any river included within the National Wild Rivers System and to report to each Congress any significant changes that might call for legislative action.

The duties of this review board could be expanded to include making a determination of economic losses to a State arising from inclusion of a river or rivers in the National Wild Rivers System for the benefit of all the people. Restitution could be provided in the form of nonreimbursable credit for such water development assistance as the preempted resources might have made to a State's economy under full or at least an alternate plan of development. Such nonreimbursable credit should be utilized entirely at the discretion of the affected State.

I ask you as reclamationists to weigh carefully the merit of the plan I suggest here. This plan is definitely in the interest of wise use and proper conservation of our land and water resources without imposing undue burden on any area. I urge the proponents and the sponsors of S. 1446 to join me in my effort to make a wild river bill workable and equitable.

The amendment should be written in general language to cover all dislocations in all other States where wild rivers are involved. This is simply the application of the accepted rule in water resource development that recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement are nonreimbursable items.

What is Idaho's stake in such an amendment? Let us look at some figures on S. 1446 which are used here for illustrative purposes only, subject to the refinement that proper research will provide. On the credit side of the account the Northwest will gain the preservation of a fish resource calculated by the Fish and Wildlife Service to be worth $11,062,000 per year.

On the debit side Idaho will lose potential hydroelectric production estimated in House Document No. 531 as being in excess of 2 million kilowatts valued conservatively at $40 million per year. Idaho will also lose the flood protection that proper stream regulation would provide. But, from a reclamation standpoint by far the most important point, is that Idaho will also lose the reclamation assistance that this hydroelectric production would provide in a total amount not less than $400 million based on the fact that a comparable hydroelectric output at Grand Coulee Dam provides that amount of assistance to about 1 million acres of new land.

I have spent enough time at the bargaining table with our Canadian neighbors on similar water resource problems to know that Idaho has an interest in wild rivers legislation that must be protected and defended by proper amendment before the bill is passed.

To sum up: I repeat what I said at the beginning: Finances are the greatest stumbling block to Idaho's future reclamation development. There is general unanimity for such projects as Lower Teton, Lynn Crandall, for supplemental water for Salmon Falls, new water and supplemental for other vast areas on both sides of the Snake River in eastern and southern Idaho, the southwestern Idaho development project which must include also the Weiser, Payette, and pumping projects in the Bruneau and Wickahoney areas.

Idaho's reclamation future depends on developing a reliable paying partner to supplement what the water users can pay.

Idaho must look to the output of its own watersheds for this source. This is Idaho's entitlement—our resource heritage.

Before we surrender—without compensation—Idaho reclamation's potential cashbox to a National Wild Rivers System, let us be sure we know what we are doing.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 14, 1966

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

Bishop W. Earl Ledden, Wesley Theological Seminary, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Lord of all being, throned afar,
Thy glory flames from sun and star;
Center and soul of every sphere,
Yet to each loving heart how near!

We bless Thy name that Thou art near, near enough to hear us when we call upon Thee. Our need is great, and we pray that Thou wilt cleanse and empower us to do Thy will for each one of us this day.

Especially do we seek divine blessing upon Thy servants in this Chamber now confronted with responsibilities, so massive and so many, in this new session of the Congress.

May they find the needed strength, and renewed confidence, as they turn to Thee in the petitions of the ancient prayer which they may make their own:

"Direct us, O Lord, in all our doings, with Thy most gracious favor, and further us with Thy continual help, that in all our works, begun, continued, and ended in Thee, we may glorify Thy holy name, and finally, by Thy mercy, obtain everlasting life, through Jesus Christ our Lord." Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 10, 1966, and Wednesday, January 12, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

REPORT ON OPERATION OF INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

To the Congress of the United States:

This is the first annual report on the operation of the International Coffee Agreement required by section 5 of the International Coffee Agreement Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-23).

The International Coffee Agreement represents an important element of our foreign policy, especially as that policy is directed toward the problems of the less-developed countries. Our participation in the agreement should help make it possible to avoid the sharp rises and falls in coffee prices that have adversely affected U.S. consumers and growers of coffee in foreign countries alike. Stability of prices will help those countries heavily dependent on coffee exports to plan for and carry out their economic development and diversification programs. The steady economic progress of these countries is, in turn, an important stimulus to a healthier and more stable political climate in each.

