hope that this memorial to those who have served with such distinction shall be a lesson to future generations.

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

The bill (S. 3265) to authorize the erection of a monument to honor the war veterans of the Oneida Tribe of Indians, introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG] be added as cosponsors of the bill S. 2973) to provide for the orderly marketing of agricultural commodities by the producers thereof and for other purposes.

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

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2964) to amend title 23, United States Code, in regard to the obligation of Federal-aid highway funds apportioned to the States.

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

RESOLUTION

POLICIES FOR THE SELECTION OF PERSONS FOR INDUCTION INTO THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution urging that the President of the United States act within existing authority to institute as soon as feasible, a fairer and more equitable method for the selection of men eligible for induction into the Armed Forces.

There is no greater problem, with such immediate urgency within the Selective Service System, than the question of graduate deferments. The current policy of selecting the oldest eligible registrants first for induction, and eliminating deferments for graduate students, will result in a disproportionate number of recent college graduates and graduate students being called to the Armed Forces.

It is my firm belief that the real promise of America's future lies in the dedication of those students now engaged in post-graduate education. The long-term consequences of naming college graduates and graduate students as primarily susceptible to the draft will be most damaging. As the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States points out in its argument in favor of reinstituting such deferments:

All fields of higher education are of equally critical importance to the continued welfare and the balanced development of the Nation.

In addition, they state:

The long-range consequences of the present law will be even more serious . . . (for it) will be equally embarrassing to government, industry, and other sectors of the economy.

The concurrent problem here is the present method of selection of the "oldest first." This policy is particularly objectionable to those men who have completed their college or graduate educations, and have become actively involved in their chosen fields. At the age of 22 or 23, the draft is more disruptive than it would be to younger men. Moreover, there are humanitarian considerations which may not be readily apparent. Taking younger men would greatly reduce the number of peak years for which any young man was draft-liable, thus removing the uncertainty and the inability to make long-range plans that exist under present regulations.

I might add that the military has indicated often that younger men adapt more readily to the required training and discipline than do older men. In testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee last year, Gen. Mark Clark said that combat commanders prefer 19- and 20-year-olds as new recruits rather than men in their early twenties. It is also my understanding that the pool of available manpower is extremely large, and indeed growing larger every day with so many men reaching the age of eligibility. With these factors in mind, I fail to see why appropriate changes have not been made.

Under Public Law 90–40, the Military Selective Service Act of 1967, the President has the authority to issue an Executive order eliminating two of the glaring defects in an already overtaxed and inequitable system: First the dilemma of the college graduate or graduate student, and second, the problem of taking the oldest first. The act itself need not be amended. The President already has the existing authority. With the introduction of my resolution today, I urge the Senate, and the President of the United States, to take immediate action on this crucial matter, the consequences of which reach far beyond our limited ken.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 274) was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

S. RES. 274

Whereas the current policy of selecting the oldest eligible registrants first for induction into the Armed Forces and of eliminating deferments for graduate students will result in a disproportionate number of recent college graduates and graduate students being inducted into the Armed Forces after June 1968; and

Whereas such policy will seriously affect civilian manpower needs in teaching, science, engineering, and other critical fields and could have serious repercussions on the future of the Nation; and

Whereas the policy of drafting older registrants first is more disruptive of the lives of young men than if they were inducted at a younger age; and

Whereas the military departments have indicated a preference for younger registrants because they adapt more readily to military training and discipline than older registrants; and

Whereas the number of registrants in the younger age group is more than adequate to fill the current military manpower needs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is hereby declared to be the sense of the Senate that the President

should institute as soon as feasible a fair and equitable method for the selection of persons eligible for induction into the Armed Forces and should provide for the selection of the youngest registrants first in order to avoid (1) unnecessary disruption of the lives of young men after they have completed their education and entered upon careers, and (2) critical shortages of highly skilled and trained persons necessary to the security and welfare of the Nation.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 1, 1968, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2029) to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 relating to the application of certain standards to motor vehicles produced in quantities of less than 500.

THE PRESIDENT AGAIN PROVES HIS GREATNESS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, difficult times pose difficult problems, but then only problems of paramount importance and profound difficulty offer the opportunity for momentous decisions. It is the manner one responds to weighty problems which measures his ability and provides the test of his greatness. I think that our President stood at the pinnacle of his career last night when he informed the American public of his decision not to permit the Presidency to become involved in the partican divisions so clearly developing in this election year. It was probably one of the most difficult decisions he has ever had to make, for in making it, he had to sacrifice himself as a candidate for the Presidency. It was one to which he responded with characteristic selflessness and overriding concern for the good of the Republic. It is certianly one with momentous implications for the American people.

Perhaps more than any of his predecessors, President Johnson has been besieged by a succession of problems of crisis proportions. He ascended to the Presidency in the aftermath of a national catastrophe, succeeded in maintaining national calm where panic and hysteria might have ensued, dedicated himself to fulfilling the unrealized dreams of his predecessor, and succeeded remarkably in bringing to the Nation domestic programs which provided great hope for all parts of our Nation.

The first year of Lyndon Johnson's Presidency was a year of incredible achievement. No President had greater success in persuading the Congress of the need for legislation to bring the benefits of our Great Society to those parts of the population which theretofore had been denied them. No President has a greater record of legislative accomplishment. No President enjoyed greater public acclaim than did Lyndon Johnson, 1 year after he became President. So overwhelming was public support that his reelection was a resounding expression of public support, of public gratitude, of public esteem. He was loved in all parts of the Nation, when he was reelected in 1964. He was, like George Washington "first in the hearts of his countrymen." Their love had been richly earned.

The ominous drums of war, already sounding faintly during President Kennedy's administration, were growing much more audible as Lyndon Johnson was sworn in as the elected President of the United States. The Congress granted the President the authority to respond to the menacing threat of war, and the President responded.

Almost from the onset of the war in Vietnam, there began a wave of public discussion almost unparalleled in our history. Lines of opinion became increasingly sharply divided, and the ranks of those convinced that our involvement in the war was unjustified began to grow. The years since 1965 have witnessed increased involvement in the war paralleled by increased public dissension.

Now, Mr. President, I strongly support the right of those who dissent, for the President, like you and I, and indeed, like all men, including those who dissent, may indeed be wrong. Considerable merit may be contained in the opinions of those who dissent. Even if particular opinions do not themselves seem to hold merit, there is considerable merit in the mere fact of opposition. Witness our court system which is an adversary one. Witness our political system which has its opposing parties. Witness the Halls of this Senate where we engage in friendly debate and often disagree quite vigorously.

I believe, Mr. President, that President Johnson also welcomes the public discussion of what is certainly a public issue of overwhelming importance, for upon its resolution hangs the fate of this Nation. He, like I, however, believes that there are limits to the propriety of certain forms of dissension, determined more by the good taste of the dissenter than any legal constraint. He also believes, as do I, that after all is said and done, the ultimate decisions as to whether we are to continue to prosecute the war in Vietnam and what kind of action is to be taken there, is his. It is his constitutional responsibility. It is a responsibility he cannot and has not shirked.

With all that President Johnson has done, I do not agree. I think that there perhaps were some things that could have been done to bring peace closer which were not. Despite whatever disagreement I may have, however, I respect the President's decisions. I know that after considering the best available military advice, after listening to the Members of this Congress, after consulting with his civilian advisers, after considering the public opinion, pro and con, the President has made the decision which he thought best. I have no doubt that he would be the first to admit that he had erred, if indeed events proved that he had. I know also that any decision he has made has been in what he believes to have been in the best interests of this Nation.

The decision which the President announced last evening was made in the same spirit. Confronted by the war in Vietnam, remembering last year's violent summer in so many of our cities, and aware that this summer may bring a repeat performance, struggling with the critical money problems which have occupied the headlines, the President decided that these problems required his full attention. He decided that he could not, in a time of national crisis, devote any of his time—and I quote—"to any personal partisan causes or to any duties other than the awesome duties of this office." He, thereby, effectively removed himself from candidacy for the Presidency.

Mr. President, it is with considerable regret that I applaud the President's momentous decision. Surely, the Nation will be losing a great President, but the reasons for his decision I can fully appreciate. I am sorry that the President had to sacrifice himself for what he believes to be the paramount responsibilities of his office and the good of the Nation. Let us unite in our resolve, Mr. President, that this noble act shall not have been in vain.

NEW LIGHT ON A DARK SUBJECT

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to an article published in the latest issue of the Journal of the Armed Forces, the issue of March 30, 1968, which sheds new light on a dark subject—the Vietnam casualty reports.

So much has been written about the number of lives that have been lost that it is easy to lose sight of the number of lives that have been saved. Too many lives have been lost but we can be thankful for those saved. The medical save rate in Vietnam, as the Journal of the Armed Forces article points out, is the highest in U.S. history. Many more lives would have been lost in Vietnam, it is apparent, were it not for the valiant efforts of U.S. military medical personnel and the helicopter rescue units.

The Journal article also puts the overall casualty picture in perspective by comparing U.S. casualties in Vietnam with U.S. losses in other wars. It is a responsibly written report by a responsible publication and I commend it to the Senate. 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:

THE CASUALTY LIST: DISTURBING BUT DISTORTED

(By James Hessman and Louis Stockstill)

Despite growing and disturbing casualty lists, members of the U.S. Armed Forces—in a very meaningful sense—have been winning their grim race with death on the Vietnam battlefield.

No troops in U.S. history have benefited from such a high "save rate" as have those engaged in the Vietnam conflict.

The heavy losses of the recent Tet offensive may temporarily have distorted or obscured the situation but the fact is that the war in Southeast Asia has been waged since its inception with a lower death rate and lower wounded rate than other wars in which the U.S. has been involved.

Analysis of various official source documents on Vietnam battle casualties reveals that:

The U.S. combat death rate in Vietnam is less than half that of the Korean War.

The wounded rate in Vietnam is lower

than in Korea, and "markedly lower" than in World War II.

The incidence of *serious* wounds (those causing "permanent residual effects") also have been lower in Vietnam than in Korea.

At the same time the analysis discloses (1) that ground forces have suffered over 90% of all U.S. battle deaths in Vietnam; (2) that, in aircraft accidents/incidents, non-combat deaths almost equal combat deaths.

A compilation of casualty statistics (Table A) discloses that the United States had suffered 20,096 combat deaths in Vietnam as of March 16, 1968, latest date for which data was available as the JOURNAL went to press.

TABLE A.—U.S. BATTLE CASUALTIES IN VIETNAM (AS OF MAR. 16, 1968)

	Killed in action	Wounded or injured: Died of wounds	Wounded or injured: Nonfatal wounds	Missing: Died while missing	Missing: Returned to control	Missing: Current missing	Captured/interned: Died while captured	Captured/interned: Returned to control	Captured/interned: Current captured/interned	Summary: Combat deaths: In aircraft: Fixed wing	Summary: Combat deaths: In aircraft: Helicopter	Summary: Combat deaths: In ground action	Summary: Combat deaths: Total
Army:													
1961-66	3,445	360	23,561	347	25	29	4	3	14	34	279	3,843	4,156
1967	4,039	580	33,556	808	7	36	4	5	9	11	191	5,229	5,431
1968	2,188	248	13,701	234	5	111	1	1	3	3	84	2,584	2,671
Total	9,672	1,188	70,818	1,389	37	176	9	9	12	48	554	11,656	12,258
Navy:													
1961-66	144	18	971	37	7	49	0	0	46	78	7	114	199
1967	260	27	2,338	24	0	45	0	0	61	20	19	272	311
1968	90	19	857	37	0	16	0	1	4	20	7	119	146
Total	494	64	4,166	98	7	110	0	1	111	118	33	505	656
USAF:													
1961-66	108	10	846	143	10	256	1	0	34	232	5	25	262
1967	90	7	587	75	5	167	0	0	71	135	6	31	172
1968	42	8	380	14	4	33	0	2	10	19	1	44	64
Total	240	25	1,813	232	19	456	1	2	115	386	12	100	498
USMC:													
1961-66	1,790	232	12,360	5	4	42	0	0	2	16	69	1,942	2,027
1967	3,077	362	25,523	0	0	23	0	0	8	12	64	3,363	3,439
1968	1,091	127	7,337	0	2	43	0	2	5	9	39	1,170	1,218
Total	5,953	721	45,220	5	6	108	0	2	15	37	172	6,475	6,684
Total:													
1961-66	5,487	620	37,738	532	46	376	5	3	96	360	360	5,924	6,644
1967	7,466	976	62,004	907	12	271	4	5	135	178	280	8,895	9,353
1968	3,411	402	22,275	285	11	647	1	6	22	51	131	3,917	4,099
Total	16,364	1,998	122,017	1,724	69	850	10	14	253	589	771	18,736	20,096

When the number of men who have died is combined with the number of men who have been injured or wounded in Vietnam, the total dead/injured/wounded column adds up to 142,113—or some 5,200 more than in Korea (Table B). But in Korea there were 336,629 U.S. battle dead, 13,533 more than in Vietnam.

No comparison with the Korean War can be valid, however, unless the casualty rate is related to troop strength. Top U.S. strength in Korea was 358,735. At latest count there were 509,000 U.S. military personnel in Vietnam (333,000 Army; 34,000 Navy; 83,000 Marine Corps; and 59,000 AF). This is 150,000 more than in Korea.

Thus, it readily can be seen that 13,000 fewer men have died in Vietnam, despite a much higher troop deployment than in the earlier conflict.

Even more meaningful, perhaps, is some of the information gleaned from statistical studies periodically conducted by the Office of the Army Surgeon General (OSG). These studies have computed the death rate per thousand men per year in the combat zone.

The most recent study shows that, from July 1965 through January 1968, deaths in Vietnam from all combat causes (killed in action, died of wounds, died while captured, and declared dead from a missing status) "occurred at a rate of 19.2 per thousand average troop strength per year." This compares "to a rate of 43.2 Korea and 51.9 for the [WWII] European Theater of Operations from June 1944 [D-Day] through May 1945."

[In the United States in 1966 some 29,500 Americans died in home accidents. In 1967 more than 53,000 U.S. citizens died in traffic accidents (over 1,000 per week). Some 2,700 additional Americans (more than 50 per week) were killed in firearms accidents. About 2,400,000 Americans suffered "disabling injuries," including 600,000 who suffered "permanent impairments."—National Safety Council figures.]

TABLE B.—OTHER WARS

War and branch of service	Number serving	Casualties: Battle deaths	Casualties: Other deaths	Casualties: Wounds not mortal
Revolutionary War, 1775-83 (total)	[1] 184,000-250,000	4,435		6,188
Army		4,044		6,004
Navy		342		114
Marines		49		70
War of 1812, 1812-15 (total)	286,730	2,260		4,505
Army		1,950		4,000
Navy		265		439
Marines		45		66
Mexican War, 1846-48 (total)	78,718	1,733		4,152
Army		1,721	11,550	4,102
Navy		1		3
Marines		11		47
Civil War (Union forces only) 1861-65 (total)	2,213,363	140,414	224,097	281,881
Army	2,128,948	138,154	221,374	280,040
Navy	84,415	2,112	2,411	1,710
Marines		148	312	131
Spanish-American War, 1898 (total)	306,760	385	2,061	1,662
Army	280,564	369	2,061	1,594
Navy	22,875	10	0	47
Marines	3,321	6	0	21
World War I (Apr. 6, 1917, to Nov. 11, 1918) (total)	4,734,991	53,402	63,114	204,002
Army	4,057,101	50,510	55,868	193,663
Navy	599,051	431	6,856	819
Marines	78,839	2,461	390	9,520
World War II (Dec. 7, 1941, to Dec. 31, 1946) (total)	16,112,566	291,557	113,842	670,846
Army	11,260,000	234,874	83,400	565,861
Navy	4,183,466	36,950	25,664	37,778
Marines	669,100	19,733	4,778	67,207
Korean war (June 25, 1950, to July 27, 1953) (total)	5,720,000	33,629	20,617	103,284
Army	2,834,000	27,704	9,429	77,596
Navy	1,177,000	458	4,043	1,576
Marines	424,000	4,267	1,261	23,744
Air Force	1,285,000	1,200	5,884	368

[1] Estimated.

The wounded in Vietnam also have fared better than their predecessors who fought in earlier wars.

Touching upon the save-rate, the OSG study comments that: "Of the wounded admitted to medical treatment facilities, 2.3% have died of their wounds. This is slightly less than the 2.5% recorded for the Korean War, and markedly lower than the 4.5% for WWII."

The medical save rate actually is more impressive than even these figures would indicate. Because of the greatly increased use of helicopters for medical evacuation, a number of mortally wounded personnel—who would not survive in any case—now reach hospitals alive. Because they die *after* arrival at the medical facilities, they are counted against the medical save rate. As the OSG study notes, such personnel in earlier conflicts "would have died on the battlefield and been considered and counted among the 'killed in action'."

Use of the medical evacuation helicopter is but one of the factors contributing to the high Vietnam save rate. Among other factors frequently cited are the qualitative improvement of hospitals (many, if not most, have modern surgical wards), the forward location of many permanent-installation medical facilities, the greater availability of whole blood, increased use of protective armor, more and better survival gear, and improved and intensified air rescue activities.

In addition, the types of weapons employed by the enemy would seem to have some bearing on the dead/wounded ratio. Among combat deaths in Vietnam, the OSG study observes that, "much higher proportions are due to small arms fire, and to booby traps and mines than in Korea or in WWII, and much lower proportions are due to artillery and other explosive fragments than in these earlier conflicts.

The study comments that among nonfatal wounds the proportion due to small arms fire, although not markedly different from WWII, is "somewhat lower than in Korea. The proportion due to booby traps and mines is considerably higher than in either of these past two wars, and the proportion due to explosive projectiles and fragments is slightly lower. Also, some 6% of the nonfatal wounds are due to punji stakes, which were not a factor in the earlier conflicts."

Data compiled for the House Armed Services Committee by the Defense Intelligence Agency also adds significant shading to the overall picture. The DIA statistics show that, of 99,817 personnel injured in combat from January 1965 through December 1967, some 48,565 (48.7%) were returned to duty without hospitalization. Of the 51,252 hospitalized, 38,545 (75.2%) were returned to duty after a short stay. Some 23,539 went back to in-theater duty, and 15,006 were sent elsewhere.

In all, 87,110 (87.3%) of all wounded were returned to duty within 90 days after being wounded.

Of the other 12,707 personnel: 3,400 (3.4% of the total number wounded) were discharged disabled; 1,585 (1.6% of the original total) died; 7,722 (7.7%) remained in the hospital—an estimated 50% of this latter group (3,861 personnel) were expected to be returned to duty, which would bring to 91.2% (90,971 personnel) the overall total of wounded returned to duty, and to 8.8% (8,846 personnel) the number died, discharged disabled, or not expected to be able to return to active duty.

The DIA report embraced all Services. The OSG study, which considered Army casualties only, took a different approach, computing the number of wounded per thousand per year. The study found that in the period July 1965–January 1968 in Vietnam, Army troops receiving nonfatal wounds were admitted to medical treatment facilities, at a rate of 82.8 per 1,000 average strength per year. In Korea this rate was 121.1 and in the WWII European Theater of Operations from D-Day to V-E Day it was 152.

The Army study disclosed that, "if percentage ratios of these surviving wounded to the total of battle deaths plus surviving wounded are computed, it is seen that some 70.7% survived in WWII, 73.7% survived in the Korean War, and 81.2% have survived in Vietnam."

Not only have there been fewer actual deaths, as well as fewer deaths and fewer wounded per thousand in Vietnam than in Korea or in WWII, but there also are indications that the incidence of major wounds—of the type which leave permanent residual effects—also is somewhat lower in Vietnam than in previous conflicts: "Such indicators as are now available," the OSG study notes, "seem to point towards marked improvement over previous experience."

As an example, the study cites the fact that "in Korea and in WWII the number of soldiers with major amputations resulting from wounds, who were admitted to amputation centers in this country, represented 2 to 2½% of the total hospitalized wounded. Thus far, for Vietnam the corresponding proportion is about 1%. From January 1965 through January 1968 the Army general hospitals in this country have reported that 306 wounded patients have been admitted to their amputation services. From January 1965 through January 1968, a total of 227 major amputee Army patients have been transferred to Veterans Administration hospitals. During this same period, the number of blind and deaf Army patients so transferred was 33."

The casualties have not been distributed evenly among the Services. As has always been true in all wars in which the U.S. has fought (Table B), the number of Army deaths (12,258) and of Army wounded (70,818) exceed the dead and wounded totals of all other Services combined. The Army dead/wounded total represents 58.5% of all U.S. casualties for the entire war.

The Marine Corps, with 51,904 casualties (6,684 dead and 45,220 wounded) has suffered 36.5% of all U.S. casualties. The Navy, with 4,822 casualties (656 dead, 4,166 wounded) has suffered 3.4% of the total U.S. casualties. The AF, with 2,311 casualties (498 dead, 1,813 wounded) has suffered 1.6% of the total.

With the Army and Marine Corps combined accounting for 95% of all casualties, it is not surprising that 93.3% of all deaths (18,736 of 20,096) have occurred in ground action.

Of the 1,360 aircraft-related combat deaths, well over half (771) have occurred in helicopter accidents or incidents. The remaining 589 resulted from accidents/incidents involving fixed-wing aircraft.

Statistics on the number of non-combat U.S. casualties in Vietnam (as disclosed in the weekly DoD summaries) show that, as of 16 March, there have been 1,127 aircraft-related deaths (409 helicopter, 718 fixed-wing) of U.S. personnel in Vietnam which were "not the result of action by hostile forces." In other words, almost as many aircraft-related deaths have occurred in non-combat situations as in combat situations.

No truly objective picture of U.S. casualties in Vietnam would be complete, however, without comparative data concerning allied and enemy losses. DoD summaries reveal that, as of 16 March, the South Vietnamese Armed Forces had lost 56,888 personnel in combat since the beginning of the war, and other free world forces had lost 1,947.

During the same time frame, according to Pentagon data, the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese combined had lost 314,460 men.

And enemy losses, already large, have been soaring in recent weeks.

From 1961 through 1966 the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese had suffered an estimated 161,041 combat deaths. The total for 1966—first full year of large-scale U.S. participation—was 55,524. In 1967 the total climbed to 88,104. During the first 11 weeks of 1968 there have been 65,315 enemy combat deaths—a rate close to 6,000 per week (or over 300,000 per year, if the enemy could continue to absorb such losses).

Of perhaps more significance than the actual total of enemy dead is the *ratio* of allied dead to enemy dead—the so-called "kill ratio." DoD statistics show that, from 1961 through 1967, U.S. and allied forces combined lost 70,834 men in combat, and the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese had lost 249,145.

In other words, about 3½ enemy soldiers were killed for each allied soldier killed—such was the ratio at the beginning of 1968.

During the first 11 weeks of this year 8,097 U.S./allied deaths were recorded—this total compared with the 65,315 lost by the enemy, works out to an eight to one ratio.

FARMERS UNION HONORS SENATOR FRANK CARLSON

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, it was my privilege to participate in the banquet session of the National Farmers Union convention in Minneapolis last month and to be present when that organization honored one of our colleagues, Senator FRANK CARLSON, of Kansas.

Senator CARLSON was presented with the National Farmers Union's 1968 award for outstanding service to agriculture.

President Tony T. Dechant, in presenting the award, praised the Senator's consistent friendship for the farm people from whose ranks he himself came, and for his bipartisan approach to agricultural problems.

My own admiration for the Senator from Kansas is well known, and it is a privilege for me to request unanimous consent to include in the RECORD Farmers Union President Dechant's remarks upon presentation of the award to Senator CARLSON, and the biography of the Senator contained in a brochure circulated to all those who attended the presentation banquet.

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

PRESENTATION OF AWARD FOR OUTSTANDING SERVICE TO AGRICULTURE TO SENATOR FRANK CARLSON BY TONY T. DECHANT, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL FARMERS UNION

A great man in politics announced a few weeks ago that he is stepping down after 40 years and going back to his Kansas farm. He is not seeking re-election to the Senate seat he has held for 17 years.

His career is the American dream come true . . . the rise to high office and public trust of a farm boy, the son of immigrant parents who came to Kansas from Sweden.

Frank Carlson's reputation as "Mr. Wheat" or as the "Small Farmer's Friend" is earned. He is a man who never planned to enter politics, and who has never sought the spotlight of publicity.

Yet he has been state legislator, governor, congressman and senator. He has never lost an election. He has never lost touch with Kansas, with agriculture, or with the people who honored him with their votes.

He is a pillar of strength in the international aspects of agriculture, food for peace, international commodity agreements, expanding trade. He saw, before most others, that agriculture is becoming a new and mighty global force in foreign policy.

Perhaps his most important contribution has been his most bipartisan approach to legislation concerning agriculture—elevating the farmer's problems above partisan politics.

Next year, at long last, Frank Carlson will be able to devote time to the land he started out to farm back in the 1920s. The step from

U.S. Senator to farmer in Cloud County, Kansas, is a natural and proud one for this man—for in his heart he never really left the farm.

Before he leaves public office we want to recognize the life-long friendship of this great man for farm people and for agriculture. On behalf of our members, I present to Senator Frank Carlson the National Farmers Union 1968 Award for Outstanding Service to Agriculture.

FRANK CARLSON'S RECORD

Senator Frank Carlson of Kansas has been called by his Senate colleagues, "The Small Farmer's Friend, Mr. Wheat, The Sunflower of the Senate, A Son of the Soil." And, now that he has announced his retirement after 40 years of public service, "A Kansas Legend."

Such glowing tributes for a man who has never sought the spotlight of publicity, who, more often than not, avoided it. Publicly, Senator Carlson is perhaps best known for initiating the Presidential Prayer Breakfasts, an annual non-denominational event now practiced by heads of state throughout the Christian world. To the people of Kansas, he is simply, "Senator Frank," the farmer's friend.

Frank Carlson is truly a "son of the soil"—the son of early settlers of Cloud County, Kansas, who immigrated from Sweden. His parents were true Kansas pioneers who braved the dangers of the prairie and elements to carve out a proud living and heritage from the rich Kansas soil.

He was educated in the Cloud County rural schools, attended Concordia Business College and later completed a course in agriculture at what is now Kansas State University in Manhattan. He holds eight honorary degrees from colleges and universities.

He never planned to enter politics. After serving in the Army during World War I, he returned to Concordia where he began farming and raising livestock. In 1928, while operating his farm in Cloud County, he was asked to run for the state legislature by friends in his home community.

The Cloud County farmer responded by saying, "I agreed to have my name placed on the ballot because I knew I would not be elected; I had too much work to do on the farm for politics." He was elected by a landslide and was re-elected to a second term in 1930.

It was during his early days in the Kansas legislature that Frank Carlson became the friend of the small farmer. He was instrumental in defeating a corporation farming bill that prevented a wholesale takeover of many Kansas family farms enduring hard times.

In 1934, the Republican Party, in an effort to find a positive and attractive candidate, asked the young legislator-farmer to run for Congress. Despite the fact his farm was his first love, he agreed to run.

The sixth district of Kansas elected him to Congress in 1934. Re-elected five times, he withstood the depression, the dust storms of the 1930's and a political climate that was the downfall for many others. His reputation as a friend of the farmer became household knowledge in Kansas.

It was on April 27, 1935, that he helped sponsor a bill that would stand as landmark legislation towards conserving and saving our national farm land . . . it was the birthdate of the Soil and Water Conservation Service. He was a powerful proponent of this act during hearings—coming from a state where he had seen good top soil blown right out of the country.

The Carlson farm, still in operation, was again destined to take a back seat in 1946. Frank Carlson was elected governor of Kansas and was re-elected in 1948. During his administration, farmers benefited from provisions for vast, new research facilities to seek new uses for farm crops and new industrial opportunities. Governor Carlson, recalling his early days at Kansas State University, foresaw abundance through research and knowledge.

As governor, Frank Carlson also put a long-range highway program into effect that, in many cases, enabled rural citizens to reach the market place with comparative ease for the first time.

In 1950, Frank Carlson's career of public service became complete. He became the only Kansan to serve as representative, governor, and U.S. senator. He was elected to the Senate in 1950 and was returned in 1956, and in 1962.

Owning and operating his family farm in Concordia gave him insight into the problems of those engaged in agriculture. He sponsored many initial flood control and soil conservation projects. The public law providing for extensive watershed projects is the result of the Hope-Aiken bill introduced by Frank Carlson. He literally changed the face of his once arid state into one of fertile crop lands, conservation and recreation.

Recently, Senator Carlson has been instrumental in the Kennedy Round trade negotiations that have greatly enhanced the opportunities for American agriculture to participate profitably in the international exchange of goods.

A second key element with regard to liberalizing trade agreements is the Food for Peace program. As he has stated publicly, "Perhaps our greatest contribution in the struggle for world peace is our ability and capacity to produce food and our willingness to share that knowledge and bounty with our neighbors and friends."

Senator Carlson's interest in agriculture is clear in everything he does. In the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, he maintained that rural people should share equally with their urban friends the great benefits of general news and specific scientific data for the advancement of agriculture. He has been a firm supporter of low distribution rates for weekly newspapers and agricultural magazines.

In the Senate Foreign Relations Committee he has consistently stated that while military might is essential for our national defense, food for peace and freedom over the world may prove the mightiest weapon of all. Through this program, the United States has provided food to people in 116 countries, containing almost half of the world's population. Senator Carlson believes agriculture is a new and mighty global force in our foreign policy.

Perhaps the most important contribution Senator Carlson has made to the American farmer over the years, however, is his almost "bi-partisan" approach to legislation concerning agriculture. Although he avoids the spotlight, he is a tower of strength in committee and on the floor where the legislative decisions are made.

Many Carlson bills designed to meet specific needs have passed without hearings. Two of his bills this session—one to end federal estate tax discrimination against the family farm and ranch and the other to provide some control over noxious weeds on federal lands adjacent to crop land—will attract little publicity and few headlines. But they will save the farmer millions of dollars. He is truly the man behind the scenes in American agriculture and he prefers it that way.

Now, in his last year of public service, Senator Carlson has turned his attention to agriculture of the future. In a recent speech he said the farm picture today is not so much one of despair and failure but of challenge and change. He predicts a new and exciting world of agriculture with a new breed of farmer—a highly-educated and talented man who must run a technical and complex business operation.

In his retirement statement, Senator Carlson said his 40 years of public service had been the American dream come true—the son of immigrant parents being honored and entrusted to public office.

At long last, Frank Carlson will be able to devote time to the land he started out to farm back in the 1920's. The step from U.S. senator to farmer in Kansas is a natural and proud one for this man—for in his heart he never really left the farm.

OUR INTELLIGENCE IN VIETNAM TERMED FAULTY

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it is extremely disappointing to me and, in my opinion, it is a manifestation of poor judgment on the part of President Johnson that when re relieved Gen. William C. Westmoreland of his command in Vietnam he postdated it to next July 1. This is very unfortunate for American fighting men now in South Vietnam and Thailand.

The evidence is clear and convincing that General Westmoreland has made very miserable use of the Armed Forces under his command. He was clearly outgeneraled by the leaders of the armed forces of the National Liberation Front or Vietcong who noisily and openly massed many battalions of VC and North Vietnamese troops encircling Khe Sanh on three sides. It should have been evident to an alert general that such rather noisy massing of soldiers in the early darkness and until midnight before Khe Sanh during the latter part of January was a bluff or feint to have our generals withdraw our forces from other areas, leaving those areas bare and unprotected to the devastating attacks carefully planned and prepared by the VC leadership.

General Westmoreland and other generals of his command informed me in Vietnam approximately 2 weeks before the Tet holiday that the VC and Vietnamese would attack Khe Sanh in force probably 3 days before the Tet holiday, planning to overrun it and then celebrate their great victory during the holiday season. General Westmoreland adopted a grandiose scheme of encircling the encirclers before Khe Sanh by withdrawing some 40,000 men of our Armed Forces from the central highlands and even in the Mekong Delta and sending them to the Khe Sanh area and to the other outpost areas near the demilitarized zone. The VC struck everywhere else in South Vietnam and met with huge success during all the time that our marines, the best offensive fighters in the world, were held on the defensive in fortified enclaves such as Khe Sanh and Danang.

Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara complained that General Westmoreland, with more than a half million men under his command, was making use in combat of some 67,000 while the others were engaged in clerical, supply and so-called logistic work in Saigon and other areas many miles from the combat areas. In Vietnam I learned with amazement that huge numbers of marines and our infantry were even assigned to so-called pacification work in the provinces and hamlets.

For many months I have spoken out against our involvement in a civil war in

Vietnam. In particular, in recent months I have denounced our ineffective conduct of the war and the fact that everywhere throughout all South Vietnam more than half a million American soldiers and marines, in addition to 50,000 Republic of Korea soliders, have been stationed in defensive positions. It seems amazing that the Marine generals, and in particular General Westmoreland who is in supreme command and who dictates the policy, remain in defensive position, fortified strongholds, so called, which are not so fortified, despite the fact that daily and nightly these positions are pounded by mortar fire from the VC. Never, to this good—or rather bad—hour, has General Westmoreland ordered the marines and his thousands of other troops, herded in bunkers at Khe Sanh, Danang, and elsewhere, to leap from those bunkers and trenches and under cover of artillery and airpower take the offensive against the VC.

General Westmoreland should be relieved and replaced forthwith, instead of 3 months hence. Our entire policy should be reappraised under new leadership in Vietnam and by President Johnson and Defense Secretary Clifford in Washington, eliminating Secretary of State Rusk from decisionmaking as his views all along have been proven wrong.

Mr. President, in the Washington Post of March 30, 1968, under the caption "U.S. War Intelligence Called Faulty," there was published a column by Jack Anderson, a highly respected, nationally known columnist, stating in most convincing terms the fact of our deplorable situation in Vietnam, the lack of adequate handling of our Armed Forces, and the startlingly inadequate intelligence, so-called, relied on by our generals. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. WAR INTELLIGENCE CALLED FAULTY

(By Jack Anderson)

The United States cannot afford to wait until Gen. William Westmoreland's delayed departure from Vietnam next July to repair his failures. Here are problems that need immediate attention:

Intelligence gap: It is now clear that our policy makers have been basing their war plans upon faulty intelligence. Before the Communist Tet offensive, Secretary of State Rusk justified his hawkish views by showing intimates a confidential report from Saigon. We have now obtained a copy of this pre-Tet document. It's amazing in its errors, yet it had great influence on Rusk's thinking.

"We have mounting evidence that the Southern-born enemy is rapidly losing heart for the war," declared the report. "Once the enemy was able to recruit about 7000 men per month from the population. Now we believe fewer than 3500 are recruited; and many of these are boys 14 and 15 years of age. Women are also being recruited where possible in order to release more men to combat.

"No doubt the enemy is trying to offset his recruiting deficiency in the South by increasing his rate of infiltration from the North. While we do not know just how successful he is, we believe he has not sent South enough men to offset his losses during the past several months. We believe the tide has turned and the enemy strength is on the decline. There is evidence of faltering morale and discipline among the Southern enemy—the true Vietcong. There are fewer but significant signs that the Northern invader is likewise weakening."

The Tet lunar offensive proved just the opposite. Last November we reported that Westmoreland's former intelligence chief, Maj. Gen. Joseph Alexander McChristian, was transferred to Ft. Hood, Tex., because his bosses in the Pentagon didn't like his pessimistic estimates of Communist infiltration and recruitment. They preferred to believe lower, more comfortable estimates of enemy strength.

The Air Force, in particular, disputed McChristian's figures, because they implied that Air Force bombing was not slowing down the infiltration from the north.

Today intelligence experts generally agree that McChristian was right, that the official figures underestimated enemy strength by as much as 130,000.

Strategic gap.—Westmoreland has relied largely upon conventional strategy to defeat an enemy who has refused to fight according to the rules laid out in the West Point textbooks. Many observers feel that the United States might have done better if Westmoreland had forgotten all he learned in World War II and studied the Indian wars instead.

More and more, our troops find themselves operating from fortified strongholds into hostile country, just as the cavalry did in Sitting Bull's day. The parallel is heightened by the Marines at Khesanh, who must know how Custer's troops felt at the Little Big Horn.

At Khesanh the Marines find themselves crowded into a bull's-eye, pounded from all sides by Communist artillery. Trained as a shock force, to be used in offensive situations, the Marines haven't done an adequate job of digging in for defensive trench warfare.

In the Mekong Delta, meanwhile, Army units trained for foxhole fighting are being used in amphibious assaults against the fleeting guerrillas in the swamps. They should have been in Khesanh, and the Marines in the Delta.

The South Vietnamese army has also been organized by its American advisors in the image of the U.S. Army, trained to fight a conventional war. Westmoreland has largely ignored pleas that the South Vietnamese be retrained and re-equipped to fight guerrillas. He has given only nominal support to his own counterinsurgency forces, which know how to fight Vietcong-style warfare.

Manpower gap: When Westmoreland took command of our forces in Vietnam in August, 1964, the U.S. role was limited almost entirely to advising the South Vietnamese army. Our troop commitment was then only 27,000 men. At his urging, there has been a continuing increase in American participation. The troop strength is now close to 600,000 men.

Of these 600,000, only 65,000 to 100,000 men are in combat. The rest are behind desks or in garages and storehouses—a bureaucracy of half a million men.

Westmoreland's decisions have been dictated, in part, by President Johnson. The general ruefully refers to the heat from the White House as "the blowtorch." LBJ has shown his gratitude by appointing Westmoreland to be the next Army Chief of Staff, which, though a kick upstairs, is nevertheless a promotion.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S DECISION NOT TO RUN

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, like all Americans, I was greatly surprised at President Johnson's announcement that he will not seek renomination for the Presidency. I had expected him to run, and I felt he would win renomination and reelection.

His very moving statement last night that he will not run represents the ultimate sacrifice for national unity. It is a sacrifice that saddens me, but I salute the President's courage.

The President and I have known each other and worked together for many years. I know of no American who loves his country more deeply, and I can think of no man who has gone further or done more to make our United States a greater nation.

I have sent the President the following telegram:

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

It was with deep and stunned regret that I heard your announcement that you would not seek reelection to the Presidency. It has been a rare privilege to serve in the United States Senate while a fellow Texan of my party was President—a privilege that comes to few Senators in America. Your great services in the fields of health, education, agriculture, civil rights, labor, relief of poverty, and all other fields of domestic progress and welfare marks your Administration as one of the all time great Presidencies in the field of public welfare of all the people. God bless you and keep you in good health.

RALPH W. YARBOROUGH.

Let history reflect that the Johnson administration is an administration of domestic triumphs. More significant education legislation; more new laws to assure human dignity; more efforts to reduce the gaps between the haves and the have-nots have emerged during the 5 years since Lyndon B. Johnson became President than in any similar period of our history. The Johnson years have been years of achievement for every American.

SPECIAL DRAWING RIGHTS

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, this past weekend a decision was made in Stockholm which should draw a sigh of relief from every one concerned about the world monetary system. In Stockholm, the big 10 financial powers—including, of course, the United States—agreed to the creation under the auspices of the International Monetary Fund of a new international asset, Special Drawing Rights.

Special Drawing Rights, or "paper gold," as they have come to be called, will increase substantially the volume of credit available to finance trade expansion. This credit increase is direly needed, for as John Maynard Keynes warned at Bretton Woods in 1945, the world's supply of gold is too limited to cover the increasing flow of capital between nations.

On several occasions, I have advocated that we sever our monetary link with gold altogether, and set about a basic overhaul of the international monetary system. Although the creation of "paper gold" is not the extent of what needs to be done, it is certainly a giant step in the right direction.

Mr. President, yesterday the Washington Sunday Star published a very intelligent editorial on this subject. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial

was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Mar. 31, 1968]

PAPER GOLD AS AN ALTERNATIVE TO CHAOS

It is probable that gold, the most beautiful of all the elements, was the first metal to attract man's attention. It is certain that since the earliest civilizations, gold has held a mystic fascination for mankind; a fascination that defies all rational explanation.

Man has fought wars for gold. He has murdered for gold; enslaved his brother, denied his gods and—in recurrent legend—sold his soul to the Devil for gold. The worth of the individual and the wealth of nations has been measured in gold from the beginning of recorded time down to the present.

But at this moment in time, men have planned the most decisive move ever made to free themselves from the ancient thralldom of gold. This weekend, in Stockholm, officials of the Big Ten—the major financial powers of the free world—have tried to move the international monetary system toward logic and away from the idolatry of gold as the basic medium of international financial transactions.

The idea of an international scrip—paper gold—for use in dealings between central banks is not new. In 1944, representatives of 45 nations met in Bretton Woods, N.H., with the aim of creating international machinery to prevent wild fluctuations in the value of national currencies, to pool resources to aid member nations over economic rough spots and to curb the sort of financial adventurism on the part of the major economic powers that had, in the past, touched off international depressions.

The result was the International Monetary Fund, which now counts a 107-nation membership—nearly all the non-Communist countries of the world—and which exercises a considerable measure of control over the financial practices of all the member nations. At the time of the founding of the IMF, it was decided—largely at the insistence of the United States—to retain the traditional predominance of gold as the basic medium for international exchange. But prescient voices were raised, notably that of England's John Maynard Keynes, who urged the creation of a new international medium of exchange for use by governments only, and who warned that the world's supply of gold was too limited to cover rapidly expanding international trade and the increasing flow of capital between central banks.

Keynes' vision of 24 years ago has today become a reality. The gold crisis, which has temporarily been brought under control by the creation of a two-price gold system, was a manifestation of the inability of the gold supply to keep pace with the demands of world trade. So long as the international financial waters remained calm, so long as confidence in the dollar remained high, there was no major problem. Central banks and monied speculators were willing to maintain large percentages of their reserve funds in dollars and to refrain from taking advantage of the United States' pledge to redeem foreign-held dollars for gold at $35 an ounce.

But in recent years, that confidence has begun to erode. Foreign bankers and investors noted that the United States' balance of payments had shown a deficit in 17 of the past 18 years. They noted that the outflow of dollars from the American economy was increasing rapidly. They watched inflationary pressures building up, budget deficits increasing, and they took careful not of the fact that neither the administration nor the Congress seemed to take the matter very seriously.

It was not a question of America going broke. No nation with a gross national product pushing a trillion dollars is going to hit the gutter in the foreseeable future. But serious doubts began to grow that the United States would ever take the fiscal steps necessary to protect the dollar from devaluation. As those doubts grew the demand for gold in return for dollars began to grow. And the doubts began to feed on themselves, creating a 24-karat snowball. The United States, faced with $34 billion foreign-held dollars and $10.4 billion in gold holdings, was forced to take emergency action.

The first emergency step was the creation of the two-price system for gold. One price—$35 an ounce—was fixed for monetary gold. A free market, uncontrolled and unsupported, was established for speculators. The supply of gold on the free market is more than enough to meet the demands of technology, jewelry and dentistry, on which gold depends for its intrinsic value. The big speculators, notably the oil-rich sheiks whose personal wealth rivals that of many governments, had hoped to make a killing by forcing a devaluation of the dollar in relation to gold. They have been left, instead, holding a very dubious bag.

But the monetary crisis is by no means over. Renewed doubts about paper currency and about the determination of the United States to defend the dollar could send the price of gold on the free market skyrocketing again. Some nations would be sorely tempted to go for a quick killing by selling their gold holdings to the speculators, despite the warning that if they do, their gold holdings will not be replaced.

The next logical step to bring a semblance of permanent order to the potential monetary chaos is the one decided upon in Stockholm; a step toward the total abolition of gold as a monetary metal. The idea of establishing an official currency, known as Special Drawing Rights, has been under consideration for years and has won general international acceptance. But now, the need for SDRs has taken on an urgency that should finally produce results.

The final steps will not be easy ones. There is powerful opposition to the concept from Charles de Gaulle, who insists that the Western world should turn back the clock to the 19th century by a restoration of the full gold standard. De Gaulle would solve the problem of a shortage of gold by raising the price of gold to a point at which it would, once again, be of sufficient value to cover international financial transactions.

Such an arrangement would, it is true, be of benefit to France, which is second only to the United States in its gold holdings, and is second to no Western nation in the percentage of its national treasure tied up in gold. But the belief is that even De Gaulle will have to realize that France cannot impose its will on all the other fund nations and cannot refuse indefinitely to join in a general monetary reform.

There are economists in this country who take a very dim view of any move by this or any other government to cut its monetary system completely free from all monetary metal. To do so, they argue, is to remove all restriction on the issuing of paper money. An irresponsible administration could then try to solve its financial problems merely by printing more money.

But the fact is that the International Monetary Fund and the proposed paper gold should themselves act as a very effective curb on any such monetary hanky-panky. SDRs would be in part a form of international currency and in part a form of credit. A given nation's drawing rights would depend, in part, on its credit rating in the community. A disorderly financial house would not sit well with the other partners.

It would mean, for the United States, no relaxation of the necessity to tidy up its affairs by controlling its balance of payments problem, by cutting the budget deeply and by raising taxes materially. It would, if anything, mean an increase of the pressure, for the success of the plan would depend in large measure on the integrity of the dollar, and the failure of the plan would mean international financial chaos.

It would mean some loss of economic sovereignty. But the gold crisis has already shown that the United States is not a financial island unto itself. This country, in its own self-interest, must pay close attention to foreign opinion.

It will mean an agonizing fiscal belt tightening—once the practicalities of the election make it possible—regardless of who is elected president. But there is, it would seem, no reasonable alternative.

OVID A. MARTIN, OF ASSOCIATED PRESS, HONORED BY FARMERS UNION

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, at the banquet session of the National Farmers Union convention in Minneapolis recently, which I was privileged to address, a distinguished service to agriculture award was presented to Ovid A. Martin, farm writer for the Associated Press here in the Capital. He has held that post for more than 30 years.

The Farmers Union's award to Ovid is a well-deserved tribute, and I took satisfaction in being present when it was given to him. Ovid was a veteran of the farm struggle when I came here as a Member of the House in 1957. The very fact that he has survived and won widespread respect while reporting one of the most controversial policy and program fields in American political and economic life is really all that needs to be said to prove that he richly deserved the recognition he received.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to place in the RECORD the remarks of President Tony Dechant of the Farmers Union when the presentation was made and a sketch of Mr. Martin contained in a brochure presented to those at the meeting.

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

PRESENTATION OF AWARD FOR DISTINGUISHED SERVICE TO AGRICULTURE TO OVID A. MARTIN OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS BY TONY T. DECHANT, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL FARMERS UNION

Telling agriculture's story is one of the challenging responsibilities of a farm organization. And it becomes increasingly important in a society that becomes more and more urban . . . that now has 70% of its people living on 1% of its land.

As one editor from an eastern metropolitan paper said to me recently, "Tony, what you don't seem to realize is that there are hundreds of thousands of people in big cities that have never seen a live cow."

We are confronted with misunderstandings . . . with attitude problems . . . and by outright propaganda. We can not afford to take these things lightly because gaps in information are reflected in editorials . . . in positions taken by labor, business and other urban-based groups . . . in decisions made in Statehouses and in Congress.

Fortunately, most of this misunderstanding about agriculture and farm people is in the big cities. The main reason is that the rest of the country is served by a large number of professional farm writers, editors and broadcasters.

Many of them have been at this convention. All of you know them . . . both from their work and from their appearances at farm meetings.

These men are committed to farm people . . . they identify with you . . . they attempt to interpret you and your problems to the public . . . they are your advocates.

Their after-hours bull sessions, much like ours, deal with such things as the out-migration of young people from rural areas . . . low farm prices . . . the quality of rural schools and other facilities . . . the effect of low farm income on Main Street businesses.

We don't insist that a farm writer or broadcaster should be biased toward our viewpoint (although we certainly don't discourage that). All we ask is that they present our position fairly . . . and we hope, often. We want our viewpoint to be part of the continuing farm policy debate in agriculture.

A number of farm writers, editors and broadcasters spend a lifetime in the high calling of interpreting agriculture . . . of doing this job in line with the highest standards of objectivity, fairness and responsibility. That is the kind of man we are honoring here tonight.

Ovid Martin, one of the most modest and unassuming reporters in Washington, is the dean of American farm writers. That is a title Ovid would never claim for himself. But it is one that is earned and unchallenged.

His entire career, spanning 42 years of reporting farm policy news, has been closely tied to events shaping the lives of farm and rural people. The byline "By Ovid A. Martin" has appeared in large papers and small. City and farm people alike follow the clear and objective reporting that marks his work.

To Ovid A. Martin, farm writer, we present our 1968 award for distinguished service to agriculture.

FOR OUTSTANDING SERVICE TO AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

OVID A. MARTIN'S RECORD

Ovid Martin, one of the most modest and unassuming reporters in Washington, is the dean of American farm writers. This is a title he would never claim for himself. But it is one that is earned, deserved and unchallenged.

His entire news career, spanning 42 years, has been closely tied to events shaping the lives of farm and rural people. The byline, "By Ovid A. Martin," has appeared in large papers and small, and from border to border. It is the trademark of careful and objective reporting, read and understood by farm and city people alike.

When Ovid Martin came to Washington in 1936, the nation for the first time was attempting to deal directly with the economic and social problems facing agriculture. He witnessed, and reported on, the New Deal, the Depression years effort of President Roosevelt that put the beginning of our farm programs on the books.

He was transferred to Washington by the Associated Press from the bureau in Topeka, Kansas. There, as AP correspondent, he had covered the dust storms, drouth, and economic hardship that drove hundreds of thousands of farm families off the land. This experience could not help but move the spirit of a man who, even then, identified closely with the people who tilled the soil.

He also is a perceptive and experienced political reporter. He helped cover the Presidential campaign of Alf Landon, a Kansan, in 1936. A month after the election Ovid Martin was transferred to Washington, a move that prompted Gov. Landon to remark, "Well, Ovid, I'm glad that one of us got to go to Washington anyway."

This transfer removed him from the Missouri and Kansas farm areas he knew so well. He was born in the central Missouri farming community of Iberia in 1904. He grew up in Tuscumbia, Missouri, where his father published a rural county seat weekly paper.

He attended the University of Missouri where, in 1926, he was graduated from that institution's famous School of Journalism. Upon graduation, he joined the news staff of the Springfield (Mo.) News and Leader, with the county agent's office one of his news beats.

In 1933 he joined the news staff of The Associated Press at Kansas City, Missouri, beginning a distinguished career with that international wire service. He went to Topeka, then to Washington to cover the House of Representatives, and finally to the Department of Agriculture assignment.

Ovid Martin has covered the department longer than any other man. He has covered the administrations of six Secretaries of Agriculture—Henry Wallace, Claude Wickard, Clinton Anderson, Charles Brannan, Ezra Taft Benson, and Orville Freeman.

It has been a long time since the farm planks in the platforms of either political party escaped the sharp analysis of Ovid Martin. He has helped cover 15 national political conventions, explaining to his readers the aspects affecting agriculture.

When the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) was organized at an international meeting in Quebec, Ovid Martin was there. He also has covered dozens of conventions of national farm groups including, of course, several by Farmers Union.

He accompanied one secretary of agriculture on a tour of farming areas of West Germany, Yugoslavia, Poland, Finland, Sweden, Norway and the Soviet Union.

He has never been the kind of reporter who sought honors or awards. Among those he has received is the J. S. Russell Award for distinguished service to agriculture, given annually by the Newspaper Farm Editors Association.

THE CASE AGAINST A TAX INCREASE

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the Wall Street Journal on March 22, 1968, carried a very interesting article on the proposed tax increase, substantially endorsing the position of my distinguished colleague, the senior Wisconsin Senator, WILLIAM PROXMIRE.

The article notes that renewed administration pressure has been extered for a tax increase because of the balance of payments and gold crises

Senator PROXMIRE, and the article agrees, says that a tax increase will aggravate and not improve our balance-of-payments position.

I recommend that my colleagues take a few moments to glance through the article, for it makes some powerful arguments. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

THE CASE AGAINST A TAX INCREASE

A great many people, both in and out of Government, contend that the gold crisis has made a 10% income surtax imperative. It is, however, possible to argue quite persuasively that a tax boost, far from solving the balance-of-payments problem, could easily make it worse.

One man who does so is Senator William Proxmire, chairman of the Joint Economic Committee. "The surtax," the Wisconsin Democrat declares, "would weaken our balance-of-payments position. It would aggravate the gold outflow."

In the Senator's view the tax-rise talk is a bit paradoxical. "Consider," he says, "that on February 6, 1964, the then Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon told the House Ways and Means Committee that the tax reduction recommended that year . . . would help our balance of payments.

"He said that it would do so by making American investment more attractive relative to European investment, and help stop the flow of American capital and U.S. gold abroad. And Dillon was right. In the two years following the 1964 tax reduction, America's balance of payments did improve."

This year it is reasonable to assume that a tax increase would depress expectations of after-tax business profits in the U.S. and thus make investment in other countries relatively more attractive. Ironically this would come at a time when Europe's slower economic pace has been diminishing U.S. interest in investments there.