I believe that during 1965 the dual aims of the agreement—adequate supplies of coffee to consumers and markets for coffee to producers at equitable prices—have been met. I am also confident that the Congress will view with satisfaction the spirit of international cooperation that has increasingly come to characterize the operation of this agreement. The passage of the International Coffee Agreement Act permitted its implementation for the year that began October 1, 1965. The results to date justify our confidence that the agreement will further advance the national interest of the United States.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 14, 1966.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 767) authorizing the President to proclaim National Ski Week; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 767) authorizing the President to proclaim National Ski Week, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

ROBERT G. DUNPHY, SERGEANT AT ARMS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

The resolution (S. Res. 168) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That Robert G. Dunphy, of Rhode Island, be, and he is hereby, elected Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I notice that the Dunphy family—his wife and five children—are present.

I should like to say a word to the children about their daddy that they perhaps do not know, and that is the high esteem and affection in which their daddy is held by all the Members of this august body.

Bob Dunphy came to us as a young boy in 1941, when he was employed in the Post Office Department.

In 1942 he went away to World War II. After the termination of that conflict, he came back to us. In 1955 it was my honor, together with my senior colleague at that time, the venerated Theodore Francis Green, to sponsor Bob Dunphy as Deputy Sergeant at Arms.

During the time that he has served in that capacity, he has earned the admiration and affection of every Member of the Senate.

It was my privilege to present to the conference Tuesday his name for appointment to the high office of Sergeant at Arms of the Senate.

I am quite sure that this man, who is still young, will serve this body with great distinction. I know of no man who is better qualified for that post. He is a man of even temperament and great ability. I know he will do an excellent job, one that will reflect credit not only upon his wife and children, but also upon the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I join wholeheartedly in the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island. He offered Bob Dunphy's name in the Democratic conference, and the nomination was seconded by the Senator's colleague, the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL].

All of us have every confidence in the integrity and ability of Robert Dunphy, of Rhode Island, who is now the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to add a word to what the Senator from Rhode Island has said. Although we all regret the departure of Joe Duke as Sergeant at Arms, I believe we can commend the conference for selecting Bob Dunphy as his successor. I am satisfied that a better selection could not have been made. I know that Bob Dunphy will render distinguished service to the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, occasions of retirement and succession always come as an admixture of both sorrow and joy.

Bob Dunphy succeeds Joe Duke. Thirty-four years ago, in the middle of the depression, Joe Duke contacted his Senator, Henry Fountain Ashurst, in the hope that Joe could come to Washington and serve in some public capacity.

He began his service in Senator Ashurst's office. He has served Senators and the Senate with real distinction and affability and friendliness from that day to his retirement.

Now he is succeeded by the one who has been his assistant for nearly 12 years.

Bob Dunphy is one of the friendliest public servants that I have ever encountered. He tries always to serve to the very best of his ability the Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle. To him I extend the hand of fellowship as he joins the group of Senate officials who serve this body. I wish him and his family well.

RETIREMENT OF JOSEPH C. DUKE AS SERGEANT AT ARMS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at this time I wish to express my deep personal regret and the regret of the entire Senate for the retirement of Mr. Joseph Duke, of Arizona.

Joe Duke wanted to retire on three previous occasions, but at my personal urging and request he remained. Finally, he reached the point where, because of his health and the health of his wife, he had to get away to rest and recuperate.

It is with great sorrow and deep regret that we note his departure. However, we are extremely fortunate to have in the person of his successor a man of the caliber of Robert Dunphy.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. The expressions which have just been uttered by the minority leader, the majority leader, and the Senators from Rhode Island and Vermont, are certainly reechoed among each of us who sits in this Chamber.

I call Joe Duke my friend—so does the minority leader and the majority leader—so do all of us. Joe Duke has ministered to the wants and needs of Senators in a superb manner. From time to time, I look forward to seeing him in the State of Arizona, as he will be a neighbor of mine.

I also wish to pay tribute to the successor to the excellent man who now is in retirement. Bob Dunphy is made of the same kind of cloth. He, too, may look forward to a tenure of responsibility as Sergeant at Arms of the Senate with the same high caliber of service in which the multitudinous responsibilities of that office were discharged by his predecessor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish to add a few words regarding Joe Duke.

Yesterday, I wrote him a letter expressing my appreciation for his helpfulness and fairness. I will not discuss in detail here the contribution which he made to the work of the Senate but I feel that I should mention here some of the qualities which made him so valuable to this body: He was always fair, impartial, and helpful to every Member of the Senate no matter on which side of the aisle he sat.

To me, that is as high a compliment as I can pay him, because, of course, his was a partisan appointment. Despite the fact that he was selected by the majority party he carried out his responsibilities in a way that made us all feel he was our friend and helper as we carried on our work as Members of the Senate.