Senator Proxmire is no more optimistic that a tax boost would counter the inflationary forces that are making U.S. exports less competitive abroad. In fact, a tax is a cost that would tend to push prices of America's exports still higher.

The Senator is probably close to the mark when he estimates that it would take more than a year for a tax increase to have any significant anti-inflationary impact on the domestic economy. Even that assumes the Government would not use any revenue gain as an excuse for stepped-up spending—a risky assumption at best.

In any case, the Government almost certainly cannot wait a year or more for improvements in the nation's payments position. Like the rest of the Administration's gadgetry the "two-tier" gold market has given the U.S. some time to maneuver, but the time is more likely to be measured in weeks than in months.

Much more quickly effective, Senator Proxmire comments, would be sizable reductions in nondefense Federal spending. Cuts in outlays, furthermore, would be at least as effective as a tax rise in alerting other nations to the fact that the U.S. had finally awakened to its financial responsibilities.

For our part we would add that spending reductions also would take account of the circumstance that the payments crisis has been caused almost entirely by actions of Government, not the public. Therefore a tax increase, in addition to its other flaws, would be more than somewhat unfair.

Even as a booster of Federal revenue, a tax rise could prove to be self-defeating. In the current uncertain economic situation the increase could deflate economic activity to such an extent that the higher levies would produce not more but less revenue.

Finally, on a politically pragmatic basis spending cuts look fully as good as a tax increase. There are of course potent pressures for maintaining or raising practically all sorts of Federal nondefense outlays, no matter how nonessential or ineffective the spending has been. But Congressmen shouldn't kid themselves into believing that the gold crisis has softened the public's antipathy to a tax rise in this election year.

On all counts, then, the case against a tax increase appears powerful. And, as Senator Proxmire says, the case is strengthened, not weakened, by the urgent need to restore a stable dollar.

INDIAN EDUCATION

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, last week it was my privilege to participate in hearings before the Subcommittee on Indian Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I regret very much that these hearings, which had already been postponed and rescheduled several times, came during a very busy time in the Senate. Information was uncovered and testimony taken that I think will prove most helpful as we seek to devise ways of improving Indian education.

Mr. President, I invite the Senate's attention to a statement made during one of our meetings that sums up the Indian educational problem better than I have heard it done before anywhere. When I first heard Miss Marion Antone, of the Papago Tribe, give this statement, I was moved more than I can express. I invited her later to repeat it for the news media, and although she was quite nervous, she did an excellent job.

Miss Marion Antone is a high school senior at the Indian Oasis School, near Sells, Ariz., west of Tucson. I ask unanimous consent that her statement before the Subcommittee on Indian Education be printed in the RECORD.

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

Members of the Senate committee, honored guests, parents, and fellow students, I have been asked to come before you this day to represent high school boys and girls on this reservation. I am supposed to be able to tell you what we the Papago boys and girls of the high school age want for educational opportunities.

Realizing that I cannot possibly speak the minds of all my fellow students I will attempt to tell you how I feel and I am sure that most other Papago boys and girls must feel.

First of all I want to make it extremely clear that we do not like our present position of poverty and ignorance caused by the lack of educational opportunities. We do not want charity—we do want—opportunity. We want the opportunity to help ourselves. We want the opportunity for good education and we can help ourselves.

To me education means more than a diploma. Many of our people have had diplomas from high school. Many of these same people were not educated.

During the entire history of our Papago people, less than 10 people have graduated from college, so I am told by Mr. Ray Narcho.

Gentlemen, does this tell you anything? Some people have said that the Papago people are dumb, some people said that the Papago people don't care, I care. I am not dumb and I don't believe that any other boys and girls on this reservation are anymore dumb or care any less than children anywhere.

What is this education about which I speak?—I do know that it has something to do with knowledge. We need knowledge. We need knowledge about ourselves, about our country and about how to do things like all other Americans.

Education cannot be bought with money—education cannot be bought with dedication. It can be bought by all of the things I just mentioned.

Money has been too often used as a measurement of educational opportunity—not far from this spot you can see a new school building being built. As you travel over this reservation you can see many other school buildings—the old saying, "a house doesn't make a home" applies here—buildings do not make schools.

It is true that we need these buildings but we also need more dedicated teachers who believe in us. We need leaders who seek our opinions. We need leaders who respect us.

We do appreciate what others have tried to do especially on the national level. But we cannot tell other people what is best for them anymore than they can tell us what is best for us.

I am sorry that I cannot tell you just what our schools should be like. I do not have the experience. I do know that all of us want an opportunity to become whatever we desire—limited only by our abilities.

Give us these opportunities and we will give you in return—responsible, productive American citizens instead of wards of the United States Government.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

TAX ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1968

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 995, H.R. 15414.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 15414) to continue the existing excise tax rates on communication services and on automobiles, and to apply more generally the provisions relating to payments of estimated tax by corporations.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Chair will recognize Senators HANSEN, CLARK, and CASE.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator CASE may be permitted to proceed out of order notwithstanding rule VIII.

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

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I thank the acting majority leader for his courtesy.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Senator.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S ANNOUNCEMENT THAT HE WILL NOT BE A CANDIDATE FOR REELECTION—THE VIETNAM CONFLICT

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, President Johnson's announcement that he will not be a candidate for reelection occupies all our thoughts today.

All Americans, regardless of party, must join in common sympathy and compassion for the travail through which Mr. Johnson must have passed in reaching his decision.

Yet, even as we pause to honor the courage with which he faced and made his personal decision and as we share in a measure the suffering through which he has passed in reaching it, we must continue our concern with the problems which face our Nation and all of us and which inevitably were his chief concern.

And so I feel that remarks which I prepared for delivery today should not be postponed.

They deal with Vietnam and our country's role in that unhappy land.

In his speech last night, overshadowed only by the President's announcement in regard to his noncandidacy, was his statement in regard to deescalation of the bombing of North Vietnam. Incidentally, this is a step which I urged in practically identical terms many months ago. I am glad he has taken it.

But his speech as a whole, it seems to me, does not advance matters much. I waited in vain for some recognition of the essential failure of our policy, namely, the making of this struggle into an American war and the failure to get the South Vietnamese to do what they must do if it is ever to be won.

More than 2 years have passed since Senators MANSFIELD and AIKEN returned from Vietnam to warn that, in the absence of a negotiated settlement, we faced an "indefinite expansion and intensification of the war which will require the continuous introduction of additional U.S. forces."

Nothing has occurred since then to fault the logic of that prediction. To the contrary, everything that has happened confirms its remarkable—and terrible—accuracy. The number of American troops in South Vietnam has grown in this time from 170,000 to more than 500,000, and still the war rages on with no end in sight.

It is no wonder that the expanding scope of our involvement—and the swiftly rising number of our casualties—have contributed to the growing sense of frustration, misgiving, and apprehension here at home. But it is not only the "open-ended" nature of this war that underlies the spreading bewilderment and bitterness among Americans.

More and more, the confidence of the American people is being sapped by the growing belief that if the administration continues its present policies it can have no hope of saving South Vietnam except by destroying it.

The recent Tet offensive against the cities revealed far more than the hollowness of claims that we were making steady progress in providing security to the people, that at long last there was "light at the end of the tunnel."

What these bloody weeks have brought into focus is the true costs to the South Vietnamese of relying upon American firepower for their protection. Vast sections of Saigon, Hue, and other cities were reduced to rubble as the only means of dislodging the Vietcong attackers. To the millions of refugees who had already fled the countryside were added hundreds of thousands in the urban areas. And this promises to be only a beginning, for it appears that the enemy retains the capacity to set off further rounds of "saving" destruction.

Is the American commitment in Vietnam such that, inexorably, we must destroy the country and its people if that is the only way to deny victory to the other side?

When I asked that question of Secretary Rusk when he appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, he responded by denying the premise and asserting that we had inflicted a great deal more destruction on Germany in World War II than has been the case in South Vietnam.

The Secretary's analogy was highly questionable, and in any event most unfortunate, for it was the opposite of reassuring. It implied a commitment to "unconditional surrender" in Vietnam and a willingness to destroy a good deal

more of the country if need be. Such a commitment, I submit, speaks more for the failure of administration policy in Vietnam than for its success.

What has become of our essential objective of helping the people of South Vietnam to build a cohesive society and viable nation?

For all the talk of steady progress in nation building, the Thieu government rules today by martial law, holds many of its political opponents in jail, and advances an inch for every mile of proclaimed reform. The proportion of Vietnamese military forces willing and able to provide security for the people remains appallingly small. And of genuine public support for and loyalty to the Government of South Vietnam there is precious little, if any, evidence.

But the lack of significant progress toward strength and stability in South Vietnam is not, of itself, the full measure of our policy failure. The full measure of the administration's failure lies in its refusal to recognize the fact that, by turning this into a largely American war, it has deprived the Vietnamese of any real incentive to take up their own cause.

Last summer, on my return from a trip to Southeast Asia, I called attention to the fact that in the judgment of some close observers, the United States no longer exercised any real influence or "leverage" in South Vietnam because the regime there had come to believe that we were so deeply committed that it could safely ignore any and all suggestions, requests or even demands we might make upon them for self-help.

As I stated then, this was an intolerable position so far as the United States was concerned. I urged the administration to refuse to accept it. At the same time I warned against the constant increase of American personnel in South Vietnam and the danger that the war was becoming an American war.

My own and many other similar warnings were ignored. The President announced last August, without explanation or public justification, that we would send an additional 45,000 troops to Vietnam, for a total of 525,000. Now, that ceiling has been raised to approximately 550,000. Thus, we continue to compound our loss of effective leverage with the South Vietnamese.

It has become clear to me—and to most Americans, I believe—that the course the administration is pursuing in Vietnam is sterile and self-defeating. It is becoming more and more obvious that this administration can destroy South Vietnam and that, without a change in direction, it will destroy South Vietnam.

Success in South Vietnam depends primarily upon the South Vietnamese themselves, and the odds against their doing what only they can do increase in proportion to the growth of the American presence in their country. As one highly perceptive observer pointed out, how can anyone expect the South Vietnamese Government to change its ways when those who control it have never had it so good. Yet, unless it does change its ways, we are faced with an endless involvement in this war on the Asian mainland at an awful cost in American lives and in Vietnamese lives, both North and South, civilian and military alike. And in the end Vietnam reduced to dust and ashes.

The time has come to redirect our policy in Vietnam to fit these facts. Most needed is a credible assertion that we recognize these facts and are prepared to act upon them, that we are determined to deescalate the American involvement.

How do we get from here to there, from the course of constant increase of American military presence and responsibility to the only course which ever made sense, that of supplying marginal help for a nation effectively meeting a challenge to its survival?

There are several ways by which this reversal of policy could be affected. Several have been publicly discussed.

Common to all must be, of course, every consideration for the safety of our own forces and to the avoidance of adding unnecessarily to the problems and difficulties of the South Vietnamese themselves.

A first step might well be to arrange now for the withdrawal of one or more American combat units by a fixed date. Granted, this would seem a drastic action. But so involved have we allowed ourselves to become that only action, drastic action, will convey to the South Vietnamese regime our determination to insist upon a change of course.

Faced with such a determination, the Government of South Vietnam would be obliged, and would be free, to weigh realistically its interests in pursuing a solution to the war. And that is as it should be. Indeed, that is as it must be if any viable solution is to be reached in Southeast Asia.

If this is not America's war to win, it is not our war to lose.

We can no longer refuse to face the truth so well set down by Barbara Tuchman:

> Where will and motive and energy and ability to resist aggression are not present, they cannot be synthetically induced, nor substituted for, nor can the country in question be propped up from outside.

And, as we cannot do these things, neither can we successfully prescribe the nature of any settlement that the people of Vietnam can or should seek. No outsiders can do this. The primary responsibility is theirs. Only they can meet it. So far we have surely fulfilled in more than generous measure whatever commitments we have undertaken to help the people of South Vietnam settle their own future. We can continue to help but only in a secondary role and only if their own effort becomes such as to hold a fair promise of success.

The time has come, I believe, for that change in American policy which will permit the South Vietnamese to choose among the alternatives to the only future that the mushrooming American presence promises: the devastation of their country.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLOTT in the chair). 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.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule VIII, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN] may proceed for not to exceed 1 hour on a subject that is not germane to the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Wyoming.

THE GOLDEN GOOSE—IS IT DYING?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, the President's announcement renouncing his candidacy is uppermost in our minds today. Eloquent expressions have been made already in the Senate and I'm sure that all Americans will weigh this event for some time to come.

Nevertheless, I had prepared a speech to be delivered in the Senate last week. The Senate has been engaged in very pressing business and because of that business I postponed my speech.

Because the Senate will give all its attention to tax matters tomorrow, it appears best, despite the momentous news events of the day, to proceed with my remarks now.

Mr. President, the week before last was a busy time for Washington and for our Nation. That was the week that Members of this body took to the campaign trail making headlines as they went. That was the week when the people of this country and responsible members of the financial banking community around the world sought to catch their breath following the frantic rush for gold on the free world money markets. That was the week when all Members of Congress began to ponder the need for significant cuts in the Federal budget more earnestly than we had ever done before. Two weeks before that, world confidence in the dollar, and indeed world confidence in this Nation, was at a dangerous low. Today, many of us, indeed I hope all of our countrymen, are asking: "Now, where do we start working to again put things right?"

Thursday before last, I had the privilege of attending a hearing before a subcommittee of the Senate. At the hearing there were no television cameras, there were no bright lights, there were few interested spectators, and even fewer reporters. The Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was chaired by Senator ERNEST GRUENING. Speaking to Senator GRUENING and Senators ALLOTT, FANNIN and myself, was Dr. Walter R. Hibbard, Jr., Director of the Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior. Dr. Hibbard will soon be leaving his post at the Bureau of Mines to accept a responsible position with private industry. In many ways, Dr. Hibbard presented us with a valedictory, but more important he presented us with a landmark statement.

Dr. Hibbard is a brilliant scientist. He spoke quietly but as his testimony progressed, he also spoke with a growing sense of urgency.

I speak out in the Senate today for a number of reasons, but first among these is my concern that Dr. Hibbard's remarks will go all but unnoticed in the feverish competition among ideas now taking place on the contemporary scene. Second, I would note that it has been a little over a year since I first spoke out in the U.S. Senate on the subject of U.S. minerals and fuels policy. I would like to reflect now, a year later, on this subject and would like to indicate my view of where we have, or have not, made progress toward the proper development of our domestic minerals and fuels resources. I would like to draw specific attention to the part that I believe our domestic resource policies should, indeed must, play with respect to our continuing balance-of-payments crisis.

On March 22, Senator GRUENING placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of Dr. Hibbard's formal remarks. Therefore, I will only draw on small portions of his testimony. In addition, though, I would like to have placed in the RECORD at this point the introductory remarks which were made by Senator GRUENING last Thursday, when he opened the public hearing on the increasingly critical problems facing our country with respect to shortages of minerals and our consequent growing dependence on foreign, oceanborne sources of these minerals. I read the remarks:

Dr. Hibbard is an extremely articulate scientist and will develop the case best in his own way. However, by way of background, the physical foundation of our society is based on minerals and the materials derived from them. Among all the world's peoples we enjoy the highest standard of living in no small part because we have been able to develop and utilize the abundant mineral resources of the United States. . . . Minerals are woven inextricably into the very fabric of our history, our economy, and our civilization, and they are indispensable to our continued security. Structures, roads, and machines are built largely of minerals; the energy to heat homes and buildings and to drive the machines is mostly mineral; agriculture fertility is maintained by mineral fertilizers; and the national security is provided by military equipment and machines largely of mineral origin.

We are the world's largest consumer of minerals. We have, in fact, during the past 30 years, consumed more minerals than the entire world for all time prior to that. It is a fact that must be faced that we consume more than we produce. And our own national demands are growing in what seems to be geometrical progression.

The value of mineral imports in 1966 were $2.9 billion and exceeded the value of exports by a ratio of more than three to one. In addition, quantities of semi-processed and manufactured minerals, fuels and other mineral-related products are imported. Department of Commerce statistics indicate that the total dollar value of these imports was $6.7 billion, with exports of $3.3 billion in the same categories. Actually, today, imports supply more than 75 percent of our needs for 20 different mineral commodities. Unless this particular trend is somehow reversed, there appears no alternative to a steady growth in our reliance on imports.

Yet, at the very time our reliance on foreign, ocean-borne supplies of minerals are increasing, we know we have vast reserves of many of the same minerals within the borders of our own country, or within the North American continent. Much of these vast reserves are, unfortunately, of low grade, compared to some foreign sources. This fact, plus high production costs in the United States, plus the attractiveness of the growing foreign market, have resulted in what is perhaps a disproportionate emphasis by Americans on the development of foreign mineral resources.

My long interest in the development of the mineral resources of my own State of Alaska, and my service as Chairman of the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials and Fuels, have impressed on me the great potentials for further discovery of new mineral resources and the further development of these resources now known.

Mineralogically speaking, the United States—and especially my own State of Alaska—may still be an "under-developed" and "emerging" country.

Over the years, from time to time, various units of the Congress, as well as various Commissions appointed by the Executive Branch, have held hearings and conducted investigations as to the validity of the controversial theory or concept that the United States now is a—quote—"have-not"—unquote—Nation.

I hope that these hearings will throw additional light on this vital subject and point to what if anything we should and can do about it.

In his opening statement Dr. Hibbard said:

My purpose is to invite your attention to a situation that is emerging which appears to threaten both the adequacy and dependability of our supply of minerals and mineral fuels. This conclusion has resulted from a long-range study which I initiated a year ago.

In presenting the detailed results of this study to the committee, Dr. Hibbard said:

Of course, our domestic mineral industries now fulfill a substantial portion of our needs and also supply a great variety of minerals to world markets. How long this important domestic capability can be maintained is open to considerable conjecture.

That question lies close to the center of a complex pattern of foreseeable critical issues . . . issues to which we not only should, but absolutely must, give immediate attention. How effectively this attention is directed will largely determine the degree to which an adequate, dependable, timely, and efficient flow of mineral materials may be achieved in 2000, or at any future time, for that matter.

Dr. Hibbard summarized the findings of his study in this way:

Today the United States is the largest consumer of metals and fuels in the free world. It maintains this position by being the largest producer of minerals and fuels in the free world. Over the years, it has maintained its production leadership, even in the face of the necessity for using lower and lower grade resources and rising labor costs, by an aggressive program of exploration and new discoveries and in advancing technology which has reduced the overall costs of extracting and processing these lower grade ores.

Recent and projected trends indicate that U.S. mining interests are turning to foreign sources. The U.S. is now the largest importer of minerals and fuels. Over 75 percent of our requirements for a number of important commodities are imported today. This is not new. For many of these commodities we have never had substantial production. However, major tonnages of our key basic materials are coming from foreign operations:

85 percent of our bauxite for aluminum;

Almost 20 percent of our copper (and probably much more in 1967 and 1968);

40 percent of our iron ore;

Nearly 40 percent of our zinc and more than 25 percent of our lead;

All of our manganese and chromium for steel; and

Our gold and silver production is about one-fourth of our industrial consumption.

Our projections based on population growth indicate that by 1985 our mineral and fuel requirements will increase by about 50 percent on the average, and in some cases by as much as 100 percent.

Facilities for this increased supply require on the average about 5–10 years lead-time and $100 million per venture to bring them on stream.

Then Dr. Hibbard delivered, in his admirable low-key way, the kicker to his statement:

There is no evidence that these facilities are being put in place today to provide for this long-range need. And this is what worries me.

He pointed out that a substantial amount of U.S. exploration and investment for facilities in the future is now being made in foreign countries. Dr. Hibbard summarized the reasons for this trend as follows:

(1) Foreign ores are richer and new technology to mine and process them is not required.

(2) Foreign labor is cheaper.

(3) Many countries are making tax and other financial concessions.

(4) Foreign markets are growing faster than U.S. markets.

He often departed from his prepared testimony and highlighted his discussion with us by examples of events that have prohibited or inhibited the domestic production of such commodities as copper, gold, potash, sulfur, iron ore, aluminum, natural carbonates, uranium, and finally oil shale.

Director Hibbard testified:

If these trends continue, our capability to produce minerals from domestic sources may not only remain static, but in some cases disappear, because they cannot be maintained in competition costwise with foreign production.

Most important, he said that inattention by our Government at this time would result in the idling, and thereby the wasting of abundant resources which are being passed over in favor of more attractive imports.

Last year, at the request of myself and others, the Senate Interior Committee held a series of informational hearings on the "Federal Oil Shale Program." One of the star witnesses at that hearing was John G. Winger, vice president, Energy Resources Division, Chase Manhattan Bank, New York, N.Y. Mr. Winger made no moral judgments about whether domestic capital should or should not be allowed to migrate to foreign investment opportunities. Instead, Mr. Winger presented to the committee in clear and precise terms, using excellent graphs and slides, he had prepared for the purpose, the factors which influence a businessman in making his investment decisions.

Similarly, Dr. Hibbard did not pretend to make a moral judgment about the flight of U.S. dollars to foreign investments, but he did issue to us a stark and dramatic warning. He said:

We may then lose our market leadership with respect to this mineral production and possibly be obligated to pay world prices which are often controlled by the country of origin during periods of tight supply. And I would point out that this future period is going to be a period of tight supply unless someone moves very fast to put in new production facilities.

One need only glance at the morning's news to have his preconceptions joggled about world trade, world monetary arrangements, and U.S. policies with respect to the foreign investment of U.S. dollars. I call the attention of the Senate to three articles that appeared in the Wall Street Journal during 2 days in the week before last.

The first is headlined, "Devaluation of the U.S. Dollar, In Effect, Already Has Occurred, Economists Argue," and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar 18, 1968]

DEVALUATION OF THE U.S. DOLLAR, IN EFFECT, ALREADY HAS OCCURRED, ECONOMISTS ARGUE

(By Chairles Stabler)

NEW YORK.—At the Pentagon, procurement officers buy U.S. construction materials for foreign bases, paying up to 50% more in dollars than the same materials would cost at the construction site.

In Islamabad, dollars given to help development of Pakistan are reduced in purchasing power because they must be used to buy higher-priced U.S. steel rather than being spent in Japan where the same dollars would buy 15% more of the metal.

And at the fashionable George V hotel in Paris, an assistant manager tells an American tourist his dollar Travelers Cheques may not be cashed for francs.

Thus, argue many economists, the dollar already has, in effect, been devalued. Although formal devaluation was avoided yesterday, a patchwork defense of penalties and controls on the dollar's use already hobbles what has long been the world's strongest currency. The result, it's argued, is that a defense procurement dollar, a foreign investment dollar or an Agency for the International Development dollar, isn't worth a dollar.

"In a very real sense, the dollar has already been devalued," maintains Peter B. Kenen, chairman of Columbia University's economics department. Says Milton Friedman, professor of economics at the University of Chicago, "We profess to have kept the exchange rate rigid. Yet we have in effect devalued its selectivity."

Not all economists agree, by any means. Yale University's Henry Wallich scoffs, "It's a question of semantics, with a political background. To call this devaluation does violence to the normal usage of the word."

The argument is more than academic. If, in fact, controls over use of the dollar add up to unofficial devaluation, the argument for maintaining present currency exchange rates is weakened. Professor Friedman, for example, argues that multiple exchange rate systems are an inevitable outgrowth of an artificial gold price peg. He would, "abolish governmental price fixing. Let exchange rates become free market prices determined primarily by private dealings."

To an economist, the term devaluation means the lowering of one nation's currency in terms of the currency of other nations. It's brought about when there is an oversupply of the weaker currency, such as when, in the present case of the U.S., a nation runs a continuing deficit in its balance of payments with another nation. If the rate of exchange between the weak currency and the stronger ones—its price—doesn't change freely, it must be shored up artificially.

A change in the price of gold wouldn't necessarily mean devaluation, economists note. Other nations can simply change their relationships with the dollar in the same amount. In the end, the dollar's official value in terms of gold might be, say $70 an ounce, or twice the current level, but it could remain worth four West German marks or 625 Italian lire, as it is now.

If the U.S. continued to send more dollars abroad than were brought home, the need for selective controls—unofficial devaluation in the opinion of many economists—would remain.

What form has this concealed devaluation taken? Some economists argue that the most obvious loss in buying power of the dollar has come through inflation—a lowering of the dollar's current value in terms of its past value as a currency.

EFFECT OF INFLATION

"Remember we have had actual devaluation of our dollar over a period of years—devaluation measured in very real terms," says Arthur A. Smith, economist for the First National Bank in Dallas. "Inflation has so eroded the real value of the dollar that it now takes about $2.50 to buy what $1 bought in 1940. That is the kind of devaluation we must live with—devaluation that hits us squarely in the pocketbook."

However, other nations have also experienced inflation, so that net effect on exchange rates is lessened. In fact, says James Meigs, economist for New York's First National City Bank, "the dollar has probably suffered less (from this deterioration) than any other currency."

More clearly damaging to the purchasing power of the dollar have been selective controls over its use, most economists agree. The U.S. has clamped these controls on three major areas:

Tied Aid: Dollars given to other nations by the Agency for International Development must be spent in the U.S., even if they would buy more goods in other nations. This aid is running at about $2 billion a year.

There are no solid estimates of how much this rule has reduced dollar purchasing power for recipients of this aid, but it's probably 15% to 20%, estimates C. Fred Bergsten, an economist for the Council on Foreign Relations. A case study of aid to Pakistan, for example, indicates that if that nation had been able to spend its dollars freely, they would have bought 15% more in actual quantity than they did by being spent in the U.S.

Defense Procurement: Since 1961, the Defense Department has been willing to pay a premium of up to 50% in order to buy goods in the U.S. for use overseas, instead of buying them freely on the world market.

PURCHASING HERE AND ABROAD

According to a Defense Department study, from the beginning of 1961 through June 30, 1967, procurement officers spent $340 million in the U.S. for goods that could have been purchased abroad for use abroad. If these goods had been purchased abroad, the spending would have been reduced by $75 million, or 22%. This study covered only certain categories of products, leaving out oil, for example, so the total extra cost charged against defense of the dollar was higher.

The Interest Equalization Tax: Since 1963 there has been a Federal tax on money used by Americans to buy foreign securities from foreigners. In effect, this tax is geared to increase the interest foreigners must pay for American investment money. The same requirement, designed to discourage the outward flow of U.S. dollars, was extended to long term bank loans in 1965.

The tax originally amounted to 15% on these portfolio dollars and represented, in effect, a 15% devaluation of these dollars. It has since been raised and the President has authority to boost it further, to 22.5%.

In addition, there are other hard-to-measure controls that have the effect of devaluing the dollar. For example, as of the beginning of this year, there are mandatory controls over direct investment in industrialized, developed foreign lands. An American company may still build a plant in Germany, but it may have to borrow foreign money at relatively higher interest rates in order to finance it. In effect, these higher interest rates represent a devaluation of the dollars so borrowed, economists argue.

DEFENSE OF OFFENSE?

New proposals for defense of the dollar could represent further devaluation. For example, a border tax on imports into the U.S. would be "massive" devaluation, says Mr. Bergsten, and would move dollar defense into a new, more touchy area. He notes that measures taken so far have involved capital movements and transactions between governments. Controls on trade, or on tourism, might easily provoke retaliation by other countries.

"We would be breaking the international rules," he says. Agreements such as the one setting up the International Monetary Fund or the General Agreement of Tariffs and Trade, seek to limit such unilateral restrictions on trade. They're less binding on capital movements.

However, the present monetary crisis already has sparked incidents indicating an informal and unofficial weakening of the dollar in terms of other currencies. Over the week-end, for example, there were numerous cases of foreign hotels or banks refusing to accept dollars at the official rate of exchange, or limiting the amount they would accept.

And earlier, some American businessmen detected the same decline in confidence. Nelson B. Bosted, executive vice president of International Rectifier Corp., Los Angeles, said he recently asked a European creditor if he would accept Italian lire instead of dollars in payment of a debt. To the American's surprise, the creditor said he would in fact prefer lire.

"He said it half jokingly," says Mr. Bosted, "but only half."

Mr. HANSEN. The second article, titled "Tiger in the Tank of Peruvian Fields," by Roger W. Benedict, describes how U.S. private investment in foreign countries is plagued by the capriciousness of unpredictable foreign governments. Perhaps our State Department, which in the past has actively sought to stimulate U.S. private investment in underdeveloped countries by favoring an increase in oil import allowances within administration councils, should look at facts for what they are. Despite these efforts by the State Department, it is now clear that U.S. investors are leaving such countries as Peru, Venezuela, and the more volatile Arab States at a fast walk.

I ask unanimous consent that this article, which appeared in the March 20, 1968, issue of the Wall Street Journal, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

TIGER IN THE TANK OF PERUVIAN FIELDS

(By Roger W. Benedict)

An affiliate of the world's largest oil company is learning how nightmarish international business agreements can be in these days of nationalistic fervor. The lesson is being taught by a small democratic nation generally considered friendly to U.S. investment.

The big company is Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) and the affiliate is International Petroleum Co., of which Jersey Standard owns a comfortable 99.9%. But the real tiger in the tank is the Republic of Peru.

What began as a dispute over taxes flared into a crisis last July, when the Peruvian congress passed a law canceling IPC's title to La Brea y Parinas oil fields, Peru's second largest. The measure also authorizes President Fernando Belaunde to expropriate any company equipment and property used to produce, refine, store, transport and sell oil from the fields—assets IPC puts at $200 million.

The law provides no compensation to IPC and states that any payment for other seized assets would take into account any "debts owed by IPC to the State." Peru says it plans to sue IPC for $144,015,582, which it calculates to be the company's entire profit from La Brea y Parinas for the last 15 years—as far back as Peru's statute of limitations permits a claim to be made. The government has also forced IPC to pay another disputed new retroactive tax by threatening to attach all IPC funds in Peru. Yet in the end Peru will surely lose more than it gains.

What is the dispute all about? There isn't even agreement on that. An ancient land grant is apparently the central issue, but a review of the history of this document, and the complex unfolding of recent developments, suggests "national sovereignty" is more important than the legalistic dispute over the land grant. The controversy has also become entwined with Peruvian domestic politics.

Unlike all other oil and mining operations in Peru, La Brea y Paranas oil fields are on private property, rather than being a concession granted on goverment-owned land.

EXPENSIVE SPECIAL STATUS

At present, private ownership results in somewhat lower payments to the government than a concession would pay, since royalties are paid on oil produced on government-owned land. But the property's special status has often meant higher, rather than lower taxes. In fact, IPC's efforts to convert the fields to concession status in 1957 were rejected by the government on the ground it would reduce the company's taxes.

Status of the land grant has been the subject of several disputes between the government and prior owners. Most notable was a controversy between 1911 and 1922, finally resolved by an international arbitration tribunal and two treaties. Peru disavowed those agreements in 1963 and now contends it can claim the title and past profits from La Brea y Parinas. IPC asserts that even if such unilateral and retroactive action could be condoned, it still would not alter title to the area, which it says dates the earliest years of the Peruvian republic.

"La Brea" in Spanish means pitch. The ancient Incas and later the Spanish Conquistadores collected tar-like deposits to waterproof their boats from an area in extreme northern Peru on the Pacific Ocean, which became a mine owned by the Spanish crown. Simon Bolivar, the "Great Liberator," whose defeat of Spanish armies forced Spain to recognize Peru as an independent nation in 1824, decreed all abandoned mines to be state property that could not be sold to repay debts incurred in Peru's fight for independence. One of these was the former crown pitch mine called "La Brea de Amotape." It was awarded to Jose Antonio de Quintana in payment for supplies provided Peruvian hero Jose de San Martin.

Jose de Lama, who owned the estate surrounding the mine, bought it from Mr. Quintana, and the combined 643-square-mile area eventually came to be known as "La Brea y Parinas." In 1863, just four years after the first oil well was completed in the U.S., the first oil well in South America was drilled on the pitch deposits. The result was La Brea y Parinas oil fields.

The property's status came into question when Peru passed laws in 1873 and 1877 to revalidate mining claims and to tax them. Genero Helguero, who had inherited La Brea y Parinas, claimed exemption from both laws on the basis the oil fields were private property. A Peruvian court in 1888 levied taxes on the oil fields equal to those on ten mining claims, but upheld Mr. Helguero's private ownership claim. When Peru started an official compilation of real property in 1899, La Brea y Parinas was duly registered in it.

Two British citizens, Herbert Tweedle and William Kestwick, bought the oil fields and leased them in 1889 to London & Pacific Petroleum Co. In 1911, Peru decreed taxes on them equal to 41,614 mining claims. When company efforts to contest these taxes were overruled, the British government protested on behalf of the company. This eventually led to the international arbitration award and two treaties between Peru and Britain, specifying a $1 million tax settlement and setting tax rates on La Brea y Parinas through 1972.

Much of the subsequent resentment of this decision probably relates to the Peruvian view that a powerful foreign nation, Britain, forced an unpopular compromise on a weaker nation, Peru. And Peru, which once ruled what is now Bolivia, had lost another area to Chile and has had border disputes wtih Colombia and Ecuador, is quick to take offense at anything it feels imposes on its sovereignty.

IPC inherited the La Brea y Parinas dispute by buying the oil fields in 1924. Recognizing resentment over the private-property status of the fields, IPC asked in 1959 that they be changed into a concession subject to terms of Peru's 1952 petroleum law. The government rejected IPC's petition.

Following sharp devaluation of the Peruvian sol in 1958, President Manuel Prado in 1959 approved price increases on petroleum products. Opposition parties attacked both the new prices and IPC, but the increases proved an ineffective political issue. So attacks were switched to seeking nullification of the 1922 arbitration award. A consulting commission named to study the issue asserted such action would be "improper," so the government suggested negotiating a new type of agreement with IPC. Congress failed to act on the proposal.

In his presidential campaigns of 1962 and 1963, Mr. Belaunde, seeking support of opposition groups, promised to resolve the status of La Brea y Parinas. On taking office he said he'd negotiate a settlement within 90 days. But IPC charged that his proposals would take over 100% of its profit from the oil fields, and talks broke off. Congress then passed a law voiding the 1922 award.

GOVERNMENT COUNTERPROPOSAL

New talks began in 1964. IPC thought it had agreement on a contract giving Peru 65% of the profit. But the government submitted a new "counterproposal" calling for a 90% take. There followed over the next three years a wild succession of proposed settlements and proposed legislation ranging from a two-thirds profit take to expropriation.

The situation is further complicated because the Congress is controlled by two opposition parties, not President Belaunde's alliance of two other parties. This opposition coalition introduced the legislation last summer that confiscated IPC's title to La Brea y Parinas and authorized expropriation of IPC assets. Under an option in that new law, President Belaunde last fall announced his intention to put La Brea y Parinas up for bid. But when IPC indicated it did not intend to join the bidding, these plans were indefinitely shelved.

After the government announced late last year its intention to sue IPC for $144,015,582, IPC considered further negotiation futile. But earlier this year the government indicated it still may be willing to talk. It announced that any such discussions in the future would be between IPC and the heavily subsidized government-owned oil company, Empressa Petrolera Fiscales.

Meanwhile there are indications that some Peruvians are not unmindful of the long-term consequences of the dispute.

Peru's potential losses loom larger than those of IPC. For one thing, IPC is currently Peru's biggest taxpayer, contributing $26.1 million to the nation's coffers in 1966. If the heavily subsidized government-owned oil company winds up running La Brea y Parinas, as now seems likely, a large plus for the federal treasury could become a minus.

Far more important could be potential impact on future development of Peru's oil industry and its economy as a whole. Once the world's tenth largest source of crude oil and a major oil exporting nation, Peru has slipped to 27th place in oil output and has been forced to import steadily rising amounts of oil the last five years. With its internal oil consumption expected to about double in the next decade. Peru's oil production is declining and oil exploration has dwindled.

Oilmen suspect there are large untapped oil reserves in Peru, a nation as big as Texas, New Mexico and Arizona combined. They've found major new oil fields in the Amazon jungles of neighboring Colombia and Ecuador. But so far they've plowed little exploratory money into Peru, and they say the IPC affair dampens interest in Peru at a time when the U.S. has further tightened restrictions on foreign investment.

EXPERIENCE AND OUTPUT

It's obvious that Peru will need the help of both foreign capital and technical knowledge to adequately search for and develop its oil and gas resources. And IPC has already shown what an experienced oil company can do to boost the country's oil output. IPC more than quadrupled production from La Brea y Parinas within ten years after buying title to those oil fields, although they contain some of the world's most complex oil geology. IPC has more than tripled output in the neighboring Lobitos oil fields, Peru's biggest, the last ten years, after buying a 50% interest in them and taking over as operator. What's more, IPC is the country's biggest oil refiner, and Peruvians can buy gasoline as cheaply as 10½ cents a gallon, probably the lowest prices in Latin America.

Then, too, there are other IPC contributions to the Peruvian economy. Its employes are among the most highly paid in the country, receiving $18.4 million in wages and benefits in 1966. And IPC bought $28.9 million of materials and supplies from other Peruvian companies in 1966.

Should Peru seize IPC assets without adequate payment, it could also jeopardize a sizable flow of U.S. foreign aid. The Hickenlooper amendment to U.S. foreign aid legislation permits the State Department to cut off funds to any nation expropriating U.S.-owned assets without providing adequate compensation. Peru has received an estimated $379 million in U.S. economic and military assistance the past seven years, and is scheduled to receive $34 million more this year.

IPC's weird adventure has not gone unnoticed by other U.S. subsidiaries in Peru, of course. (And 10 of Peru's 20 biggest taxpayers in 1966 were U.S. subsidiaries.) A spokesman for one large U.S. mining company with operations in Peru said the government had tried to assure company officials that the IPC matter was a special case.

"But," he adds, "it's causing us some unease."

Mr. HANSEN. I ask unanimous consent that a third article, headlined "Oil Producing Nations May Bid Firms Pay More if 'Free' Gold Price Rises Too Much," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 20, 1968]

OIL PRODUCING NATIONS MAY BID FIRMS PAY MORE IF "FREE" GOLD PRICE RISES TOO MUCH

International oil companies may face demands for higher oil taxes and royalties from major producing nations if the free-market price of gold rises too much above the fixed $35 an ounce official exchange rate on the U.S. dollar.

Kuwait, the tiny Persian Gulf country that ranks as the fourth largest source of Free World crude oil outside the U.S., has asked for an emergency meeting of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries, (OPEC), made up of nine major oil-producing states.

The meeting is said to have been called to review oil payments to producing countries in light of the current world monetary crisis.

Should the nine-nation group demand higher oil payments based on the free-market price of gold, in effect, it would be unilaterally devaluating the U.S. dollar. This is something many international financial experts have feared might occur with establishment of the "two-price" system for gold. Under this system, the U.S. continues to pay $35 an ounce for gold in governmental dealings. Supply and demand fix the price in unofficial, or free-market, transactions.

Officials of international oil companies both in the U.S. and abroad were reluctant to comment about the possible demands. But one international oil expert predicted there would be resistance to any such demands, asserting that if they should be forced on oil companies, it could lead to a flight of important amounts of oil capital to non-OPEC countries and to ventures outside the oil industry.

OFFICIAL COMMENT DECLINED

Officials of OPEC at the group's headquarters in Vienna declined to comment on the meeting, its purpose or where it would be held.

Greatest concern over the gold situation appeared to be among the Middle East oil countries, which like to hold gold in their national reserves. They have also been quick to seize on any development that might increase their revenue from oil companies. For example, when Britain devalued its pound last November, the Middle East countries received oil payments computed in pounds immediately asked for a switch to computing them in dollars.

Other OPEC countries are Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Libya, Saudi Arabia, Venezuela, and two other small Persian Gulf members, Abu Dhabi and Qatar.

Oil companies are already being asked by Middle East producing countries for modification of various allowances and crude-oil pricing that would amount to eventual increases in annual tax and royalty payments of between $120 million and $250 million, depending on final terms of pending agreements.

Seven OPEC members (excluding Indonesia and Abu Dhabi) received a total of $3,474,400,000 in oil payments in 1966. Each country boosted its oil output in 1967 from 1966, and several raised tax and royalty rates.

One U.S. banker asserted that if new demands are made on international oil companies, "they'll begin to squeeze the golden goose too hard."

PRECEDENT CITED

The banker recalled that adverse decisions by the Venezulan government several years ago led to a heavy flight of oil capital from that country, much of which brought about the rapid rise of Libya as a new oil power. Libya's swift climb, in turn, also cut into the oil production growth of not only Venezuela, but the Middle East countries as well. The same type of situation could happen again, he said, with capital this time fleeing to Australia, Africa or even back to the U.S. He noted that in 1966, for the first time, oil companies earned a higher return on investment at home than abroad.

He also noted increasing investment by oil companies outside the industry, and pointed out that one company, Signal Oil & Gas Co., now has more nonoil than oil ventures.

Present oil company contracts with producing nations call for payment in dollars or pounds, not in gold. A spokesman for one Middle East country raised the possibility of seeking insertion of clauses in oil contracts protecting against devaluation of the dollar or gold revaluation. But it seemed unlikely that any practical method could be devised to do so, since the potential cost to a company would be prohibitive. The suggestion however, indicates there is Middle East concern over the gold situation.

The wider the spread between the official $35 price and the free market price—$37 to $39.50 an ounce yesterday—the more pressure is likely to develop from oil-producing nations for renegotiation of oil contracts.

Mr. HANSEN. The conclusion that I come away with after listening to Dr. Hibbard and reviewing the day's news is simply that we must look to the heartland of our own country rather than abroad if we are to assist, by domestic minerals and fuels policies, in bringing order out of the chaos caused by our imbalance of payments. By this, I do not mean that we as politicians can set things right by locking our doors and shutting our eyes to all events abroad, but we must form policies which will stimulate domestic, as opposed to foreign, investment of U.S. dollars.

Dr. Hibbard addressed himself to one way of reversing the alarming trends which threaten to debilitate our economy, our dollar, and our world stature. He put it this way:

> The answer to these trends—the ways and means of retaining leadership in world mineral production is clear from history—that is, the retention of world leadership in technology, the technology of exploration and discovery, extraction, processing and use.

To sum up, I believe that those of us charged with the responsibility for influencing present and future policy must see to it that our Government of laws is administered in such a way as to make our domestic industry and our domestic sources competitive in the world marketplace wherever that is possible.

Let me hasten to add that I oppose any attempt by our Government to impose further restrictions on U.S. investment abroad. Critics of the administration's recent attempts in this direction argue that such a policy would worsen rather than lessen our long-range payments problems. But U.S. investment capacity is a finite thing. Businessmen in this country choose that investment opportunity which promises the greatest return. Presently, decisions are being made on whether to place large amounts of U.S. capital in long-term investment either at home or abroad. What I am arguing is that where we have a clear opportunity to produce a domestic resource profitably, such as our oil shale and associated minerals, this opportunity should be positively encouraged by our Government. Long-term investment decisions are being made today in the private sector. Our Government cannot afford to procrastinate in making its mineral policy decisions if this country is to keep pace in the world markets of the future.

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

Mr. HANSEN. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Wyoming on his speech, which I have read, with respect to the mineral hearings we held week before last.

We both share a very common interest in the entire question of minerals, the production of minerals and their relation to our economy as well as our national welfare.

I believe it is unfortunate—I am sure the Senator has said this in other words—that the entire Senate could not have been present when Dr. Hibbard testified and, without any wraps on him—politically or otherwise—expounded so clearly on the economic forces which move the mineral markets of the world. He also expressed quite clearly why the mineral resources of the United States have not been developed. Frankly, I believe everyone who is interested in the economy of this country should read his testimony. I believe the Senator agrees with this.

Mr. HANSEN. I do, very much.

Mr. ALLOTT. Certainly, anyone who is interested in the national welfare of this country, as determined by our future interests, should read that testimony, because we are at the dividing point.

I have offered several times in the Senate a bill to establish a national minerals policy; and it came out quite clearly at those hearings that Dr. Hibbard had approved this bill and had sent it on to the hierarchy in the Department of the Interior, where the approval had promptly been lost, and it has never been communicated to the Committee on the Interior, although it has been requested several times.

I believe the Senator is performing a very worthwhile service for the Senate in calling attention to an area about which most people very rarely think. They do not wonder where their aluminum, copper, steel, antimony, zinc, lead, or any of the other minerals come from. Yet, either we are going to attack this problem, which the last two administrations have failed and refused to do, or we may well wind up in the next few years dependent basically upon foreign countries for our raw materials, which would mean we would also be at their mercy in times of crises both as to supply and price. Does the Senator agree with that statement?

Mr. HANSEN. I agree with the statement very much.

I am delighted to have the Senator, who is a recognized authority on oil shale, participate with me this afternoon.

Senators who read the RECORD are aware of the fact that last week the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] had printed in the RECORD a factual and comprehensive statement which the Senator from Colorado delivered in New York City in February calling the attention

of the people of this country to the great emergency facing the people of the United States.

As I recall, the Senator chose as the title of his address "To Be or Not To Be." In that excellent speech he called attention to the fact that if we are going to have the development of oil from oil shale, we have to get onto the job now. Leadtime is required, and great investment is required. These are things which cannot be postponed, as Senators know, until the last minute or until we need oil from this source. Is that correct?

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is entirely correct.

When one considers that we have 800 billion barrels of oil from high grade oil shale in Colorado alone, not to mention the high grade shale in Utah and the formation in the Senator's great State of Wyoming, it is fantastic that the Department of the Interior could have made so many continuous blunders and forays off the trail in this attempt to develop one of the greatest assets of this country.

I applaud the Senator and I sincerely hope that he and other Senators, both on the other side of the aisle and on this side of the aisle, will be able to call the attention of the country and the Congress to the fact that we are in fact bypassing one of our great resources and letting it become a "has been." We will come to the day when we will rue our lack of attention.

I thank the Senator for yielding and I compliment him on the very learned speech he is making, not only with respect to oil shale, but also all minerals. I can agree with the Senator in almost all respects, if not in all respects, and I agree with his conclusions.

Mr. HANSEN. I thank the Senator very much for his gracious remarks.

U.S. POLICY FOR SYNTHETIC FUEL PRODUCTION—DO WE HAVE ONE?

This brings me to focus on the issue which was the subject of my first speech in the Senate, oil shale and its associated minerals. I would like to expand upon that issue now to have it include the entire question of synthetic fuel production from both oil shale and coal sources which will be required if we are to meet our domestic demands within the next decade.

Many leaders and executives from both the private and public sectors have spoken out in the last year to the effect that synthetic fuel production will be required to meet domestic needs within a time certain. Some of these authorities list the year 1975 as the point at which the domestic requirements will demand fuel sources in addition to that which can be reasonably supplied by the present crude oil petroleum industry. Others state the year 1980 or 1985. On the question of timing, there is some small difference of opinion, but on the question of inevitability of our requirements, there is none.

During last Thursday's hearing, I called attention to the fact that the Provincial Government of Alberta had just recently authorized a production increase, from 50,000 barrels per day to 150,000 barrels per day, from its vast Athabaska Tar Sands.

I said:

It seems to me, Dr. Hibbard, from everything I can learn, that Canada is moving ahead full bore with its program for increasing synthetic fuel production, while we in this country are sitting on dead center.

In response, Dr. Hibbard spoke of projections for synthetic fuel production from domestic sources of oil shale and coal:

We have projections for production in 1980 and the year 2000 at the level of 400 million barrels and 1 billion barrels respectively. We believe this is very essential to our fuel mix, energy mix. And again I believe that technically we are almost ready to go.

Further he said:

We believe that production from oil shale is almost essential by the year 1985.

I was delighted to see Dr. Hibbard emphasize, as I had tried to do, albeit without his professional expertise, before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly hearings which were held by Senator HART last year, that technology is best developed by doing.

A celebrated political theorist testified before Senator HART's subcommittee on the question of oil shale development. Unfortunately, his testimony was a tour-de-force studded with starbursts of wit and bright rhetoric, rather than an up-to-date appraisal of the facts. But if this witness could bring himself to agree with me on several points, then we might be better able to discuss the realities of technology development. I have already stated the first of these points which is that within a very few years this country will need to develop domestic sources of synthetic fuels if it is to supplement adequately present crude oil supplies in order to meet our Nation's total energy requirements.

The second point upon which we might find agreement is my assertion that it would be a scandalous dereliction of responsibility for our Government to prevent a largely Government-owned resource, such as oil shale, from being used to meet these domestic requirements. It would be a fraud on the American people to tell them, as some public figures have recently done, that they own a share of a vast public resource of potentially, and I emphasize the word, great value, and then to prevent the development of this resource by Government inaction.

If we can reach some public understanding of these points, then we are confronted with the question of means. I believe that Dr. Hibbard's testimony last week reflected my view that the most efficient, and the most economically and politically advisable way to stimulate a workable technology for the processing of any given commercial product is by permitting that product to enter into the marketplace at the hands of the private sector. As I tried to point out before Senator HART's subcommittee last year, the production of synthetic fuels cannot be accomplished by Government edict nor can it be accomplished overnight. The most efficient way, and the way which is most beneficial to this country, is to allow private industry access to a resource, such as oil shale, and let them market it, if they can. The technology necessary to do this will be perfected as that resource, and only that resource moves closer and closer to the market. Technology is only developed by doing and I, for one, believe that the energy industry of this country is ready to go.

A qualifier is in order here however, for leadtime is required if commercial production of any major mineral or fuel is ever to be achieved. And on this note let me add my admonition to our present administration that there is little time left to maneuver. We do not have time to dally much longer if we are to meet our domestic energy needs by 1980.

Mr. Russel J. Cameron, the Nation's leading expert in the field of synthetic fuel technology, appeared before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs during its exploratory hearings on Federal oil shale policy. More recently, he said:

Frankly we are in a critical time bind. With little more than ten years until the decade of the 1980's there is serious doubt in my mind that significant production of synthetic oil can be developed before we encounter actual shortages by being denied imports, either because of the balance-of-payments problem or interruptions by external forces.

U.S. ENERGY POLICY AND THE BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS CRISIS

Let me turn now to that other consideration which is of especial importance to the Congress and to the country today. That is the question of whether an intelligent minerals and fuels policy could and should contribute to an easing of the balance-of-payments crisis which faces us so starkly.

According to a study which was made by the Chase Manhattan Bank, which I I used in preparing my statement to the Senate last year, the U.S. petroleum industry invests large amounts of capital overseas. But the bank study indicates that earnings from these foreign investments exceed the rate of new investment, making these investments a net producer of foreign exchange. The industry also provides services, sells equipment, licenses processes, and the like, and it earns for than it spends for these activities.

The industry imports oil and refined products into this country amounting to about 20 percent of our total domestic oil demand, spending almost as much for these imports as it earns from its other activities.

But it is apparent from studying the statistics of the industry that there is very little connection between the earnings of the industry overseas and its imports into this country. Most of the earnings arise from the production and sales of oil and refined products in foreign countries and not to the United States. Therefore imports to this country could be diminished without serious effect on overseas earnings but with a significant reduction in dollar outflow.

Currently we have shut-in oil production that could replace a reasonable cut in imports. A reduction of 1 million barrels per day could reduce dollar outflow by more than $500 million per year. We increased domestic production by about 1 million barrels per day during the recent Arab-Israel conflict.

Oil producers are unanimous in saying that the domestic industry has produc-

tive capacity that can be developed at modest increases in cost over current producing reserves. In the meantime, an aggressive effort to initiate synthetic fuels production from oil shale and coal would insure our ability to sustain this more favorable balance of payments.

Looking to the future, an even more critical situation is facing us if we do not minimize our dependence on imports. Chase Manhattan Bank estimates we will be spending about $2.4 billion on imported oil and refined products by 1975 and an additional $244 million in foreign exchange for transportation and shipping.

Cameron & Jones, Inc. of Denver, Colo., an independent engineering and consulting firm, did a study entitled "A Comparative Study of Oil Shale, Coal, and Tar Sands for Sources of Oil." That study suggests an import level by 1985 of more than 6 million barrels per day, if present policies are continued. The cost in foreign exchange for such a level of imports at 1964 prices would be about $4.5 billion exclusive of transportation charges. I believe a substantial part of this future outflow could be stopped if we vigorously attack and solve the problems that hinder oil shale development and place greater emphasis on perfecting oil from coal processes now only beginning the pilot plant stage.

THE PRESENT SITUATION

This brings me up to the situation at the present day. Last year, I spoke only of oil shale and associated minerals. This year, I speak of the entire synthetic fuel issue.

A member of my staff recently attended a meeting at which Federal officials estimated that as many as eight coal hydrogenation plants may be constructed by 1980 in the Powder River Basin of northeastern Wyoming and southern Montana. It was estimated that these plants would each have an average capacity of 100,000 barrels of synthetic oil per day. In addition, these same officials estimated that major new thermal plants generating electricity and fired by this same Powder River coal or by uranium would appear in this area by 1980.