I am sure that his successor, Mr. Dunphy, will carry on in the same manner because of his experience and association with Joe Duke.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I, too, would like to add my words of commendation to the great record which Joe Duke created as Sergeant at Arms of the Senate.

I have known him for a long while. He has been Sergeant at Arms most of the time I have been in the Senate. Joe Duke is the kind of Senate employee of whom every Member can be proud.

In every sense of the word, he was the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, not of one particular party or one particular side of the aisle. I can truthfully say that I have never made a request of Joe Duke which he did not fulfill with both dispatch and cheerfulness.

It may well be—I know nothing about it—that he may have conferred more kindnesses, courtesies, and favors on the Democratic side of the Senate than he did on the Republican side. If he did, it was our fault. We may not have had as much imagination or ambition in making requests as did others, but I can say that I have heard many Republican Senators in past years applaud the fairness, the objectivity, and the courtesy of Joe Duke.

I am happy that Bob Dunphy has been trained by him. I do not know Bob Dunphy as well as I know Joe Duke, but I feel that, having been trained under that kind of tutelage, we can look forward to the same kind of fair, courteous, and helpful service that we have always enjoyed. Certainly, we will give Mr. Dunphy an opportunity to demonstrate the fact—and we do so with great confidence.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the distinguished majority leader in expressing my keen appreciation of the kind of service rendered the Senate by our former Sergeant at Arms, Joe Duke, and to express regret that he is leaving us.

I have been a Member of this body through most of the service of Mr. Duke as Sergeant at Arms, and in the House of Representatives for 14 years previous to that. I am therefore able to judge him both by his own performance and by comparison. By that test, he has been an excellent public servant, and I dislike to see him go.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator can be certain that that will be the policy of Bob Dunphy.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I know that I share the sentiments of all

my colleagues when I say that we will be very sorry to see Joe Duke retire after 30 years' service to the U.S. Senate.

Joe has been a friend to all of us and we junior Members of the Senate will never forget his great kindness and useful advice during our early days in these halls.

Joe has discharged his duties as Sergeant at Arms with great honor; he has worked diligently to insure the efficient operation of his office; and he has proved an invaluable friend to all of us.

I know that Bob Dunphy, our new Sergeant at Arms, will carry out the heavy responsibilities of this office with the same diligence and care. And I know that Joe is pleased that his successor is so ably qualified to discharge these important duties.

Mr. President, I congratulate Joe Duke for a job well done, and I extend to him my thanks for his great help and assistance.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, we are all going to miss having Joe Duke around. His ability and efficiency as Sergeant at Arms have helped to keep the Senate institution operating smoothly for all the years of my tenure. Although he is still a relatively young man, he has served us as Sergeant at Arms for 15 years. He has rendered distinguished service in dealing with the many administrative details handled by his office. He has aided me many times with counsel and personnel problems. I am sure he has had his difficulties in resolving the conflicts that arise when such efficient service is being rendered to all his 100 bosses, but he can take pride in the smooth manner in which these questions have been resolved.

I shall miss him; we shall all miss him. He has aided the entire Senate.

We wish him a happy and well-earned retirement.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I join with other Senators who have paid tribute to our Sergeant at Arms, Joe Duke, who has retired. I, for one Senator, am much indebted to Joe Duke for the many kindnesses that he extended to me.

I know that all Senators will miss him. I join with my colleagues this morning in wishing that his health will improve as his burdens are lightened by retirement, and that the years ahead will be many and happy ones for him for his family.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, in a note advising me of his retirement, Joe Duke prefaced his remarks with the phrase, "It is with a feeling of sadness." It is with an equally deep feeling of sadness that I rise to bid farewell to this fine friend and dedicated public servant.

I have known Joe Duke most of my life. I have had the privilege of observing his work as Senate Sergeant at Arms for many years. I know, as every Member of this body knows, that he has given added stature and immeasurable value to the post he has held for so long.

The Senate has been fortunate to have so able and tireless a man as Joe Duke serving as Sergeant at Arms. Congress as a whole has benefited from the work of Joe Duke, and so has the Nation.

Certainly he richly deserves all the happiness that awaits him in retirement. But we will miss him. And I suspect that he will miss us.

So it is with a mixture of happiness and sadness, actually, that I say goodby to Joe Duke. Together with the goodby I offer my sincere best wishes for the happiness that follows fulfillment.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, all of us who have come to rely with confidence upon the ability and unfailing courtesy of Joseph C. Duke are saddened by his retirement.