Bidding by major energy companies for water sources, which is indispensable to both the hydrogenation process and thermal power production, has been spirited and serious within the past 4 months. These companies are moving rapidly to tie up all available industrial water from the Boysen Reservoir and the Yellowtail Reservoir in Wyoming and Montana by contracting with the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation within the Department of Interior. Plans for transporting this water vast distances by pipeline across the upland basins of Wyoming are now on the drawing boards.

Leasing of coal deposits for hydrogenation purposes and for the production of electricity by steam is going on at a rapid pace. A staff study which describes the current law with respect to acquisition of rights to deposits of coal owned by the United States shows that in this area, at least, policy has been clearly defined and intelligent investments by the private sector are now being made in order to meet future demands.

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

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

ACQUISITION OF RIGHTS TO DEPOSITS OF COAL OWNED BY THE UNITED STATES

Coal was the first of the minerals to be reserved to the United States under a general policy. It was one of the enumerated minerals made subject to leasing by the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920. The 1920 Act, as amended, the regulations implementing the same, and certain supplementary acts form the basis for the acquisition of coal rights from the United States.

The Mineral Leasing Act does not apply to lands within national parks, national monuments, Indian reservations, incorporated cities and towns, or Naval petroleum and oil shale reserves. But other lands are not necessarily available for lease or permit. The particular land may have been withdrawn for specific purposes. Between January 1, 1948 and December 31, 1965, there were approximately 3,475 Public Land orders issued and most of those orders constituted withdrawals.

Certain rules apply to coal as well as to other of the leaseable minerals. Generally, it can be said that leasing requires more capital than is usually required for mining claim location. The areas involved in leases are large compared to individual mining claims. Filing fees and yearly land rental fees are collected in advance and bonds in varying amounts are required before the issuance of either a prospecting permit or a lease. Unless the would-be lessee has a right to a preference right lease by virtue of discovery made under a prospecting permit, he may never obtain a lease. If mineral deposits are known to occur in an area open to lease, leases on such ground are sold to the highest bidder after an initial application therefor. If a discovery is made on unsurveyed land and a preference right lease is in order, the lessee may have to bear the costs of the survey.

Coal lease royalties are prescribed by law at not less than 5 cents per ton and in recent practice have varied from 17.5 cents to 20 cents per ton, with relief being given at times to assist during the first 5 years of a new operation.

Sections 2 to 8 inclusive of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended, authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to:

a. Divide into leasing units and award leases to coal lands and coal deposits owned by the United States;

b. Issue permits to prospect unclaimed and undeveloped areas of coal lands and coal deposits; and

c. Issue limited licenses or permits to prospect for, mine, and take for use coal from public lands.

When the land included in an application for a coal lease, permit or license is within a withdrawal, the head of the agency responsible for the withdrawal may be called upon for a report as to the objection to the application. He may require special stipulations be included in the lease to protect the interest of the United States.

A coal lease or permit may not exceed 5,120 acres. Tracts will include contiguous tracts in reasonably compact form. In any one state, the maximum an individual, association or corporation is allowed to hold at one time is 46,080 acres by permit, lease or license. (78 Stat. 710, 1964) Under special cases, an additional 5,120 acres (in multiples of 40 acres) may be permitted if shown to be necessary for economical operation. Such applications for additional lands are posted in the appropriate land office, and public hearings are held on the applications.

Leases and prospecting permits may be issued to citizens, associations of citizens, corporations organized under the laws of the United States and municipalities. Limited licenses or permits for mining coal may be issued to citizens, associations of citizens, municipalities, and certified relief agencies.

Applicant must submit a statement that his application will not exceed the 46,080-acre limitation as far as his own interests, leases, permits, directly or indirectly, are concerned.

If lands included in a lease, permit or license have been disposed of with reservation of the coal to the United States, it is the responsibility of the lessee to comply with the law under which the reservation was made even though it is not written into his lease, permit or license. This provision applies particularly to coal deposits on Stock Raising Homesteads.

No coal may be leased until the land has been divided into suitable leasing units. These units may be established by application or by departmental decision. Factors taken into consideration when establishing the units are: character of the deposit, depth, topography, contiguous land (private or public), proximity to transportation, market outlets, and investment required. If the land is unsurveyed, it must be surveyed before the lease is issued.

Lands contiguous to those leased may be obtained through a modified lease if it is advantageous to both the lessee and the United States. However, such a modified lease may not exceed 2,560 acres.

A lessee may apply for additional land if he can show that his lease will be worked out within three years from the date of the application. Before a lease is modified under these provisions, the lessee must file the consent of his surety and the agreement to the applicable reservations.

No specific form is required for an application for a coal lease. The application should be supported by: name and address of the lessee, proof of citizenship, complete information on partnerships, associations or corporations, such as articles of incorporation, agreements, etc., citizenship of members and/or stockholders, and aggregate of coal land acreages held individually, directly or indirectly. Municipalities must submit evidence of their charter and authorization for the application. An accurate description of the land is required in the application. The application should include information as to the need, topography of the area, markets, transportation, character and depth of the deposit, contemplated investment for development for a stated daily production, signatures, authorization, and authority for signature if on behalf of a corporation. A compliance bond of not less than $1,000 is required for the issuance of the lease. This may be increased before or after issuance of the lease at the discretion of the Bureau of Land Management.

Leases are conditioned upon the payment of a royalty on a minimum annual production beginning with the sixth year of the lease, and operation must be continuous barring strikes, the elements, or casualties. If the operator wishes, he may with the consent of a designated official pay the royalty, less rent, for a year in advance and suspend operations for that year.

If lands are found to form an acceptable leasing unit and are subject to lease, they will then be offered at sale to the qualified bidder offering the highest bonus.

Notice of lands open for lease by competitive bidding is published in a newspaper of general coverage in the county in which the lands are located. The notice will contain the time and place of the sale. Successful bidders are required to pay their prorated share of the cost of publication of the offer to lease notice. In all auctions the government reserves the right to reject any and all bids.

In instances, sealed bids may be supplemented by oral auction. In that event the sealed bids received prior to the auction are

read before the bidding is started. In practice, the public auction is used primarily to afford the owner of the land in which the coal owned by the United States is situated or the owner of a nearby operating mine a chance to top the prior high bid. All sealed bids must contain an advance payment of one-fifth the amount of the bid in the form of a certified check, cashier's check, bank draft, money order or cash. The successful bidder at a sale at public auction must deposit with the manager at that time one-fifth the amount of the bid.

If the lease is awarded and the land is surveyed, the lease forms will be forwarded to the lessee. He will be allowed 30 days in which to comply with the lease terms and make final settlement on the amount due on the bid. If the land is unsurveyed, the lease will not be forwarded until the survey has been completed and made a matter of record. If the lessee fails to execute the lease within the 30-day limitation, the deposit on the bid will be forfeited.

Leases are for an indefinite period but are subject to revision or adjustment at the end of each period of 20 years. If there are reasons for objection, the lessee may file an objection to the revised conditions. If he does not file an objection or does not relinquish the lease within 30 days of receipt of the notice, it is understood the lessee has agreed to the new terms.

When it has been shown that the public interest will not be impaired, the lessee may surrender the lease or any legal subdivision thereof. If a relinquishment is accepted, it is effective as of the date filed, subject to accrued rentals and royalties and to requirements for preservation of the mines. Leases may be cancelled for failure to comply with all the provisions of the law and specific conditions of the lease. Leases may also be cancelled if the cancellation is in the public interest or if the coal deposit lands are no longer necessary for the lessee to carry on business economically.

Permits are issued for a period of 2 years to qualified applicants. They are for the purpose of prospecting unclaimed and undeveloped lands where prospecting is necessary to determine the existence or workability of coal deposits. The permit gives the holder the exclusive right to prospect for coal in the land described in the permit. He is allowed to remove as much coal as is necessary to determine the workability and commercial value of the coal.

A permit is obtained by making an application, in duplicate, to the appropriate land office. The application must be accompanied by a $10 filing fee, a year's rental at 25 cents per acre, and all the same supporting documents required for a lease, i.e., proof of citizenship, acreages held, etc. Submitted with the permit application, there must be a plan for prospecting and exploration, together with the estimated cost and rate at which the work will be done.

A corporate surety bond is required to be filed after the amount, not less than $1000, is determined by an authorized officer.

Permits may be extended two years upon application to the Bureau of Land Management and satisfactory evidence presented to the Bureau of Land Management and United States Geological Survey supervisor that work has been prosecuted with reasonable diligence. If no application is filed, the permit will expire without notice and the lands will again be subject to filing for new permit applications.

Permits may be relinquished in whole or in part. If it is a partial relinquishment, the notification submitted to the local land office must describe the lands relinquished. However, relinquishment of a permit does not relieve the permittee of the responsibility of providing for the preservation of mines or production works and any permanent improvements according to the terms of the permit.

Permits may be cancelled for failing to comply with the various provisions of the permit, and will terminate automatically if the annual rental is not paid on or before the anniversary date.

Lands covered by a cancelled permit become available for the filing of a new permit, provided they have not been withdrawn for leasing.

A permittee, who discovers coal in commercial quantities in the land embraced in his permit, may apply for a preference right lease promptly after the beginning of commercial operations—in no case later than the expiration of the permit. The application must be accompanied by the rental fee of 25 cents per acre per year for one year. If the permit holder applies for a preference right lease, and the permit expires with final rejection of the lease application, the permittee will be charged royalty on any coal that was removed up to the time of receipt of the rejection but he will not be charged with trespass.

Coal permits and leases may be transferred in whole or in part. The procedure is the same as for obtaining the permit-application, filing fee, advances, qualifications of the transferee, bonds, etc. An application for transfer must be filed within 90 days from the date of execution of the transfer.

Overriding royalties created by assignment or transfer may not exceed 50 percent of the royalty first paid the United States unless it can be shown that such an overriding royalty in excess of the 50 percent is necessary because of substantial investment in the lease prior to the transfer.

Coal licenses may be issued for a period of two years to individuals, associations of individuals and municipalities to mine coal for their local domestic fuel need. Licenses to an individual or association of individuals are limited to a 40-acre legal subdivision or less, and may be revoked at any time. Licenses expire automatically at the end of two years unless renewed upon application made in plenty of time before the end of the two-year period. Renewal applications cost $10. Applications must be filed in quadruplicate on an approved form, or substantial equivalent, with the appropriate land office.

Licenses may be granted to recognize relief agencies for mining coal at not more than 20 tons per relief family per year. The areas to be mined will be designated by the local land office. No filing fee is required for these applications. All operations of this type must operate pursuant to the state and federal mining regulations. (See 43 CFR 3130)

Mr. HANSEN. On the other hand, the outlook for oil shale is grim indeed. A year ago last January, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall announced a five-point oil shale program. Then in May of last year the Secretary promulgated in the Federal Register the regulations which he proposed for the administration of this program. Following the publication of those proposed regulations the Senate Interior Committee, as I have indicated, held informational hearings on the subject. The one conclusion that could be reached from these hearings was that the private sector could not live under the regulations as proposed by Secretary Udall. The regulations, such as have been brought to light so far, have discouraged rather than encouraged possible investment in the development of shale oil from the public lands.

The Secretary has since returned to his Department where he promised to form a study group to evaluate the comments that had been received by the Department and by the Senate Interior Committee. That study was to have been completed by mid-January of this year and, while I have contacted the Secretary since that time, nothing has yet been made available to me or to the public. I have only received conflicting reports from within the Department of the Interior, some of which would indicate that no action on a synthetic fuels policy is contemplated by the administration until after the November elections.

I consider this most regrettable. I believe that Secretary Udall did a real service by helping to give the question of oil shale policy a public airing. But if we are to grind to a stop on the question of policy formulation now, we may find that within the very near future events most prejudicial to the best interests of this country will overtake us. This year's election campaign's promises to be most beneficial to the country to the extent that public debate will be stimulated on the question of whether we may have been led into a policy of doing too much of the wrong thing in a tragic war in Southeast Asia. On the other hand, if the Department of Interior is in fact stalemated on the question of domestic mineral and fuel policy formulation, I believe we have an example of how Washington gets stuck in the mud at election time because the Federal bureaucracy fears public criticism in this instance of having done too much of nothing.

The public has been led to believe that oil shale development has been just around the corner for the last 40 years. Throughout that entire time the Federal Department of the Interior has held a key to the granting of production leases on oil shale lands. According to the thrust of Dr. Hibbard's testimony we now have sufficient technology to begin moving this resource toward the commercial production of synthetic fuels from oil shale.

As I have outlined, synthetic fuel production from coal is off and running. That is healthy, and in itself, as it should be. In addition, uranium production has boomed reflecting the glowing projections for future nuclear power demands. Looking a bit further to the north, as I mentioned previously, our neighbor of Canada has recently tripled the daily production allowed from its vast Athabaska Tar Sands.

All of these potential energy sources should be allowed to compete with one another. All will be needed, unless this country prostrates both its security and the value of its dollar in favor of rapidly increasing foreign imports.

All that has been asked in the past by those interested in seeing an orderly development of our mineral and fuel resources has been that these various resources be allowed to compete on even terms. Competition is one thing that made our country great. An abundant supply of natural resources is another thing that made it great. We are now at a crossroads. For the first time in our history, our Government is apparently choosing, by its inaction, to stifle competition and to prohibit the entry of a resource into the market when it is desperately needed.

The flight of gold, and the flight of U.S. dollars to foreign investments, leads me to urge as strongly as possible that the administration come forward with a

forthright and timely policy for future minerals and fuels development, especially with respect to oil shale and its associated minerals. If we cannot continue to move forward with a workable policy that will provide sufficient incentive for the creation of a viable commercial shale oil industry, I believe that we will all be guilty of a dereliction of duty that nears scandalous proportions.

Consequently, if the Department of the Interior cannot produce a workable leasing policy which would give private industry sufficient go ahead to develop these much needed resources, I will be prepared, within a reasonable time to introduce legislation to that end. I have deferred this action because I respect the effort that the Secretary of the Interior has taken on this problem during the past year. I am hopeful that he can continue to make progress since he has all the legislative authority necessary to do so at the present time.

The threat poised against this country from the imbalance in our international payments is familiar to us all. Nevertheless, if we face the facts, and plan now for the future utilization of our domestic resources, the alarming flight of U.S. capital and U.S. gold can slowly be turned around.

On the other hand, if we now sit idle, allowing our publicly owned resources to lie wasting in the ground only for the lack of a positive policy, we must all share responsibility for killing a golden goose that could give great benefit to all the people of this country.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to make two insertions in the RECORD.

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

NATIONAL SECURITY CONSIDERATIONS

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, in my speech to the Senate February 2, 1967, I went to considerable lengths to describe the strategic importance of a healthy domestic energy industry. Events since that speech, and I speak of the last summer's Suez crisis, bore out my observations, I believe.

I did not want to cover that ground again in today's speech, but since the question of national security has been raised, I will put in the RECORD at this point a staff study showing the effects of last summer's Arab-Israeli war on world oil demand-supply relationships and on the national security of our country.

I ask unanimous consent to have the staff study printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

STAFF STUDY ON U.S. STRATEGY IMPLICATIONS OF 1967 SUEZ CRISIS, JULY 1967

The dependence of the Free World on petroleum and petroleum products has been brought sharply into focus since the Mid East crisis early last month. Petroleum plays the largest role in the entire energy demand of our nation, and half of Free Europe's total energy use depends upon oil. The tremendous economic development of the U.S. and the rest of the Free World would not have been possible without the energy source provided by petroleum. With the closing of pipelines and the Suez Canal, the economic growth of nations outside the U.S., heavily dependent upon Mid-Eastern oil supplies, now remains uncertain.

Even more important perhaps is the dependence on petroleum in national defense efforts. Mr. J. J. Muir of the State Department points out that military demand for fuels, while steadily increasing, is not subject to sudden increase or decrease during times of war and peace. He says:

"First, is the ever increasing thirst for oil of our new weapons systems. For example, the First Cavalry Division now operating in South Vietnam consumes fuel three times that of a World War II or a Korean division. Also, the planes and ships of the Seventh Fleet operating off Vietnam, and the Guam-based B-52's supported by KC-135 refueling tankers, require many times the fuel of their predecessors.

"Secondly, and the important key, is the fact that modern military forces, whether on alert, training, or combat, consume substantially the same quantities of fuel."

Mr. Muir indicates that the use of petroleum and petroleum products will continue to be used as energy for our military equipment, and even when these present systems are replaced, it will be by the larger hydrocarbon energy consuming systems.

Until 1939, the U.S. was one of the largest suppliers of oil in the world. By 1966, our industrial development had proceeded to such a level that our total petroleum demand required that we import about 20% of all oil used in this country. Some experts are already claiming that the U.S. is now or soon will become an energy-deficient nation. What this means is that the U.S. must rely upon the importation of energy in order to run its industry. This increasingly heavy reliance on imported energy is a major threat to our national security.

In 1966, the Mid Eastern oil producing countries (Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Iran, Iraq, Qatar Bahrain, and Abu Dhabi) produced an average of 9.210 million bbls/day. At the time the Suez Canal, IPC and Trans-Arabian pipelines were closed, between 11 and 12 million barrels of oil a day were suddenly unavailable. This accounted for nearly ⅔ of all oil used by Free Nations excluding the U.S.—or ⅓ of the world's daily supply. (Although the U.S. imports of oil included only 2% from Mid East sources, Western Europe depends upon Mid Eastern oil for 70% of its oil supplies.

And, of course, besides the tremendous loss of oil to free world markets, tanker and transportation rates have skyrocketed, because oil must now be tanked around the coast of Africa, shipping schedules disrupted, and losses of millions to the producing nations with 65% to 70% of the Arab economy alone based on petroleum.

Assistant Secretary of the Interior J. Cordell Moore, speaking to the National Petroleum Council, stated "Even if the Canal were to open tomorrow, and normal production and shipping resumed, and the embargo to U.S. and U.K. ports lifted, an enormous dislocation has already occurred which will take weeks and months to straighten out." It has been predicted by some sources that the world oil situation will never be the same again.

The petroleum industry maintains its traditional position as the largest single industrial category of U.S. investment abroad. The U.S. Bureau of Mines reports that as of 1964, the total value of direct foreign investments of the U.S. was over $44 billion—and about 40% of this was in mining and smelting and petroleum. J. Cordell Moore states that long before the Mid East crisis the steadily declining profitability of overseas oil investment was in evidence. "The return to U.S. companies on capital invested in foreign oil operations dropped below that for domestic operations—for the first time in 20 years: 11.7% as against 12.3% for 1966 reported by the Chase Manhattan Bank last month.

Mr. Michael T. Halbouty, President of the American Association of Petroleum Geologists, urged that the vast sources of supply of oil in the Mid East are unreliable as evidenced by two Suez crises, and that nations of the Free World should not depend upon it. Our domestic sources are the only dependable sources of supply, he insists. Mr. Halbouty objects to our continuing efforts in the Mid East, at the sacrifice of our domestic petroleum industry.

95% of companies in Saudi Arabia, and 54% of all companies in the Mid East oil producing countries are equity-owned by the U.S.; 30% are owned by the U.K.—the two major victims of the recent embargo. Just last month the Chairman of the Syrian National Petroleum Organization urged Arab oil-producing countries to revise their contracts with Western companies "in order to end all imperialist concessions." He added, "A revision of our oil policy would aim a fatal blow at monopolistic and imperialist interests."

U.S. RESPONSE TO 1967 SUEZ CRISIS

On June 8th, 1967 Emergency Petroleum Supply Committee, established by the Secretary of the Interior in 1951, was called into session to determine the scope of the disruption of petroleum supply as a result of the Mid East crisis on the Free World. Before this Committee can be called the Assistant Secretary for Mineral Resources must determine that an emergency exists outside of the U.S. which threatens the broad security interests of the U.S.

On June 10th an emergency situation was declared by J. Cordell Moore, with the concurrence of the Office of Emergency Planning, the Department of Defense, and the Department of State. A Plan of Action was drawn up by a Subcommittee of the EPSC and Government officials to outline the operating policies and procedures to meet the oil shortages resulting from the Mid-East production shortages and closure of pipelines and the Suez Canal. John Ricca, Deputy Director of the Office of Oil and Gas, was named Chairman of the Emergency Petroleum Supply Committee. On June 20 the Plan of Action was approved by the full EPSC. The first meeting of the EPSC was held on July 7, and the first task of the 26 member oil companies is to "provide a continuing appraisal of the size and detail of the supply and transportation problems affecting mainly the countries of Western Europe, but including other countries as well."

To meet the free world oil shortages the U.S. has already responded admirably. Texas has raised its allowable for July to 42.9% from 35.9% in the latter half of June. Jim C. Langdon, Chairman of the Texas Railroad Commission, responsible for the state's allowable raise, indicated that Texas and Louisiana may be producing 12 million bar-

rels per month of additional crude just to meet U.S. domestic deficits. Oklahoma has also increased its allowable from 42% to 54% for August and September, 1967, with Louisiana and New Mexico following suit. June increases from Gulf Coast ports of crude oil and products totaled 5½ million barrels over the normal monthly estimates. 2.2 million barrels of this total went to Europe, 5 million to Canada, and 2.8 million to the East Coast U.S. June increases in Venezuela production totaled 6½ million barrels—6.6% increase. On July 14th U.S. crude oil production was up 650,750 bbl/d.—with approximately 40% of this increase exported to Europe and Canada.

Canada has begun exploration off her eastern and western coasts with a $50 million plunge into the waters of the continental shelf. Utilizing what is termed the world's largest mobile drilling platform, a major discovery could boost Canada to an important position in the world offshore oil industry.

Oil shipments from Libya have resumed except, of course, to the U.S. and U.K. Iraq has resumed shipments to France, Spain, and Turkey. But the fact remains that the closing of the Suez Canal has cut off approximately 3.5 million barrels of oil a day and there is no indication of when this oil will again flow into world markets.

CONCLUSION

Many sources indicate that the U.S. is confronted with a serious decline in our own domestic energy producing capabilities. In contrast to the phenomenal growth of the oil industry in foreign countries, our domestic drilling for oil has fallen off by 41% in the past decade and our oil finding success ratio is the lowest it has been in 30 years. Our ratio of domestic reserves has declined accordingly. In 1950, the ratio of reserves to production in the United States was 13.6 to 1. Last year, it was only slightly more than 12 to 1. This steady decline of exploration in this country has reached a point where annual consumption of petroleum products exceeds new reserves found.

Yet, with all these indications that the key to our complex industrial economy—energy—will possibly be lost in the shuffle of foreign investments and increased foreign trade, aid, and development, our Government has generally favored the political ramifications of trade and disfavored recent efforts to stimulate our domestic industries.

BUREAU OF MINES COMMODITY STUDIES: GOLD, ALUMINUM, OIL SHALE

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, Dr. Walter R. Hibbard, Jr., presented my office with a copy of the commodity statements to which he referred during the hearing by the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels on March 21, 1968.

Perhaps, readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would be interested in selected excerpts from that commodity statement study. Therefore, I ask that portions of the statements on aluminum, on gold, and on oil shale, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF MINES,
Washington, D.C., March 25, 1968.

Hon. CLIFFORD P. HANSEN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HANSEN: Attached is a copy of the Commodity Statements to which reference was made during the hearing by the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials and Fuels on March 21, 1968.

While these are working papers designed to support initial attempts to improve upon our capabilities to understand current and future supply-demand relationships I believe you may find them useful for reference purposes.

I deeply appreciated the opportunity to discuss the Bureau of Mines current studies and findings with your committee.

Sincerely yours,
WALTER R. HIBBARD, Jr.,
Director.

COMMODITY STATEMENTS, JANUARY 1968

(Supplement to Bureau of Mines strategic plan)

These statements furnish the source material comprising one facet of a comprehensive planning endeavor that seeks to continuously identify subjects in most urgent need of the Bureau's attention. They are, in effect, digests of voluminous information concerning some 80 mineral materials reduced to a common topical format. Each topic is described in three parts and each part treats only with information that was, at the time of compilation, considered to be significant in some way to the overall planning operation.

In each instance the opening paragraphs comprise a limited number of summary observations in which the essential conclusions, relative to the individual topics, are thought to be pertinent. Thus, the reviewer may gain a rapid summary of the status of a given mineral material through reference to the first page or two of each statement.

The summary observations are, in each instance, followed by a Background section in which current relationships, positions, and factual data are digested. The year 1966 is taken as a base wherever statistical data are employed. Supply-demand relationships are abstracted diagrammatically and are followed by sections on apparent reserves, industry patterns, consumption patterns, byproduct and coproduct relationships, economic factors and technology.

Finally an Outlook section projects a range of domestic and world demands through 1985 and 2000, and resources are appraised in terms of price-quantity and price-time relationships. Projections are based upon standard econometric techniques after selecting an index considered best applicable to each topic. The projections have been modified to reflect the effects of foreseeable probable and possible technological advances that would tend to lessen costs, reduce demands, increase supplies, or establish new markets. They have been further modified through introduction of the possible effects of non-technologic changes like price incentives, import or export controls, international events and the like.

The topics describe here include the significant mineral forming elements, the common fossil fuels, and certain mineral forms of commercial significance. Wherever feasible substances are addressed in terms of elemental content in preference to the mineral forms in which they are commonly priced, traded, and in some instances, consumed, in current marketing patterns. While the resulting units are not familiar in some discussions of current supply-demand relationships, they are essential in speculating upon future source and end-use patterns. The effectiveness of the planning endeavor rests largely upon the appraisal of future events and constraints and dictates the adoption of the unfamiliar units in many of these statements.

On some copies of these statements certain data have been obliterated because the manner in which information became available to the Bureau of Mines does not permit general disclosure. Where such information is essential for planning purposes it may be obtained from the appropriate office.

ALUMINUM—OUTLOOK

Demand

United States demand for primary aluminum as shown in the following table, projected on the basis of GNP, will be about eight times the 1966 consumption by the year 2000. The average annual growth rate from 1966 to 2000 is about 6 percent. Growth in demand for bauxite for applications other than making aluminum is expected to parallel that for the metal. Aluminum demand in the rest of the world, on the basis of population growth, is expected to grow at about 4½ percent per year, reaching 24 million short tons by the year 2000. Significant technological advances occurred during the period on which these projections are based and future advances of the "non-breakthrough" type are expected to affect future consumption. Production of aluminum from clay, probably by 1985 for 10–20 percent of total production, is expected to have little or no effect on the projected demand pattern.

PROJECTED U.S. DEMAND FOR ALUMINUM

[Million short tons]

	1966	1985	2000
High	4.45	14.34	36.81
Median	4.45	13.68	35.03
Low	4.45	13.12	33.69
PROJECTED REST OF THE WORLD DEMAND FOR ALUMINUM			
High	5.42	12.52	24.02
Median	5.42	12.05	23.18
Low	5.42	11.59	22.33

The price of aluminum is expected to stay relatively stable.

Availability of aluminum from GSA stocks through 1978 also should help stabilize prices as well as supplement supply.

Supply

Supply is projected in terms of contained aluminum in bauxite, the present ore of aluminum, and on contained aluminum in high-alumina clays if the price of aluminum increases to 30 cents per pound. The ratio of 4.1 long tons of bauxite to one short ton of aluminum in 1966 is expected to increase gradually as lower grade ores are used.

Domestic reserves of metallurgical-grade bauxite, all in Arkansas, contain 11 million tons of aluminum. An additional 55 million tons are estimated to be economically recoverable from ferruginous and other low-grade bauxites containing an average of 38 percent Al_2O_3 in Arkansas, southeastern States, Oregon and Washington, and Hawaii at prices for aluminum ranging from 27.5 cents to 35 cents per pound. An estimated 4 billion tons of bauxite and kaolin clays in Arkansas, Georgia, Hawaii, and Oregon, averaging 33 to 42 percent Al_2O_3, contain on the order of 500 million tons of aluminum that can be considered a reserve at prices above 30 to 35 cents per pound for aluminum. The United States, however, must rely almost entirely on imports for the immediate future bauxite supply because of the time necessary for industry to convert to the use of lower-grade materials.

GOLD

The national interest would be advanced through events that would permit increased domestic primary production of gold at the prevailing statutory price for the metal. Among other factors short-term foreign liabilities are reducing United States Treasury stocks at a rate that threatens statutory reserve requirements.

Because of its monetary relationship and the resulting fixed price and single legal domestic market for gold, the normal com-

modity supply-demand relationships do not apply. Price is not influenced by costs and, as a result, domestic production except that issuing as a byproduct has declined as costs have increased. Except in a few instances, technologic advances have not effected cost reductions to the extent necessary to permit continued commercial production. In view of the extent of the known resources that are presently noncommercial, the feasibility of new techniques, systems, or concepts that would permit profitable exploitation at the fixed price level invites attention.

Technologic advances in exploration have been effective in recent gold discoveries of commercial significance. In fact, the prospect of finding new sources of gold that will yield to present technology at present price levels is sufficiently attractive to merit a priority of attention. Similarly, such techniques are expected to disclose new large marginal gold sources that might be commercially attractive if modest advances in extraction and processing technology are realized.

Other factors which increase the uncertainty of gold supplies include the fact that gold production abroad was dominated by the Republic of South Africa where 65 percent of world output was mined in 1966, but where some uncertainty attaches to future production rates. Although demand abroad for the arts and industry appears to have been relatively small compared with per capita consumption in the United States, there is an enormous but unmeasured disappearance of gold into foreign private hoards.

In the United States, copper and other base metal ores provide substantial amounts of byproduct gold. Byproduct silver is obtained from most gold ores and the recent increases in the price of silver have given some gold mine operators a small lift. Additional emphasis on byproduct production and the development of new techniques to base metal refinery slimes might result in some additions to supply.

Considerable gold is recovered from secondary sources, but the supply could be extended by improvements in salvage practices and techniques.

The marine environment promises a new dimension to source concepts if certain capabilities can be developed (see section on nickel).

New primary sources of gold are likely to be low in grade and, if commercially significant, likely to involve large volume mining and major surface disturbance. Major land-use conflicts must be expected and equitably resolved. For example, the importance of placer deposits as a source of production is decreasing because of competitive uses for suitable dredging land.

GOLD—OUTLOOK

Demand

United States demand for gold as measured by metal issued for industrial use and based on modified projections of the Federal Reserve Board Index, is expected to increase about 4.5 times by the year 2000. The average compounded annual growth rate from 1966 to 2000 is 4.5 percent. Demand in the rest of the world is expected to reach 60 million ounces by the year 2000.

PROJECTED U.S. DEMAND FOR GOLD

[Millions of troy ounces]

	1966	1985	2000
High	7.8	22	45
Median	7.8	19	35
Low	7.8	18	32
PROJECTED REST OF THE WORLD DEMAND FOR GOLD			
High	40	52	60
Median	40	52	60
Low	40	52	60

Improved techniques of plating and coating gold on other metals and nonmetals probably will extend the application and lower the cost of using gold in industrial products, particularly electronic components. The development of new solders and brazing alloys will continue to extend the use of gold of joining materials in electronic devices. These technologic advances may tend to increase future demands.

Since the price of gold has remained fixed since 1934 and is not likely to change in the foreseeable future, price stability is a significant factor tending to increase future demand. Inflationary factors, political and monetary uncertainties create speculative demand for gold in industrial products well as in other forms. Conversely, when deflationary factors predominate in the economy demand for gold probably would decline. These factors while difficult to forecast could have an appreciable effect on demand projections. Also, changing vogue in an affluent society is a significant factor that could affect future demand for gold in fabricated products, particularly jewelry, the largest use.

The pattern of future consumption in the rest of the world may be similar to that in the United States but the overall growth rate will be appreciably lower.

Supply

Domestic resources of gold are estimated at 450 million ounces of which 9 million ounces are reserves considered economically minable at $35 per ounce from gold ores. An additional 53 million ounces are recoverable as a byproduct of copper ores. The remaining 388 million ounces could be mined at cost levels ranging upward from $35 to $200 per ounce. The 62 million ounces potentially recoverable at present price levels of gold and copper are approximately equivalent to cumulative consumption in the next 6 years.

Technologic advances in exploration utilizing new and improved scientific devices have been a factor in recent gold discoveries and are expected to contribute to future discoveries and ultimately to increased production. Bulk mining methods using modern drilling, loading and transportation equipment have lowered operating costs where the application of these methods is feasible. It is anticipated that further improvement in mining techniques will be made which could contribute in a modest way to increasing future supply of gold.

Present gold mining operations have little adverse effects on land use, but it is conceivable that exploitation of new primary sources of gold could involve large-scale surface mining, land disturbance, and some conflict in land use.

Conclusions and appraisal

Domestic resources of gold probably are of sufficient magnitude to meet projected demand to 2000 at price levels up to $200 per ounce, but at the current fixed price level of $35 per ounce minable reserves are only equivalent to projected demand to 1972. Furthermore, most of this potential gold production is dependent on the production of copper. Total minable reserves at current and future rates of production together with gold from the U.S. monetary stock (378 million ounces) are not adequate to balance total industrial demand projected to the year 2000. At the current price and present technology the indicated cumulative deficit is about 300 million ounces. Imports could conceivably balance the deficit but are by no means assured unless the price of gold is increased.

OIL SHALE

It has been repeatedly demonstrated that liquid and gaseous fuel products may be derived from oil shale. But there remains uncertainty as to whether the present technology and concepts are basically those that will ultimately be employed commercially, and a wide diversity of opinion as to when a combination of circumstances will encourage and demand large-scale domestic commercial exploitation of oil shale. (Present concern attaches almost entirely to the shales of the Green River formation and the production of liquid fuels substitutable for those commonly derived from petroleum).

Despite the technologic and economic uncertainties, the issues that immediately beset the embryonic shale-oil industry center initially on legal, social, and environmental issues. The fact that much of the oil shale is in public ownership complicated by unsettled disputes over the validity of private claims (to sodium and aluminum minerals in addition to the shale) and the absence of a perfected leasing system that would insure protection of the public's interest, tends to depress active development but not exhaustive, and largely unproductive, debate.

Aside from the legalistic issues, the emergence of a significant commercial shale-oil industry would be more apparent in the presence of further advancements in extraction and processing technology. Specially, the practical employment of in-situ extraction processes has been only partially explored, the extent to which conventional mining costs might be reduced is speculative, the present retorting concepts have certain shortcomings, the real significance of the mineral substance associated in the oil shale is wholly unknown, and, the disposal of waste products that might issue in the exploitation of oil shale under presently conceived processes or those that might be discovered in the future is seen as an impending environmental problem. Paradoxically, much of the uncertainty that complicates the legalistic and economic aspects of oil shale stems from these technologic gaps.

The commercial development of oil shale depends not only on developing an economic process to compete with petroleum but also is vulnerable to the development of a technology to liquefy coal or to the increased availability of oil produced from the Athabasca tar sand deposit in Alberta, Canada.

The environmental problem resulting from the large scale processing of oil shale and the generation of 1 to 2 million tons of solid waste per day will have to be solved before oil shale operations begin on any scale. Associated with the solid waste generation are also air and water pollution, damage to vegetation and other ecological factors. The problem of adequate water supply as well as its unpolluted disposal is involved. This subject requires intensive study and has a high priority for attention.

OIL SHALE—BACKGROUND

Supply-demand relationship

It has been demonstrated that shale oil can be used as a fuel that is supplementary to petroleum. The Bureau of Mines, in its demonstration plant near Rifle, Colorado, produced, refined, and used both gasoline and diesel fuel made from shale oil. It is reported that the Union Oil Co. processed about 20,000 barrels of shale oil to acceptable finished products comparable to similar products from petroleum. There is, however, no commercial shale oil on the market today so that a discussion of the supply-demand relationship must depend on the projected needs of the country for future energy sources.

It has been estimated that the requirement for petroleum will be 6,665 million barrels in 1980. Due to increasing costs and reserve problems, petroleum supply from domestic sources could face serious problems in the future.

A shale-oil industry, utilizing the vast reserves of oil shale in the United States could partly solve the problem of projected shortages of liquid fuels from domestic sources. Present indications are that an embryo industry may be born within 1 or 2 years. By the year 1980, perhaps 1 million barrels of shale oil per day will be produced, and the quantity will increase to perhaps 3 million barrels per day by the year 2000, representing

5 percent and 10 percent, respectively, of the country's energy needs. There is always danger in trying to predict the future. The numbers given here could be extensively modified by a breakthrough in the technology to liquefy coal or by increased reliance on the tar deposits of this country and Canada. Either of these events could affect the price of oil and endanger a new-born shale-oil industry. Similarly, a change in import regulations might either benefit or harm a new industry.

Apparent reserves

Oil shales of the Green River Formation are the world's largest hydrocarbon deposit, representing a tremendous reserve of fossil fuel energy. Composed of Eocene sediments deposited in ancient lakes, the Green River Formation lies under more than 16,000 square miles in adjacent corners of Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming. Estimates of the oil potential of this formation continuously increase with accumulation of reliable data. One recent estimate is as follows:

POTENTIAL OIL IN KNOWN OIL-SHALE DEPOSITS OF THE GREEN RIVER FORMATION

[Billions of barrels of oil in place]

	Colorado	Utah	Wyoming	Total
Intervals 10 or more feet thick averaging 25 or more gallons of oil per ton	480	90	30	600
Intervals 10 or more feet thick averaging 10 to 25 gallons of oil per ton	800	230	400	1,430
Intervals 10 or more feet thick averaging 10 or more gallons of oil per ton	1,280	320	430	2,030

Shale thicker than 10 feet with an average yield of 25 gallons per ton or more may be close to economic production now. Lower grade deposits become a reserve as demand increases or as production costs decrease.

All current estimates for the Green River oil-shale resource are based on detailed oil-yield data accumulated by the Bureau of Mines. Although more than 125,000 oil-yield assays have been made, there are significant limitations to the available data. These limitations are the inadequate geographic and stratigraphic coverage of the deposits and the fact that for much of the formation the only samples available for study have been drill-cutting samples rather than the much more reliable core samples.

The Devonian "black" shales of the central United States constitute a huge resource of fossil fuel energy. Theses marine sediments, containing organic matter relatively poor in hydrogen (about 50 percent of that in Green River oil shale), occur from Texas to New York and from Alabama through Michigan. These shales may represent an oil resource of 1 trillion barrels, but little definite information on the deposits is available.

Oil-shale deposits occur on every continent. The South American iraty deposit in southern Brazil, Uruguay, and eastern Paraguay appears to be the largest deposit outside the United States.

Potential oil production from the world's oil-shale deposits furnishes no competition to oil produced from the United States Green River Formation. Oil produced in quantity from the Athabasca tar sand deposit in Alberta, Canada, probably will affect marketability of Green River shale oil.

Industry pattern

Currently no oil-shale industry exists in the United States. However, interest in this possibility is high. More than 20 major oil companies own oil-shale land. Most of this fee land, purchased and valued for its Mahogany-zone oil shale, is in Garfield County, Colorado, along the southern edge of the Piceance Creek Basin. Also held for oil shale are some fee lands and some leased lands in Utah, also primarily for Mahogany-zone shale. A few companies, notably Superior, Sinclair, Humble, Marathon, Shell, and a combine of Shell, The Oil Shale Corp. (TOSCO), and Standard of Ohio, own fee land in the Rio Blanco County portion of Colorado's Piceance Creek Basin where shales below the Mahogany zone are also rich. In Wyoming, the Union Pacific Railroad is virtually the only private owner of oil-shale land. UPRR acquired these rights, composed of alternate sections on each side of the rail line, over the route granted by the federal government. It has been estimated that as much as 95 percent of the richest oil-shale land in the Green River Formation is federally owned.

If an oil-shale industry were to begin immediately, it would exploit Mahogany-zone oil shale cropping out in the southern part of the Piceance Creek Basin and in extreme eastern Utah. Mahogany-zone shale has been the test material for all pilot-scale tests for production of shale oil by mining-retorting procedures. All oil-shale mining tests have been made in this Mahogany zone.

TOSCO is probably nearest to commercial production. They claim to be completing successfully a series of tests on a prototype plant in Parachute Creek north of the town of Grand Valley, Colorado. Mahogany-zone shale averaging 37 gallons per ton is mined and retorted at this plant. TOSCO has announced the hope that they will be producing 58,000 barrels of shale oil per day by 1970.

Other industry experimental production activity is in progress. A group of six companies—Mobil Oil, Humble Oil and Refining, Continental Oil, Phillips Petroleum, Pan American Petroleum, and Sinclair Research—recently completed a $7.2 million research program at the U.S. Bureau of Mines facility at Anvil Points, near Rifle, Colorado.

Tests of methods for producing oil from shale without mining have been conducted in the shale strata below the Mahogany zone. Companies making independent tests include Sinclair Oil and Gas, Humble Oil and Refining, Equity Oil, Shell Oil, and Mobil Oil. The Bureau of Mines is also conducting such tests. Project Bronco, an atomic blast experiment proposed to test a possible method for achieving shale-oil production by underground combustion, is now being worked toward the proposed explosion. Tests for producing shale oil from oil shale in place have yet to produce technical success, although quite a number of patents covering the postulated methods have been issued.

Consumption pattern

The shale oil produced will have to be shipped to major refining and marketing centers. The end use patterns for shale oil will follow, in general, those for petroleum and natural gas. Present processing techniques, usually involving hydrogenation with severe conditions, to reduce nitrogen and sulfur contents of the shale oil will probably result in much of the oil being marketed as gasoline or other light distillates. The technology for removing sulfur and nitrogen from heavy distillates without changing the boiling range is not well developed. This type of sulfur removal is presently receiving attention because of air pollution by sulfur oxides and it is to be expected that nitrogen will receive similar attention in the future.

Although the bulk of the shale oil will be used as fuel, specialty items may be a significant economic factor to the success of a shale-oil industry. In comparison to petroleum, shale oil is a hydrogen-deficient product. Therefore, it has a high content of such things as olefins, useful in making biodegradeable detergents, and of nitrogen compounds, useful as commercial solvents. The nature of the materials in the low-boiling fractions has been amply demonstrated for shale oils produced in experimental retorts. Corresponding studies of heavier fractions are incomplete. Therefore, their utility in the production of specialty items cannot be predicted with certainty.

Byproducts and coproducts

Byproduct relationships are considered here as those from the production of fossil fuels. More specifically the byproducts will be those non-fuel products that are collected together with the crude shale oil and with the retort gases in the retorting step.

It is generally conceded that the gross compositions of shale-oil crudes produced in internally-fired retorts show only small differences. It is also generally conceded that the typical byproduct petrochemicals—such as ethylene, propylene, benzene, and so forth—could be produced in a shale-oil refinery as easily and in about the same quantities relative to the original crude as are produced in petroleum refineries. We will consider here only the byproducts relationships that will be more or less peculiar in quantity to a shale-oil industry as opposed to those byproduct relationships in a petroleum industry. In essence then, these byproducts will be those organic compounds that contain oxygen, nitrogen, and sulfur. The major byproducts that are recoverable and that contain these heteroatoms are as follows:

BYPRODUCTS FROM TWO KINDS OF REFINING PROCESSES

	Case 1 [1]	Case 2 [2]
Tar bases (pounds per month)	3×10^6	7.5×10^6
Tar acids (pounds per month)	1.5×10^5	
Sulfur (tons per day)	50	50
Ammonia (tons per day)	300	200

[1] Refining process: (1) Distillation to recover raw naptha, (2) extraction of raw naptha to recover tar acids and tar bases, and (3) hydrogenation of bottom to give a nitrogen- and sulfur-free product and ammonia and hydrogen sulfide.

[2] Reforming process: (1) Recycle hydrocracking to give 80 percent of crude as reforming stock, (2) extraction of tar bases prior to reforming, and (3) recovery of ammonia and sulfur from the hydrogenated products.

The impact of these products upon the chemical industry can be seen when one considers that the monthly production of tar bases is about 1 million pounds. Thus, tar-base product from a 100,000-barrel-per-day refinery would equal 3 to 8 times the current production.

Co-product relationships are considered here as being those products that will be removed from the shale before retorting or from the spent shale after retorting.

The possibility of co-producing Al_2O_3 and soda ash with shale oil by mining and processing dawsonite- and nahcolite-bearing oil shale from the northern part of Colorado's Piceance Creek Basin recently appeared. Dawsonite [$NaAl(OH_2CO_3$] occurs in an area greater than 300 square miles in a stratigraphic section of relatively rich oil shale. Lying below the Mahogany zone, this section ranges in thickness to 700 feet. In this section alumina in dawsonite represents 2½ times the free world's known supply of alumina in bauxite.

Through much of the dawsonite-bearing section nahcolite occurs in the oil shale in vugs and crystal masses. This almost pure bicarbonate of soda is an excellent starting material for production of soda ash.

Technologic processes for production of Al_2O_3 and nahcolite products are under study.

Economic factors

The most probable production of shale oil in the near future is from the Green River Formation shales of Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming. The shale is located in a sparsely settled semi-arid area. The deposit locations require that industry recruit and relocate personnel from larger centers of population. The problem of supplying an industry with water is a serious one and meaningful engineering and economic studies are needed to solve the problem.

The shale oil will probably be transported to the West Coast or to the Mid-Continent area for processing. In either event, the ne-

cessity to make a pipeline quality crude shale oil is imposed on the producer.

In recent years the federal government granted some exploration permits for sodium mineral search in the Piceance Creek Basin. Many additional applications were filed but not granted. These sodium exploration applications, granted and not granted, cover most of the thick, rich oil-shale deposits in Rio Blanco County, Colo. Coring under the granted permits found nahcolite and dawsonite plus some halite. Oil and gas leases had been granted previously over much of the "withdrawn" oil-shale land, establishing precedent for validity of the sodium lease applications. To complicate this question, mining claims based on discovery of aluminum have been filed covering the same land as the sodium exploration applications. Most of these claims are not owned by those who filed sodium prospecting applications on the same land. Filing of these mining claims has only recently been terminated.

Legal problems posed by these events include definitions of validity of the sodium lease applications before and after explorations, validity of the aluminum mining claims, whether dawsonite is a claimable or a leasable mineral, and which filing form takes precedence over the other. All of the problems tie up any possible development of the thick oil shales in the northern part of the Piceance Creek Basin.

The regulating of oil imports has a significant bearing on the development of a shale-oil industry. A change to allow the importation of more inexpensive foreign oil could act adversely to the health of a new shale-oil industry. Conversely, a further limitation on imports, through controls by the Department of by an adverse political situation could contribute to the rapid development of shale-oil production. In this situation, low-cost energy and security of supply are opposed to each other. The first suggests an increase in the supply of low-cost foreign petroleum; the second a reliance on domestic supplies or on supply by stable, friendly, foreign countries.

Under present tax laws, a depletion allowance of 15 percent of the value of the oil-shale rock as mined can be deducted from the taxable income of a commercial oil-shale operator in figuring income tax liability (provided that amount does not exceed 50 percent of taxable income computed without allowance for depletion). Oil shale, as petroleum and all minerals, is a natural resource that is entited to a depletion allowance. The depletion-allowance provisions of Federal tax laws reflect a recognition of the wasting-asset nature of the extractive mineral industries. Allowable percentage depletion rates range from 5 to 27.5 percent. A change to allow a larger depletion rate would make the production of shale oil more economically attractive.

Large-scale processing, 1 to 2 million tons of shale per day, implies a tremendous waste disposal problem. This poses unsolved problems in water and air pollution, damage to vegetation, permanent or long-term damage to the landscape and concurrently a large economic liability in materials handling.

Technology

Production of fuels from oil shale began in France in 1838. Since that time various countries throughout the world have attempted to exploit this resource on a commercial scale. Industrial shale-oil production continued sporadically in France and Scotland from the middle 1800's until the early 1960's. Government subsidy and/or import duties on petroleum products accounted, for the most part, for the industry's 100-year life. Brazil and Canada have been active in oil-shale development work and Australia, Estonia, Germany, Sweden, Spain and Red China have, at one time or other, achieved commercial production of shale oil. However, the only known large-scale shale-oil production today is in the Russian controlled Estonian plant, near Leningrad, and the Red Chinese operation at Fushun, Manchuria.

Over the past 60 years or so, many attempts have been made to mine and retort oil shale in the Piceance Creek Basin. Four of the more extensive investigations were conducted near Rifle, Colo., by (1) the Bureau of Mines under the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act, (2) the Union Oil Co. of California, (3) the Colony Development Co., and (4) a group of six oil companies, including Socony Mobil as Project Manager.

During 1944–56, pilot-plant investigations of mining and retorting oil shale were conducted by the Bureau of Mines. A demonstration mine was opened in a 73-foot minable section of the Mahogany zone to show that low mining costs and high recovery in a room-and-pillar operation were possible. An extraction ratio of 75 percent was attained and mining costs computed during the period of operation in the 1940's ranged between 47 and 56 cents per ton.

Of the numerous retorts studied in the Bureau of Mines program, the gas-combustion retort gave the most promising results. This retort is a vertical, refractory-lined vessel through which crushed shale moves downward by gravity. Recycled gases enter the bottom of the retort and are heated by the hot retorted shale as they pass upward through the vessel. Air is injected into the retort at a point approximately one-third of the way up from the bottom, and is mixed with the rising, hot recycle gases. Combustion of the gases and some residual carbon from the spent shale heats the raw shale immediately above the combustion zone to retorting temperature. Oil vapors and gases are cooled by the incoming shale and leave the top of the retort as a mist. The novel manner in which retorting, combustion, heat exchange, and product recovery are carried out gives high-retorting and thermal efficiencies. The process does not require cooling water, an important feature because of the semiarid regions in which the shale deposits occur.

The retort developed by Union Oil Co. of California also consists of a vertical refractory-lined vessel. It, however, operates on a downdraft principle and the shale is moved upward through the retort by a unique charging mechanism referred to as a "rock pump". Heat is supplied by combustion of the organic matter remaining on the retorted shale and is transferred, as in the gas-combustion retort, by direct gas-to-solids exchange. The oil is condensed on the cool, incoming shale and flows over it to an outlet at the bottom of the retort. This process, also, does not require cooling water.

Two major efforts are being made toward utilizing oil shale by mining and aboveground retorting techniques. One of these is using the facilities of the Bureau of Mines near Rifle, Colo. In May of 1964, these facilities were leased by the Colorado School of Mines Research Foundation and are being operated by it under a research contract with six oil companies; Mobil, which acts as project manager, Humble, Phillips, Sinclair, Pan American, and Continental. The first phase of the research, which lasted approximately 2½ years, was devoted primarily to studying the gas-combustion retorting process in two small pilot plants that had been constructed by the Bureau. The second phase, started in May 1966, involved both mining and retorting. The retorting included use of the largest gas-combustion process pilot plant at the facilities. This phase lasted 18 months. The entire program involved an expenditure of about $7.2 million. All of the research was on a pilot-plant scale and thus will not lead immediately to a commercial operation.

The second major effort is by TOSCO. TOSCO operations on Parachute Creek north of Grand Valley, Colo., have been in progress for about 3 years. These operations included construction of a "semi-works" plant using the TOSCO retort, and the attendant opening of a mine. The retort is a rotary-type kiln utilizing externally heated balls to accomplish retorting. Shale feed of -½ inch size is preheated and pneumatically conveyed through a vertical pipe by flue gases from a ball heating furnace. The preheated shale then enters the rotary retorting kiln with the heated balls where it is brought to a retorting temperature of 900° F by conductive and radiant heat exchange with the balls. A trommel receiving the retorting kiln discharge recovers the balls from the shale dust and they are cycled for reheating while the spend shale is routed to disposal by a screw conveyer. Excellent oil recoveries and high shale throughput rates have been reported. The announced objective of the undertaking is to achieve full plant operation at a level of about 66,000 tons per day.

Operations described in the previous section will use modern developments of the room-and-pillar mining method. Two other approaches have been proposed. One of these is large-scale, open-pit mining that has the potential of producing shale at a low cost per ton. The other new approach to mining is the use of automatic mining machines. Machines that have been proposed are outgrowths of equipment used for tunneling operations that have been successful in materials more easily mined than oil shale.

Several retorting processes, in addition to those previously described, are receiving some attention. One, known as the Petrosix process, is a variation of gas-combustion retorting. Another variation of the gas-combustion retort developed by John B. Jones, Jr., president of Development Engineering, Inc., Denver, Colo., is claimed to be applicable to oil-shale retorting.

In aboveground moving-bed operations, segregation of various sizes of crushed shale creates a serious obstacle to efficient continuous retorting. The degree of segregation increases with the particle size range and the deleterious effects are magnified sharply as the particle size range extends below ¼ inch. Pressure drops through the bed rise to a point where channeling of gas or other heat-carrying media begins and this leads to uneven heat distribution. Heat is concentrated in the channels and, if sufficiently high temperature levels are reached in the bed, fusion of the inorganic material, or clinkering, occurs. The operation then must cease and the fused material must be removed. Movement of the shale through the vessel must be controlled in such a manner that segregation does not occur.

The state of the shale retorting science has not yet advanced to the point where run-of-the-mill crushed shale can be efficiently utilized by the several modern retorting processes that have reached a reasonable stage of development. To avoid waste of a considerable portion of our oil-shale resources (12–15 percent) one of three alternatives may be taken in building a commercial oil-shale plant at the present time, these are: (1) Use a system designed to retort fine shale and grind all mined shale accordingly, (2) use a system designed to retort large particle size shale, screening out the fines and briquetting them for retort feed, or (3) use two types of retorts, one for fines and one for the oversize.

Because mining, crushing, and retorting make up about 60 percent of the cost of producing shale oil, retorting shale in place is being investigated as a means of reducing the cost of shale-oil production. This approach is attractive for several other reasons. It may be applicable to deposits of various thicknesses, grades, and quantities of overburden. In addition, it eliminates the necessity of disposing of large quantities of spent shale. Two major approaches to this problem are in the early stages of investigation. They

differ principally in the manner proposed for creating permeability in the shale bed. One approach proposes limited fractoring, whereas the other proposes massive fracturing.

When limited fracturing techniques are employed, wells are drilled into the shale bed, and a series of horizontal fractures are produced between them to provide paths for injected and produced gases and liquids. In one approach the shale adjacent to the injection well is ignited by some suitable means, and the burning zone moved outward from the well at a controlled rate. Heat is transferred from the combustion gases to the cold shale and also by conduction from the burning zone to adjacent shale. The hydrocarbons produced by pyrolysis are swept through the fractures into the producing wells by the stream of gaseous combustion products.

Sinclair Oil and Gas Co. began studying the feasibility of in situ retorting oil shale in 1953. From these tests and subsequent ones made during the following year, it was concluded that communication between wells could be established through induced and natural fracture systems, that wells could be ignited successfully although high pressures were required to maintain injection rates during the heating period, and that combustion could be established and maintained in the shale bed. More recently Sinclair Oil and Gas Co. has been conducting extensive field research at a site on Yellow Creek in Rio Blanco County, Colo.

One of the newer in situ shale recovery processes had been patented by Equity Oil Co. of Salt Lake City. This process employs injection of hot natural gas to retort the shale and it has been applied in a field experiment in the Piceance Creek Basin.

In another approach, in situ retorting by steam is being investigated by Shell Oil Co. In this process, the steam boiler is fired by methane obtained by pyrolysis of the shale. Because of retorting with steam, the methane is undiluted with products of combustion and should make an excellent fuel. However, the fuel value of the carbon residue remaining in the shale would be lost.

In situ field tests have also been conducted by Mobil Oil Co., but little information on their operation has been released.

Success of any in situ process is directly dependent on the permeability that exists or can be created in a shale bed. The Bureau of Mines is presently studying two methods for creating permeability. The first uses high-voltage electricity to fracture the shale at predetermined locations approximately parallel to the shale bedding planes. Field tests are being conducted in shale beds near Rock Springs, Wyo., to determine whether oil shale under pressure of overburden responds the same to the passage of high-voltage electricity as do unrestrained blocks in the laboratory. The second approach, which is underway at the same field location, is a study of the detonation of liquid nitroglycerine, injected into natural or induced permeable zones, to create fracturing in oil-shale beds.

The site of the preceding experiments is also being used for an attempt to recover shale oil from a bed of shale that was fractured first by electricity and then by liquid nitroglycerine. Preliminary tests use superheated steam as a heat-carrying medium. If satisfactory recovery techniques are developed, an attempt will be made to conduct underground combustion.

The second approach is represented by the Plowshare program for peaceful uses of nuclear explosives; study is being made of the feasibility of using a confined underground nuclear explosion for shattering very large quantities of oil shale from which shale oil would subsequently be recovered by in situ retorting techniques. Because of a single nuclear explosive would fracture several million tons of shale, its use may offer an economical approach to the utilization of oil shale. An experiment to test this approach is being proposed as a joint effort of government and private industry.

Fuels and chemicals can be produced from shale oil by using established techniques appropriately modified to account for differences in composition between shale oil and petroleum.

OIL SHALE (SHALE OIL)—OUTLOOK

Demand

Inasmuch as there is no shale-oil industry in the United States, the assumption used for the future pattern of utilization of shale oil is that it will follow the patterns projected for total liquid fuels in 1980 and 2000, and that the shale-oil contribution in each section will be in the same proportion as total shale-oil demand to total liquid-fuels demand.

PROJECTED U.S. DEMAND FOR SHALE OIL

[In millions of barrels]

	1966	1980	2000
Median	0	400	1,059

Because no new major shale-oil industry is envisioned for the rest of the world, no estimate of shale-oil demand outside of the United States has been made.

There is a need for continuous evaluation of trends in petroleum-product quality and markets, and of the applicability to shale-oil demand of improvements in petroleum-refining methods as they are developed. The high level of research and development in the petroleum-refining industry and the adaptability of some petroleum-refining techniques to shale oil, mitigate the need for a major effort directed toward development of unique methods for shale-oil refining.

Supply

The extent and nature of domestic oil-shale resources are discussed in the oil-shale background profile. The rate of technologic advancement in reducing operating costs will determine how much shale oil will be produced from these resources. The relationship between operating cost and 1980 shale-oil production is shown on the following chart; the assumptions and operating costs used to develop this chart are summarized in the table below:

EFFECT OF TECHNOLOGY ON THE OPERATING COST OF PRODUCING SHALE OIL AND RELATED BYPRODUCTS FROM SURFACE INSTALLATIONS

Technology used		Year in operation	Operating cost (dollars per barrel)	
Retorting	Mining		Before by-product credit	After by-product credit
1st generation gas combustion	Room and pillar	1972	$2.10	$1.49
Above with a 60-ft. diameter retort	do	1976	1.57	.97
2d generation gas combustion	Cut and fill	1980	1.28	.31

The cost of producing shale oil is the key to when the Nation's vast oil-shale deposits will be developed. Currently, a shale-oil industry appears to be only marginally attractive; thus, reduction in cost is prerequisite if industry is to develop a meaningful shale-oil production rate of the order of at least a million barrels per day by 1980. The extent to which the goal may be met, or perhaps exceeded by a factor or two, depends on how successfuly the envisioned scale-up and technologic improvements are accomplished.

New technological developments that might be used to achieve the lowest possible costs in the underground mining of oil shale would be improvements in large mechanized equipment, such as self-propelled drill jumbos, electric or diesel shovels, and diesel trucks. Some further reduction of costs can be achieved through research and development on room-and pillar configuration.

The principal improvements that might be made in open-pit technology are in the development of large-capacity machines, automation and improved methods of transporting solids.

An ideal oil-shale mining system is one that could be used to extract the full deposit thickness (up to several hundred feet), recover nearly 100 percent of the deposit, prevent land-surface damage and despoilment, and be sufficiently economical to permit extraction of substantially lower-quality shale than possible by current technology. The key elements envisioned for such a system are continuous shale breaking, inexpensive loading and haulage, and positive ground control by filling the underground voids with spent shale. As this system is developed it may be possible to retort the shale underground immediately in a mobile retort.

To reduce the expense of mining, crushing, and retorting, which make up about 60 percent of the cost of producing shale oil, retorting the shale in place should be investigated. The success of this approach will require research on method of creating permeability in the shalebed through use of high-voltage electricity, liquid nitroglycerine, hydraulic fracturing, or nuclear explosives.

Large-scale development of the oil-shale industry will create environmental problems of solid waste disposal, air and water pollution, and damage to vegetation.

Conclusions and appraisal

Although the vast domestic resources of oil shale contain the equivalent of about 70 times the present domestic proved reserves of crude petroleum, commercial development is complicated by technologic gaps and economic and environmental problems. Reduction in production costs is prerequisite to the emergence of a significant commercial shale-oil industry.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Government Research of the Committee on Government Operations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, without its being charged to either side, that I may suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I withdraw that suggestion for a moment.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ALLOTT. I understand I must get unanimous consent in order to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 5 minutes.

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

CONGRESSIONAL ACTIONS IN REDUCING BUDGET REQUESTS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, events of the last few hours have caused everyone in America to "reassess" and "reappraise," but one part of the President's speech which seems to have gone past most people, because most people are reassessing the political situation, has to do with the remarks which the President made with respect to the budget and our finances. I am going to read a portion of those remarks, but first I ask unanimous consent that the entire portion of his remarks beginning with "deficit of $20 billion," and going on for several paragraphs thereafter be included in the RECORD at this point.

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

DEFICIT OF $20 BILLION

On many occasions I have pointed out that, without higher taxes or decreased expenditures, next year's deficit would again be around $20 billion. I have emphasized the need to set strict priorities in our spending. I have stressed that failure to act—promptly and decisively—would raise strong doubts throughout the world about America's willingness to keep its financial house in order.

Yet Congress has not acted. And today we face the sharpest financial threat in the postwar era—a threat to the dollar's role as the keystone of international trade and finance.

Last week, at the monetary conference in Stockholm, the major industrial countries took a big step toward creating a new international monetary asset that will strengthen the international monetary system.

But to make this system work the United States must bring its balance of payments to—or close to—equilibrium. We must have a responsible fiscal policy. Enactment of a tax increase now, together with expenditure control, is necessary to protect our security, continue our prosperity, and meet the needs of our people.

What is now at stake is seven years of unparalleled prosperity—in those seven years, the real income of the average American—after taxes—rose by almost 30%—a gain as large as that of the preceding 19 years.

The steps we must take to convince the world are exactly the steps we must take to sustain our economic strength at home. In the past eight months, prices and interest rates have risen.

We must move from debate to action. There is, I believe—in both Houses of the Congress—a growing sense of urgency that the situation must be corrected.

My budget in January was a tight one. It fully reflected an evaluation of our most demanding needs.

But in these budgetary matters, the President does not decide alone. The Congress has the power and the duty to determine appropriations and taxes.

REDUCTIONS IN BUDGET

The Congress is now considering proposals for reductions in our national budget.

As part of a program of fiscal restraint that includes the tax surcharge, I shall approve appropriate reductions in the January budget when and if Congress so decides.

One thing is unmistakably clear: Our deficit must be reduced. Failure to act could bring on conditions that would strike hardest at those people we are striving to help.

The times call for prudence in this land of plenty. I believe we have the character to provide it, and I plead with the Congress to act promptly to serve the national interest, and all the people.

Now let me give you my estimate of the chances for peace: the peace that will one day stop the bloodshed in South Vietnam, allow that people to rebuild and develop their land, and permit us to turn more fully to our tasks at home.

I cannot promise that the initiative I am announcing tonight will be any more successful in achieving peace than the more than 30 others we have undertaken and agreed to in recent years.

It is our hope that North Vietnam, after years of fighting that has left the issue unresolved, will now cease its efforts to achieve a military victory and join us in moving toward peace.

And there may come a time when South Vietnamese—on both sides—are able to work out a way to settle their differences by free political choice rather than by war.

As Hanoi considers its course, it should be in no doubt of our intentions. It must not miscalculate the pressures within our Democracy in this election year.

We have no intention of widening this war. But the United States will not accept a fake solution to this long and arduous struggle and call it peace.

No one can foretell the precise terms of an eventual settlement.

Our objective in South Vietnam has never been the annihilation of the enemy.

Mr. ALLOTT. The President said:

On many occasions I have pointed out that, without higher taxes or decreased expenditures, next year's deficit would again be around $20 billion. I have emphasized the need to set strict priorities in our spending. I have stressed that failure to act—promptly and decisively—would raise strong doubts throughout the world about America's willingness to keep its financial house in order.

Mr. President, the President went on last night in the same vein. I think, from a reading of these remarks, it must be apparent not only to all Members of Congress but to all Americans that the President pointed to Congress and said in effect, "If there are any taxes to be levied, I have already asked for them. If there are expenditures to be cut, I have asked for that, and Congress is going to have to do it."

I recently placed in the RECORD some figures on the appropriations of the Congress of the United States, which show that in the last 8 years the Congress of the United States has cut the budget of the President of the United States significantly in all but 2 years. In those 2 years the cuts were still in the neighborhood of $200 to $400 million. In the other years the cuts have been of remarkable amounts.

Last year the Congress of the United States and its Appropriations Committees were able to effect cuts in the President's budget of $6.2 billion.

I think the thing America is missing today in the significance of the President's remarks is that if there is going to be any fiscal policy in this country, if there is going to be any sensible monetary policy, if we are going to take any steps to bring our balance of payments back into normal range, Congress is the one that is going to have to take those steps. Despite the statements of the President, every Member of the Congress in both Houses knows that week after week, and month after month we see more and higher requests for additional money for the President's Great Society programs.

We are all aware of the necessity in these areas, but we cannot continue to buy guns and butter at the same time. Despite what was said last night, this is not the end of the Vietnam war. It is not the end of the cost in dollars or in lives to the American people or to the people of Vietnam.

So it seems to me appropriate today to direct attention to these particular remarks, and to say to my fellow Senators on the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Appropriations that now is the time, as we are doing here, to consider not only a tax increase, but a tax increase with decided restrictions upon expenditures.

The big problem in this country is that no one, either downtown at 1600 Pennsylvania or up here on the Hill, has been willing to set priorities. But someone, somewhere, will have to do it, and I know of no one more appropriate than the members of the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Appropriations, of which I am a member. I must take my share of the responsibility. I know of no one who can properly take the lead in those matters except the membership of those two committees.

So I hope that while we are considering here an excise tax bill, which also, as amended, includes an income tax increase and a $6 billion reduction in expenditures, we will look at these things very hard. I hope, since we have complained—and I do not like that word, but Congress has complained—that the President has taken over too many responsibilities, and, since today and last night the President has tossed this little ball of wax into the hands of Congress, that we will live up to our responsibilities. I think we can. I think we can make meaningful cuts in expenditures. I think that with such cuts—but only with such acts—we can have an increase in the income tax; and I think, with the cuts, we can provide a set of priorities and a sense of direction which this country, in my opinion, has lacked for several years.

So the challenge has been put up to us by the President. I hope that Congress will accept its responsibility, state its priorities, set out its aims for expenditure limitation, and, in addition, take such other steps as will increase the income tax and bring our balance of payments back to a more favorable position.

TAX ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1968

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 15414) to continue the existing excise tax rates on communication services and on automobiles, and to apply more generally the provisions relating to payments of estimated tax by corporations.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, tomorrow we shall vote on the so-called Williams-Smathers substitute for the revenue bill which is before us.

I know that some will contend that, because of the President's historic and dramatic statement last night, we should proceed to adopt this substitute. I wish to say, Mr. President, that impressed as I was with the President's statement, it does not change my view, and I do not believe it should change the view of any Senator with regard to the vote which will occur tomorrow.

If we are to agree to a big tax increase, it is certainly within the power of Congress to do it by the thoughtful consideration and the processes that Congress has used for a great number of years. It is possible to enact a tax increase by conducting hearings and making a study of the issue, and not buying the administration's recommendation like a pig in a poke. It is possible to do so only after thoughtfully analyzing the recommendation and seeing that it is the best fashion in which the desired result can be accomplished and to bring forth what we believe is the means best calculated to meet the needs of the country.

For example, I have at the desk an amendment that could be considered, if we wanted to do it—I do not expect to call it up—which indicates how I would go about raising a large amount of revenue, if that is what we want to do. It would restore the corporation tax back to the 52-percent rate which existed prior to the 1964 tax cut. That would bring in about $2.9 billion of additional revenue. Then it would proceed to raise income taxes by what would amount to about one-third, by simply going back to the rates that existed after the first step of the 1964 tax cut on individuals. Instead of having a surtax, we would simply fix a tax increase within the rates. My proposal would then proceed to increase the rates for capital gains from 25 percent to 27½ percent.

Instead of having two taxes, we would have one tax; it would still be the income tax, and to calculate it we would have one set of rates, and that is how much we would owe. That would be a much lesser burden on most taxpayers. It would be a somewhat heavier burden on corporations, but corporations are able to stand a heavier burden.

As I say, Mr. President, I shall not suggest the imposition of that tax at this point. I am fully convinced that the House of Representatives is composed of statesmen equally as loyal, patriotic, and conscious of their duty as we are. I am convinced that the President has as many friends and sympathizers in the House of Representatives as he has here in the Senate. They have a very fine committee over there, the Committee on Ways and Means—the oldest committee in that body, I believe—which is composed of some of the most senior and most highly regarded Members of the House of Representatives. Those gentlemen, in my judgment, will initiate a tax increase—if they think the national interest requires it, if they agree with the President, and if they agree with the statements we have heard on this side of the Capitol about fiscal responsibility to whatever extent they think necessary and proper.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the Williams-Smathers substitute has certain other features not recommended by the President. In fact, it still has an item or two with which the President strongly disagrees. For example, it provides for a ceiling on Government employees, and imposes the ceiling in a way that is totally impracticable. It says that at any time that the number of employees exceeds the number employed on September 20, 1966, no vacancy can be filled unless the director of the Bureau of the Budget approves it. If a man who is the head of some particular agency, or who has the top office in a major city, were to retire, that position could not be filled unless it were cleared with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget who would be controlled to such on extent that only 50 percent of the vacancies referred to his discretion could be filled during any quarter when the number of employees exceeded the number employed on September 20, 1966.

It would make much more sense to say that, were two people to retire, only one of those two jobs, numerically speaking, could be filled. It should be left to the discretion of the person who is the head of the agency, or the personnel executive, to decide whether he wanted to fill the No. 1 slot and dismiss somebody holding a lesser job down the line rather than leave unfilled the position of supervisor.

Those who have studied the matter in the executive branch of the Government find very little reason to recommend the personnel ceiling as it would be applied by the Williams-Smathers substitute. I rather doubt that the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] concurred in that section of the amendment, and I imagine it to be the idea of a single Senator, rather than of two Senators.

Furthermore, this $6 billion proposed cutback is more or less a figure picked out of the air. Originally $8 billion was the figure picked by the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] when he thought up his proposal. It was based on what he believed the budget deficit would be, according to earlier administration statements—not its most recent statements—and based on the theory that we could have a balanced budget during a time when the Nation was at war—something that has never happened during my time in the Senate—and it was arrived at by taking the amount of money raised by a 10-percent surtax, reducing the estimated deficit by that amount, and then putting a freeze on expenditures for the difference.

The Senator subsequently adjusted his budget freeze downward by $2 billion, purely in the spirit of compromise. And there is no one to compromise with.

There have been suggestions from the executive branch directed toward the members of the Ways and Means Committee, and, I believe, even directed toward the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], indicating their judgment that a lesser figure would be more practicable and far more in the national interest. However, just grabbing a figure of $6 billion out of the thin air is not a practical way to arrive at the level of expenditures.

The Committee on Finance is not a committee with the expertise and knowledge to know what would be the best level at which to freeze expenditures. It is doubtful that the Committee on Appropriations, which does have the knowledge and expertise and the staff, could tell us at what level the expenditures should be frozen, until they have had an opportunity to study all the items that might be involved and to consider all the problems involved in the matter.

Mr. President, those are just some of the considerations that occur to me. I personally believe that we should not undertake to grab the ball and run off with it until we have had a chance to see whether the House of Representatives would welcome our doing a thing such as that—in view of the constitutional requirement that revenue measures must originate in the House of Representatives.

If the House committee feels it wants to study the matter further and give more thought and study to the proposed tax increase before it recomends it to the House of Representatives, that is certainly its privilege and, in my judgment, it would be well that we recognize that.

For those reasons and for a number of other reasons, I still remain firm in my opinion that now is not the time to add some huge tax increase to a revenue measure which was merely to extend and continue excise taxes that presently exist. And while I am very much impressed by what the President said last night and am moved inwardly to accord the President greater cooperation and consideration for his program and suggestions, I do feel that this is not the way we should discharge our duty.

I believe that we could do a better job and a more thorough job if we were to conduct hearings on all aspects of the tax measure, preferably based on a bill on this subject that originates in the House of Representatives. This is a matter that the House has been studying for a year.

I doubt very much that the House would be constrained to agree to the Senate's action in this fashion if the Senate should see fit to try to impose this provision on the House by amendment to an entirely different revenue bill while it was being considered by the Senate.

Mr. President, I have been asked to insert in the RECORD a summary of the Williams-Smathers substitute amendment so the Members tomorrow, when they are called upon to vote upon this substitute, will know exactly what they are voting upon.

The provisions under the Williams-Smathers amendment can appropriately be grouped into two categories, those which appear only in the substitute and those which are in both the substitute and the underlying bill for which the substitute is offered. It is only the first category which are unique to the substitute and, therefore, are the provisions

to which attention should especially be devoted.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the summary which has been prepared by the staff be inserted at this point.

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

SUMMARY OF WILLIAMS-SMATHERS SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 15414

PROVISIONS WHICH APPEAR ONLY IN THE WILLIAMS-SMATHERS SUBSTITUTE

1. Reduction in the number of civilians employees in the Executive Branch (sec. 2): The substitute provides that no vacancy in the executive branch is to be filled, except as determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, during the period the aggregate number of employees in the executive branch exceeds the aggregate number employed on September 20, 1966. However, the Director may authorize the filling of not more than 50 percent of the aggregate number of vacancies. The following executive agencies are excluded from the operation of this provision: the Department of Defense, the postal field service, the CIA (as a result of a floor amendment), and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Also excluded are certain casual employees, employees employed without compensation, employees appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, and employees transferred between positions within the same department or agency.

2. Limitation on expenditures during fiscal year 1969 (Sec. 4): The substitute provides that budget expenditures are not to exceed $180 billion ($6 billion less than the budget calls for) except by—(1) expenditures in excess of $25 billion necessary for the military effort in Southeast Asia, (2) expenditures for interest in excess of the budget amount, (3) expenditures for veterans benefits in excess of the budget amount, and (4) expenditures from Social Security trust funds in excess of the budget amount. In the case of categories (3) and (4) the only excess amounts to be taken into account are those provided for by law on March 1, 1968.

3. Reexamination of the Budget (Sec. 5): The substitute directs the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to reexamine the budget to submit to Congress within 30 days after date of enactment a report setting forth proposed reductions in obligational authority of at least $10 billion and priorities for allocating the reductions among the various Government agencies and activities in a manner which least impair the efficiency of the Government.

4. Tax Surcharge (sec. 7): The substitute imposes a 10 percent income tax surcharge applicable both to individuals and corporations. In the case of individuals the surcharge is effective for the period from April 1, 1968 through June 30, 1969, a period of 15 months. In the case of corporations the surcharge is effective from January 1, 1968, through June 30, 1969, a period of 18 months. The surcharge in the case of individuals, does not apply in the case of the first two brackets, or up to the level of $1,000 of taxable income in the case of a single person and $2,000 of taxable income in the case of a married couple. The withholding, in the case of individuals, begins the 10th day after date of enactment. It is estimated that this provision will raise $9.8 billion of revenue in the fiscal year 1969 and $1.9 billion in the fiscal year 1968.

Provisions which appear in both the Williams-Smathers substitute and the bill to which the substitute is offered.

1. Excise Taxes: Both bills continue the existing 7 percent excise tax on passenger automobiles until December 31, 1969, and then provide for the gradual reduction and eventual elimination of the tax. They also continue the existing 10 percent tax on telephone services until December 31, 1969, and then provide for the gradual reduction and eventual elimination of the tax.

2. Payment of Estimated Tax by Corporations: Both bills provide for the reduction of the present $100,000 corporate exemption from the estimated tax payments requirement to $5,500. They also provide for increasing from 70 percent to 80 percent the liability which a corporate taxpayer must pay in estimated tax payments to avoid an addition to tax.

3. Quick Refund of Overpayment of Estimated Tax by a Corporation: Both bills provide for a quick refund of an overpayment of estimated tax by a corporation if the overpayment exceeds the corporation's expected tax by at least 10 percent and the excess amounts to at least $500.

4. Timely Mailing of Deposits: Both bills provide that where a taxpayer mails a deposit of tax two or more days before the prescribed due date, the mailing is to be considered a timely deposit even though the deposit is received after the due date.

5. Interest on industrial development bonds: Both bills provide that interest on so-called industrial development bonds is to be excluded from income tax under the code in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Treasury Department, as in effect on March 13, 1968, and in accordance with the principles set forth in certain prior revenue rulings.

6. Termination of exempt status of industrial revenue bonds: Both bills provide that interest on industrial development bonds is not to be considered tax exempt under the Internal Revenue Code. This applies only to bonds issued after December 31, 1968. Industrial development bonds do not include debt with respect to recreational facilities for the general public; debt with respect to facilities for holding a convention, trade show, etc.; debt with respect to an airport, flight training facility, dock, wharf, grain storage facility, parking facility, or similar transportation facility; debt for facilities for furnshing electric energy, gas, water, sewage or solid waste disposal, or air or water pollution abatement; or debt for facilities owned by a State or local government and used in an active trade or business.

7. Public Welfare Amendments: (a) Repeal of limitation on Federal participation in aid to families with dependent children. Both bills remove the limitation set by the Social Security Amendments of 1967 on Federal financial participation in the AFDC program based on the proportion of the child population under age 18 aided because of the absence of a parent from the home. Under the limitation, this proportion is calculated based on the child population in each State on January 1, 1968, and the average monthly number of children dependent because of the absence of a parent during the first calendar quarter of 1968. The limitation becomes effective July 1, 1968.

(b) Assistance to families with unemployed fathers. Both bills repeal the requirement established by the Social Security Amendments of 1967 that in order for a dependent child to qualify for assistance (in which the Federal Government participates) on the basis of the unemployment of his father, the father must meet certain tests of prior attachment to the labor force. The bills also remove the absolute prohibition on payment of assistance (with Federal participation) to a family when the father receives any amount of unemployment compensation during the same month. Under the bills, the choice as to whether unemployment compensation payments can be supplemented is left to the States.

(c) Medical Assistance (Medicaid). Both bills extend, from January 1, 1968, to January 1, 1970, the period in which the Federal Government is to continue to make matching payments, under Medicare Part B coverage, for medical services to welfare recipients of a State which has not elected such coverage.

8. Advertising Income of Exempt Organization Publishing Periodical Substantially Related to Exempt Purpose: As a result of a floor amendment, both bills provide that the advertising income which an exempt organization receives in publishing a periodical is to be exempt from tax if the publication of the periodical is substantially related to the exempt activities of the organization.

9. Advertising in a Political Convention Program: As a result of a floor amendment, both bills allow a deduction for expenses paid or incurred on or after January 1, 1968, for advertising in a program at a political convention held to nominate candidates for President and Vice President. To be deductible, the expenses must meet certain tests designed to insure that the expenses are reasonable advertising expenses, and the funds must be used only for convention expenses.

10. Tax Exemption for Certain Hospital Service Corporations: As a result of a floor amendment, both bills accord tax-exempt status to certain entities which provide joint services to hospitals which themselves are tax-exempt.

11. Proposals for Tax Reform: As a result of a floor amendment, both bills require the President to submit to the Congress proposals for a comprehensive reform of the Internal Revenue Code not later than December 31, 1968.

12. Foreign Nations Indebted to the United States: As a result of a floor amendment, both bills require the Secretary of the Treasury to demand payment of arrears from all countries that are more than 90 days in arrears in the payment of principal or interest on debts owed the United States. The amendment further provides that dollars presented to the Treasury by a country that is in arrears are not to be redeemed in gold but instead are to be credited against the debts owed by the country to this country.

13. Textile Import Quota System: As a result of a floor amendment, both bills impose certain quotas on imports of specified textiles effective 180 days after the date of enactment.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding rule VIII, I be permitted to speak for 25 minutes on a matter not germane to the pending business.

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

AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL SAFETY

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, located at Nashua, N.H., is one in the network of air traffic control centers in America. Under the supervision of the Federal Aviation Agency the Nashua station plays an important role in all safety in the Boston area and all along the northeastern region. I have visited this installation on a number of occasions and have marveled at the job being performed here for our air traveling public. But, Mr. President, the growth of our travel of all sorts in America has begun to take its toll on the men—the controllers who operate this Nashua, N.H., installation.

Mr. President, the volume of aircraft traffic in the United States is truly exploding. In just one area—commercial airline traffic—in the first 10 weeks of this year there was an increase of 23 percent over the corresponding period of 1967. However, projected volumes of aircraft operations from 1965 to 1980—

"Aviation Demand and Airport Facility Requirement Forecasts for Large Air Transportation Hubs Through 1980," published in August of 1967—dwarf this modest increase.

I ask unanimous consent that these forecasts of future air transportation be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

	1965	1980	Percent of increase
Aircraft operations (millions)	20.3	74.6	269
Air carrier (millions)	3.8	9.1	143
General aviation (millions)	15.9	65.1	309
Enplaned passengers (millions)	69.5	370.6	433
Scheduled aircargo (tons)	1.3	19.7	1,377

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, a 1962 analysis of the density of registered aircraft per square mile for the large English-speaking nations shows that Canada had one aircraft per 1,000 square miles, the United Kingdom, one per 60, and the United States, one per 28. A current figure would no doubt alter these figures to show even more crowded conditions in this country. Obviously, unless such traffic were under control, the consequences would be tragic. Control does exist under the jurisdiction of the Federal Aviation Administration. But few air travelers know how complete and how complicated it is or how remarkable its record of accomplishments.

From the moment the door of a commercial aircraft is closed and the mobile stairway removed, the movements of the plane—on the ground, through takeoff, en route to destination, landing and taxiing to the airline terminal—are under the overall control, not of the pilot, navigator, and crew, but of a group of dedicated Government employees known as air traffic controllers.

These men work in the glass enclosed towers one sees in 370 American airports, giving clearance to planes as they taxi to and from the landing and departure strips. They work in darkened rooms, deep within these same towers, staring hour after hour at the eerie light of radar screens, talking to pilots of incoming and outgoing aircraft, keeping them separated safely one from the other, holding some aloft in carefully prescribed areas and specified altitudes, while others are landed in coordination with those taking off. They work in similar rooms in the 21 air traffic control centers throughout the country, controlling the flights of planes after they leave the range of local control facilities.

It is the unique and tremendous responsibility of these men to safeguard the lives of the 100 million passengers and crews of aircraft soon to be traveling the air highways of America. It is a task which with the mushrooming volume of air traffic daily becomes more difficult for these men to perform, more demanding on their health and more dependent on their judgment.

Without being an alarmist, Mr. President, let me say that it is a well-known fact within the aviation industry that there are not enough of these trained men available in the air traffic control network. Those already available and working are dissatisfied. Their morale is sinking. Their job tenure is comparatively short. They are leaving Government service for positions in private industry that carry less awesome responsibilities and provide greater income. At the same time, the program to recruit additional air traffic controllers suffers from lack of financial incentive for students and outmoded civil service restrictions against rapid advancement.

An examination into the reasons for this situation reveals that something more than 2 years ago, cutbacks in appropriations within the FAA brought to a virtual halt the recruitment program for controllers. Mr. Archie League, former Director of Air Traffic for the FAA and now Assistant Administrator for appraisal, put it this way:

> Our pipeline of supply for new controllers was shut off.

In addition, research and development programs for new traffic control equipment were downgraded so that equipment now in use is below the quality and capability of newer equipment already available. What we have then in the high density traffic control facilities is a condition comparable to that of a military unit facing an enemy force, but doing it with insufficient manpower, low morale, and inadequate firepower.

It is not as though the rising volume of air traffic was unforeseen when the curtailment of funds took place. It was not as though this curtailment was in an area which might have been considered a luxury. Rather, it came in an area immediately concerned with the safety of millions of traveling Americans. Under the circumstances, I must conclude that the economy was false. And that it has resulted in a most serious and pressing necessity for correction.

Even with a "crash" program of recruiting under which an additional 1,200 traffic controllers have been authorized, the present shortage of qualified personnel cannot immediately be filled. This is due to the length of the training program and to "Whitten amendment restrictions" on advancement through the various grades of the Civil Service System.

An interview with Mr. Walt Buechler, chief of the air traffic branch, New York area, disclosed a typical schedule of progress for an air traffic control trainee. The applicant is selected from the civil service registers.

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

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

> First 6 months, GS–6: Applicant is assigned to facility for which he has been recruited and in which a vacancy exists. His first 5 weeks are occupied with basic classroom training in the academic phases of Air Traffic Control. He learns the procedures and functions of the various types of facilities in the over-all system. The remaining portion of his first 6 months' training period is spent in learning particularly about the installation in which he will work: its own geographical features, its own weather patterns, its operational procedures, etc.
>
> From 7 to 18 months, GS–8: With fully qualified Radar Controller as his goal, the trainees now works on Flight Data, passing by telephone items of information regarding aircraft clearance, flight plans, departure times and other routine information between tower and center facilities. Assuming his progress has been satisfactory, he becomes eligible at the end of the 18-month period for advancement to GS–10.
>
> From 18 to 30 months, GS–10: During this period he works on Clearance Delivery, he is allowed to contact planes on the ground by means of radio. He goes through "on the job" training for advancement to GS–11.
>
> From 30 to 42 months, GS–11: Now he is qualified to speak to pilots by radio after their planes leave terminal positions. He controls them through the taxiing to runway phase of their flights before passing them on to local radar control. During the final 6 months of this period, he may, if qualified, serve as an associate Radar Controller, working as an assistant to fully qualified Radar Controllers but still not eligible for talking to pilots of planes in flight. At the end of this period, if found capable by supervisory personnel, he becomes a fully qualified GS–12 Radar Controller.

Mr. McINTYRE. It is noteworthy that a period of 3½ years expires from the time an applicant is accepted as a trainee until he becomes a qualified radar air traffic controller.

There has been a recent and intensive effort on the part of the FAA to augment the recruiting of traffic control trainees and to cut down the length of time required to provide fully qualified radar controllers. The effort is two-pronged. First, to create greater incentive in air traffic control as a profession, the Civil Service Commission has tentatively revised the job standards of controllers so as to bring about grade raises later this year for about 4,000 of the 17,000 controllers by July, and eventually for many others. At the present time, the controllers start at grade 6, and their career step-ups are grades 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12. The Civil Service Commission has proposed that they be started at grade 7 and follow the regular route up through grades 9, 11, 12, and 13.

To qualify as a trainee at grade 7, the applicant must have a college degree and at least a year of training. The top grade 13 jobs would be confined to towers and centers in high-density traffic areas, such as New York, Chicago, Boston, Washington, and Los Angeles.

In addition, a new effort, based on a cooperative agreement between the Civil Service Commission and the FAA proposes to accept men who have had previous air traffic control experience in the armed services into the Federal system at the grade 10 level. This would cut the time between entering the system and qualifying as radar controllers to a maximum of 24 months instead of the 42 now required.

The demand for these new men is now desperate. More than half of them accepted as trainees are, for one reason or another, not satisfactory. They quit because they do not like the job—because it is not attractive to them or they are not qualified and they are forced out. So the pressure mounts upon the men presently employed in the high-density traffic areas. It is pressure almost impossible to describe. But day in, day out, whenever an aircraft is in flight, there is a partnership between a group of men in its cockpit and a group of men on the ground. The failure of any of these men can result in disaster.

In a talk in New York before a group of air traffic controllers, F. Lee Bailey, the prominent attorney, said:

There is no rule or law directive from the FAA which directs how many planes may arrive at a given point at a given time. They arrive spontaneously because they chose to go there. At any time, the ground controller may be hit with thirty targets on his radar screen that he did not intend to have. It is his responsibility to get them all down, each of them safely.

This kind of a job requires more than intelligence and ability. It also requires vigor and resiliency which are by-products of youth.

In a report published in Aerospace Medicine, February 1968, is the following conclusion:

Based on training entry age, it was found that the older recruits—particularly those over 40—were more apt either to fail the initial 8 week training course or to pass with only marginal grades. More importantly, the analysis of posttraining data indicated that the older individuals were much more likely to: either leave or be separated from the FAA; transfer to another type of work; or be reported by their supervisors . . . as undesirable, potentially hazardous, or less than fully satisfactory in the performance of duties.

An earlier report, also published in Aerospace Medicine, of April 1964 says:

The only conclusion possible is that a strong inverse relationship exists between age at entry into training and subsequent training and job performance. If an individual were 33 years of age or older at the time he entered air traffic control specialist training, his chances of completing training and being considered satisfactory on the job were approximately 1 in 6. On the other hand, if he were younger than 33, his chances of completing training and being considered satisfactory on the job were approximately 1 in 2. Therefore, in the interests of air safety, fiscal responsibility, and for humanitarian reasons an upper age limit should be established.

From the above reports, one must conclude that the profession of radar air traffic controller is a young man's game. The controller's maximum effectiveness lasts over a 15 year span. The ideal age for enrollment of trainees is from the middle to upper twenties. Thus, the controller is past peak efficiency before he reaches his 45th birthday. Conversation with FAA officials disclosed the fact that with an anticipated 20,000 controllers in the near future, the attrition would eventually level off at approximately 1,200 per year. In an era when old age security is important to younger men seeking careers—and with the opportunity for administrative or executive jobs in air traffic control severely limited—there is no particular appeal to a profession for which the qualification standards are so high and the income levels so low.

Although the workload of the controller at La Guardia far exceeds that of the man in Denver, due to the rigidity of civil service regulations, they are paid at the same rate. At the same time, the cost of living in the New York area is higher than that in less congested regions. But when job opportunities open in more desirable locations, the New York controller is frozen in his present position because no replacement is available.

Many of the personnel problems were disclosed in a study of air traffic delays in the New York region by the Air Transport Association of America, a trade and service organization of the scheduled airlines. In a section devoted to "personnel" the report stated:

STAFFING

Since controller workload is directly related to factors such as volume and weather, which vary widely and may be unpredictable from day to day and shift to shift, the problem of staffing is complex; especially since the training of new controllers has been almost non-existent for the past four years. A program of hiring and training has recently been announced, but since the training of a qualified controller requires approximately two years, the problem of staffing will continue for some time.

It was the opinion of the observers that staffing in the New York Center was adequate during the periods of observation. However, much of the staffing during these periods was accomplished through the utilization of overtime and frequently through the use of "holdovers" from a previous shift for a period of four to six hours. It is obvious that the efficiency of a controller must be lessened after 12 or more hours of continuous duty and the use of "holdovers" should only be resorted to in emergencies.

TECHNIQUE

It was noted in the New York Center that while all controllers possessed the basic ability to handle traffic—whether light or heavy—and to handle emergencies which are unexpectedly presented, there is a wide variation in technique employed to accomplish the job. The controller is given wide latitude in determining the necessity for starting holds either at inner or outer fixes and the determination of aircraft separation (10 miles in-trail, for example). This is a difficult area in which to accomplish reform. However, the FAA should pursue a training program for technique standardization in order to increase the overall efficiency of air traffic control personnel.

GENERAL MORALE

The controllers do an excellent job with the facilities with which they have to work. For the most part, they are interested in doing the best possible job of keeping the traffic flowing and their "esprit" remains good. However, they are unhappy about basic working conditions, meal breaks, overtime, vacation policy, etc., when they compare their gains with those made by others with similar responsibilites. Overtime is a particular source of irritation as under present regulation, for example, a man called for involuntary Sunday overtime earns less per hour than if it were his scheduled workday.

Another common complaint is that it is next to impossible to transfer to another center when a job opportunity arises, inasmuch as a controller cannot obtain a release from New York because no trained replacements are available.

The suggestion plan is apparently ineffective and poorly administered. Controllers complain that there is no point in submitting suggestions for procedural change as management is unreceptive. If so, this is most undesirable. Any suggestion should be reviewed for merit and the sender should be apprised of the reasons for its acceptance or rejection.

Unfortunately, no good yardstick exists today for adequate comparison of facility workload. The New York Center controller feels that he works harder to control a given number of aircraft than, for example, a Denver Center controller, due to route complexity and flow patterns. An effective comparison of workload should not be based merely on the number of aircraft movements, but it should reflect a ratio of productivity to the capacity of the facility. An evaluation of this sort will not only serve to evaluate the workload of the employee for pay purposes, but will give an index to the efficiency of the center sectarization, route structure and flow patterns.

The foregoing indicates a definite problem of declining controller morale within the center and it extends to include the middle echelon of supervisory personnel. Certainly, it has some impact on over-all efficiency. The problem appears to be growing rapidly and is one with which the Administration must deal effectively in the near future.

Another comment on the inequity existing in the workload factors of controller jobs in different geographical locations comes from the Chicago terminal chapter of the Air Traffic Control Association:

In the past few years Controllers at the busy, complex facilities have become disenchanted with their jobs because of the inadequate pay compensation and are looking for controlling positions at slower and better geographically located facilities. These Controllers realize that, by and large, the FAA considers all controller positions equal (no matter how complex or busy the operation) and know that a transfer to a slower facility will not impair their career progression. They find themselves asking the question, "Is it worth controlling record numbers of airplanes with thousands of lives riding on my judgment and the knowledge that a slight error could cost many lives, when I could be living equally as well and have far less responsibility elsewhere?" This question is being weighed by every Controller in every traffic hot spot, with the obvious answer being felt through mass requests for transfers.

The reasons behind this overwhelming expression of distaste are not necessarily because of traffic, the complexity, or even the immense and continuing responsibility. It is simply the location and the high cost of living associated with these gigantic contractions of humanity.

In his Federal Diary column in the Washington Post of March 27, 1968, Jerry Kluttz described the efforts being made by the FAA and the CSC to relieve the personnel tensions. I ask unanimous consent that the column be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

FAA TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS WIN PROFESSIONAL STATUS

(By Jerry Kluttz)

Air traffic controllers with their pressure-packed jobs have won their long fight for professional status.

The Civil Service Commission recognized the 17,000 Federal Aviation Administration employes as professionals in a tentative revisions of job standards that would bring about grade raises next July 1 for about 4000 controllers and eventually for many others.

Controllers start in Grade 6 and their career step-ups are Grades 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12, the top journeyman grade.

CSC proposed that they be started at Grade 7 and follow the regular professional ladder to Grades 9, 11, 12 and 13.

To qualify for a Grade 7, an employee must have a college degree and at least a year of training. Grade 13 journeyman jobs would be limited to towers and centers in high-density areas like New York, Boston, Chicago and Los Angeles.

Controller trainees would continue to enter at the Grade 6 level. But CSC proposed creation of "sub-trainee jobs" that could be filled by junior college graduates who would be hired at Grades 4 and 5. Sub-trainees would have to undergo longer periods of training before being promoted to controllers.

Flight specialists who service private fly-

ers in high-density areas also would be upgraded from Grade 10 to Grade 11.

Controller supervisors would come under standards the CSC has issued for all agencies. Many of the supervisors, again in high-density areas, would be upgraded to Grade 13, 14 or 15.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, in my opinion this effort is a long-overdue move in the right direction. Unfortunately, the solution it offers in respect to controller income in high-density areas is inadequate and there is still not sufficient compensation to top-echelon controllers to make the career appealing to young men. It does not quickly enough provide qualified radar controllers to ease the present shortages.

It is altogether possible some radically different system of recruiting, training, and assigning controllers could be legislated. The controller is much like a soldier excepting that he serves his country in a civil rather than in a military environment. His profession demands the most youthful, vigorous and responsible people. On the basis of the projected increase in air traffic, it would indeed be wise to study the system now being used by the British.

Some time ago, they were faced with much the same problem we have. To meet their requirements, they established a 3- or 4-year course at an Air Traffic Control Institute for qualified high school graduates. Such an academy in the United States could be given the same status as the Coast Guard Academy. On the basis of an attrition rate of 1,200 controllers a year going out of the service, the academy might well have a total enrollment of 4,500 with a graduating class of 1,000 controllers a year. As in Britain, the Government would pay all expenses of these "cadets," including training as private pilots so that they would better appreciate the controller's functions.

Upon graduation, the cadets would be assigned, as are men in the Armed Forces, to locations specified by the Government on the basis of need. They would be paid in a manner commensurate with their responsibilities.

While this system, sketched here in barest outline, is a radical departure from the present one, it has obvious advantages. The nucleus of an Air Traffic Control Academy already exists in Oklahoma City. The facilities would have to be expanded, of course. The technical aspects of traffic control could be taught by former controllers, the faculty providing several hundred new postcareer opportunities for the controllers who have lost their "active duty" effectiveness.

Mr. President, the air traffic control situation becomes more critical every day. At stake are not only the lives of millions of people who travel by air—but the future development of air commerce toward which billions of dollars have already been invested. Delay, procrastination, and shirking of responsibility must not be tolerated.

The science and technology of air transportation are marching quickly forward. We here in the Congress have our special responsibilities to meet the problems posed by these advances. Insofar as the air traffic controllers are concerned, the problem is governed by the logic of supply and demand. More controllers are needed than there are controllers available. This condition will continue to exist until the profession of air traffic control becomes more desirable to young men seeking careers. It will not become more desirable until the economic benefits are commensurate with the duties performed, until working conditions are improved and a general overhaul and updating of equipment is accomplished.

I would hope that the Secretary of Transportation, a man whose past experience has given him wide knowledge of our aviation system, would promptly take steps to reevaluate the present methods of recruiting, training, equipping, and paying our air traffic controllers. Secretary Boyd has the ability to make significant and meaningful contributions to this essential element of present-day transportation. I am confident he will act promptly in this direction.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and I ask unanimous consent that the time not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceed to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] may be permitted to speak out of order, notwithstanding rule VIII.

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

DECISION OF THE PRESIDENT NOT TO SEEK REELECTION

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, had the President been motivated by concern for his own political future, I think he would have ordered a suspension of the bombing of North Vietnam months ago.

This certainly would have muted much of the criticism of Mr. Johnson, both at home and abroad. If such a suspension had resulted in meaningful negotiations leading to peace he would have been widely applauded around the world.

If, on the other hand, the North Vietnamese had taken advantage of the cessation of bombing to strengthen their forces and expand the war, he could have pointed a finger of scorn at his critics and said: "I did exactly what you claimed would bring an end to hostilities and the result is exactly what I have predicted—a larger and more destructive war."

I think it logical to assume that until recently, at least, the President has been convinced that the North Vietnamese were unwilling to negotiate on any basis acceptable to the United States and its allies.

I hope and pray that he now has good reason to believe that there has been a change of attitude on the part of the leaders in Hanoi and that they are ready to negotiate.

If, as I believe, the President's decision not to seek reelection was impelled in part by a determination to convince the North Vietnamese Government of his complete and utter sincerity of purpose, he merits the plaudits of us all.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McINTYRE in the chair). 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.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] be recognized for not to exceed 5 minutes, notwithstanding rule VIII, and with the time not charged against either side.

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

TAX ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1968—CORRECTION OF AMENDMENT

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, on Friday, March 29, 1968, I submitted amendment No. 692. There was an error in the page number to which the amendment would apply.

The correct page number is page 28, line 13 of the Williams-Smathers amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment, which I submitted last week, be corrected to show the new page and new line number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The correction will be made.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

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

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR MOSS TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the prayer and the disposition of the reading of the Journal tomorrow morning, the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] be recognized for not to exceed 1 hour.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum,

and I ask unanimous consent that the time not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The 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 UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 2, 1968, at 11 a.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate April 1, 1968:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Wilbur H. Dillahunty, of Arkansas, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Arkansas for the term of 4 years.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Administrator Howard Bertsch Speaks at Okmulgee, Okla., Dinner

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1968

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, one of this Nation's most effective public servants, Administrator Howard Bertsch of the Farmers Home Administration, delivered an outstanding address at the 11th annual banquet of the Community Chamber of Commerce in Okmulgee last Saturday evening, March 30.

The Bertsch message was an inspiring report of progress in building of a better rural America and a convincing rebuttal to the critics and skeptics who spend most of their time lamenting, "What's wrong with America?"

I believe every American who is interested in learning the truth about the development of our rural economy, and the importance of that development to our country, should have the opportunity to read Administrator Bertsch's speech. It is offered for the RECORD at this point:

REMARKS BY HOWARD BERTSCH, ADMINISTRATOR, FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION, AT THE ANNUAL BANQUET OF THE COMMUNITY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, OKMULGEE, OKLA., MARCH 30, 1968

Winston Churchill once said that the three most difficult things for man to do are these:—to climb a wall leaning toward you—to kiss a woman leaning away from you—and, third, to make an after dinner speech.

Not being a human fly, climbing any kind of wall would be difficult, if not impossible—though, I must admit that there have been times when I felt like I was being driven up one.

As for trying to kiss a woman leaning away—well, I know better than to comment on that.

And, as for making an after dinner speech—as Mr. Churchill pointed out—what can one say that can match the honor and the significance of the occasion.

For I am deeply honored to be here as your guest, and I find there is exciting significance in this annual meeting of town and country people.

To me, this meeting signifies that there is something very right and very good going on in rural Oklahoma—and yes, in all rural America.

What is going on in rural America that is good and right is not something that ordinarily makes newspaper headlines or is featured on the radio and television news. It's not bizarre enough, sexy enough, nor is it dramatically violent. These seem to be the essential ingredients of today's news.

No, what is going on in rural America is really a quiet revolution—a revolution in people's thinking, their attitudes, their way of working together to build a new rural America.

This is not a revolution that tears down the fabric of our society—but a revolution that builds it up.

Because the process is slow, gradual but permanent—it does not create the sort of flashy drama that hits the front pages.

The situation reminds me of the story of Moses when he was leading his people out of Egypt to the Promised Land.

When Moses and his people reached the shores of the Red Sea, they were some six hours ahead of their pursuers.

Moses called his engineer. He said: "You have two hours to come up with the answer of how to get us across the Red Sea."

Two hours later, the engineer came back to Moses and admitted failure.

So Moses called his architect. He said: "I shall give you two hours to figure out how we can get across—the Egyptians are only four hours behind us."

The architect came back in two hours and he, too, had to admit failure.

So, in desperation, Moses called his Public Relations man. Moses said to him:

"The enemy is only two hours from us. I shall give you one hour to solve this problem and save our chosen people."

The public relations man turned to Moses and said:

"The answer is simple. Stand on the shore of the Sea. Take your right hand and wave it to the right and the sea will move back. Then take your left hand and wave it to the left and the Sea will move to the left. There will be passage large enough for all of us to march through and when the enemy comes the sea will close around them. They shall drown and we shall reach the Promised Land."

Moses turned to his public relations man and said: "Do you really think it will work?"

And the man said to Moses: "I don't really know but if it does I can guarantee you a full page in the Old Testament."

So, while what you and thousands of other rural people are doing may never hit today's front pages, I can guarantee that you will get a full chapter in tomorrow's history books.

Yes, there is much that is right about America today and I get a little weary of the massed choir of the disenchanted, the disaffected and the disoriented who sing the chorus of despair and gloom and spend their time telling us what's *wrong* with America.

You have only to open the paper or switch on TV to see them at work. And too often, today's treatment of the news makes heroes out of nonheroes, leaders out of demagogues, statesmen out of paranoics, notables out of hatemongers, nihilists, and misdirected and alienated youth.

Six million hardworking young people, getting an education in college isn't news.

But one college pot party is.

How three million family farmers produce the most abundant food at the least price for some 200 million American consumers year after year, as they are doing doesn't make news.

But let one demagogue call farmers "price gougers" because they want increased bargaining power in the market place, and that makes the front page.

And many people reading only the headlines and hearing the flashy news bulletins, think the country is going to the dogs.

This country is not going to the dogs—it's on its way to becoming the greatest society and land of opportunity man has ever known, and rural America is destined to become a most favored place in our nation.

As President Johnson said in his recent farm and rural America message (and I quote) "We have long spoken of parity of opportunity for rural Americans. I speak now of making that promise a reality."

A decade ago, there was a chorus of voices throughout the land which said that the future of rural America was hopeless.

Let rural people shift for themselves. Let the towns dry up. Let a few big operators run our vast agricultural plant. The farm problem is insoluble. It's no use investing money to build new homes, community water systems, or new schools or health facilities, they said. In a few years there will be nobody around to use them.

And these people made the most of their arguments. They pointed to the fact that farm income had steadily declined for eight years. Farmers were leaving the land at the rate of nearly a million a year. Rural towns *were* drying up. In the period of 1945 to 1960, nearly 20 million rural people left the countryside to live in larger urban areas and cities.

But these men of little faith and less vision, did not reckon with the indomitable spirit of rural people nor the creative leadership of the Johnson Administration. They underestimated the sense of responsibility and the statesmanship of the kind of people you sent to Congress—men like your Senators Mike Monroney and Fred Harris and that truly great Congressman from this district, Ed Edmondson.

Nor did these naysayers and Jeremiahs reckon with the havoc which the migration of 20 million rural people with all their problems created in our cities—the congestion, the pollution, new and larger ghettos filled with poor, dispossessed people who out of their frustration and despair bred crime and violence.

Today, rural America offers new and fresh hope for all of who now live there and those who wish to return.

Since 1961, massive efforts have been made by all levels of government—Federal, State and County—and by thousands of rural people—to rebuild rural America and make it a place of unlimited opportunity.

Yes, today a complete turn-around has taken place in the countryside. We are moving toward a higher plane of living and economic opportunity in rural America.

Maybe we are not moving as fast as we would like—but we are moving.

As President Johnson reported to Congress:

Today, net farm income is 55 percent