The office of Sergeant at Arms of the Senate is a difficult and demanding position, but Joe Duke earned the respect and admiration of every Member who served in this body by the efficient and effective performance of his duties. He has truly earned his retirement.

As an Arizonan it is with particular pride that I want to note again that Joe is a native of my State who began his career of service to the Senate with the late Senator Henry Fountain Ashurst. Despite his many years in Washington he has never lost his affection for home, and I know he is looking forward to full-time enjoyment of Arizona's sunshine once again.

All of us have lost a true and faithful servant in the full sense of the term. And I know everyone in the Senate, as well as his host of friends in the Capital, wish Joe Duke the fullest possible measure of health and happiness in the years ahead.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, it was with the deepest regret that I learned this week of the retirement of my old friend, Joseph C. Duke, as Sergeant at Arms of this body.

I have known Joe Duke for 30 years, from the days when he was a Capitol policeman and I was a law student at Georgetown, and I am proud to say that we have been friends all those years.

A lot of water has flowed under the bridge since that time, but Joe Duke has remained essentially the man I knew back in the 1930's—warmhearted, generous, intelligent, knowledgeable, efficient, and loyal.

Now, he has earned his rest, and I wish him well.

But I must confess that I feel a twinge of envy, too, because Joe Duke will be returning to the great Southwest which is home to both of us, and there is no finer place in the world in which to live.

In his 15 years as Sergeant at Arms, the duties and responsibilities of that office expanded enormously, but Joe Duke took the new demands in stride and continued to serve the Senate in exemplary fashion.

I know of no individual who is held in higher esteem by the Members of this body, and I know of no individual who is more deserving of that esteem.

In the short time that I have been a Member of the Senate, he has helped me and my staff in a hundred different ways, making the adjustment to this office far easier than it might otherwise have been.

He will be sorely missed.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it was a matter of great regret to me when I read the announcement that Joseph C. Duke, Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, was retiring. For 15 years he has performed outstanding service in that important position. I consider that he is a fine public servant. Over the years he has been most helpful to me and I know that he has been helpful to my colleagues. I hope, as all Senators do, that he will very speedily recover his full and complete health.

All his many friends on and off Capitol Hill are all very sorry indeed that he has chosen to retire. Joe Duke's record as Sergeant at Arms of the Senate was one of unfailing courtesy, competence, knowledge, and efficiency. He was a credit to the Senate, an institution which he loved and which he served with complete dedication.

We shall all miss Joe Duke. I join with my colleagues in wishing Godspeed and happy landings to this fine public servant who is leaving us, and all good things to him and Mrs. Duke.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT ON PROPERTY OR SERVICES FOR EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, OR RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on property or services for experimental, developmental, or research work, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORT ON RESEARCH FACILITIES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on research facilities, grants executed, fiscal year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORTS ON AGREEMENTS CONCLUDED UNDER AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954

A letter from the Associate Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on agreements concluded during the month of September 1965, under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on agreements concluded during the month of October 1965, under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION (S. DOC. NO. 74)

A letter from the President, National Forest Reservation Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

IMPROVEMENT OF LAWS ADMINISTERED BY FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend various provisions of the laws administered by the Farm Credit Administration to improve operations thereunder, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORTS ON EXPORT-IMPORT BANK INSURANCE AND GUARANTEES ON U.S. EXPORTS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that the amount of Export-Import Bank insurance and guarantees on U.S. exports to Yugoslavia for the month of October 1965, not previously reported, totaled $722,582; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that the amount of Export-Import Bank insurance and guarantees on U.S. exports to Yugoslavia for the month of November 1965, not previously reported, totaled $100,980; to the Committee on Appropriations.

STATEMENT ON JUDGMENTS RENDERED BY THE U.S. COURT OF CLAIMS (S. DOC. NO. 75)

A letter from the clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement on judgments rendered by that court, for the year ended September 30, 1965 (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS ON APPROVAL OF LOANS TO CERTAIN ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES

A letter from the Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on the approval of a loan to the Indiana Statewide Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc., the Hossier Energy Division, of Osgood, Ind. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on the approval of a loan to the Southern Illinois Power Cooperative, of Marion, Ill. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on the approval of a loan to the Big Rivers Rural Electric Cooperative Corp., of Henderson, Ky. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORTS ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS

Thirteen letters from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, dated October 28, October 28, November 17, November 22, November 22, December 21, December 21, December 23, December 27, December 28, December 29, and December 29, 1965, respectively, reporting, pursuant to law, that sundry appropriations in the various departments were reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for supplemental estimates of appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON TRANSFER OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FUNDS

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the transfer of research and development funds, for the fiscal year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON REAL AND PERSONAL PROPERTY OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on real and personal property of that Department, as of June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PAYMENT OF SPECIAL ALLOWANCES TO DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to make permanent the act of May 22, 1965, authorizing the payment of special allowances to dependents of members of the uniformed services to offset expenses incident to their evacuation, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON OFFICERS ON DUTY WITH HEADQUARTERS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY AND ARMY GENERAL STAFF

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the number of officers on duty with Headquarters, Department of the Army and the Army General Staff, as of September 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY FLIGHT PAY

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of the Army flight pay, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

APPOINTMENT OF COL. WILLIAM W. WATKIN, JR., PROFESSOR OF U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the appointment of Col. William W. Watkin, Jr., professor of the U.S. Military Academy, in the grade of lieutenant colonel, Regular Army, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF U.S. SOLDIERS' HOME

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the U.S. Soldiers' Home, for the fiscal year 1965, together with a report of the annual inspection of the home, 1965, by the Inspector General of the Army (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REIMBURSEMENT OF FEES PAID BY CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend sections 404(d) and 408 of title 37, United States Code, to authorize members of the uniformed services to be reimbursed under certain circumstances for the actual cost of parking fees, ferry fares, and bridge, road, and tunnel tolls (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON AIR FORCE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS AWARDED WITHOUT COMPETITION

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military construction contracts awarded without competition, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON OFFICERS ASSIGNED OR DETAILED TO PERMANENT DUTY AT THE SEAT OF GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Air Force, reporting, pursuant to law, that, as of September 30, 1965, there was an aggregate of 2,225 officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive part of the Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON AIR FORCE FLYING PAY

A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Air Force, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Air Force flying pay, for the 6-month period ended August 31, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON MILITARY PROCUREMENT ACTIONS FOR EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, OR RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military procurement actions for experimental, developmental, or research work in the interest of national defense or industrial mobilization, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON ADDITIONAL FACILITIES PROJECTS PROPOSED FOR AIR FORCE RESERVE

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the location, nature, and estimated cost of certain additional facilities projects proposed to be undertaken for the Air Force Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PROJECT FOR NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS RESERVE

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), reporting, pursuant to law, on an additional project for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, at Galveston, Tex. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PROJECTS FOR AIR NATIONAL GUARD AND AIR FORCE RESERVE

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on projects for the Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PROCUREMENT RECEIPTS FOR MEDICAL STOCKPILE OF CIVIL DEFENSE EMERGENCY SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT PURPOSES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, reporting, pursuant to law, on the actual procurement receipts for medical stockpile of civil defense emergency supplies and equipment purposes, for the quarter ended September 30, 1965; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON COAST GUARD FLIGHT PAY

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, reporting, pursuant to law, on Coast Guard flight pay, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1965; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS STOCKPILING PROGRAM

A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the strategic and critical materials stockpiling program, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS PROGRAM—EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES

A letter from the Director of Civil Defense, Office of the Secretary of the Army, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Federal contributions program—equipment and facilities, for the

quarter ended September 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON LIQUIDATION OF ASSETS OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the liquidation of assets of the former Reconstruction Finance Corporation, for the quarterly period ended September 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON EXPORT CONTROL

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on export control, for the quarterly period ended September 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROCUREMENT FROM SMALL AND OTHER BUSINESS FIRMS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary 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–August 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms, for July–September 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms, for July–October, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON PROGRESS OF LIQUIDATION ACTIVITIES OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting pursuant to law, on the progress of the liquidation activities of the national defense, war and reconversion activities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, for the quarterly period ended September 30, 1965; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Corporation, for the year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON PROVISION OF WAR RISK INSURANCE AND CERTAIN MARINE AND LIABILITY INSURANCE FOR THE AMERICAN PUBLIC

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision of war risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, as of September 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES UNDER MERCHANT SHIP SALES ACT OF 1946

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on activities under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, for the quarterly period ended September 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON PROVISION OF AVIATION WAR RISK INSURANCE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision of aviation war risk insurance, as of September 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON NEGOTIATED PURCHASES AND CONTRACTS MADE BY THE COAST GUARD

A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration, Treasury Department, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on negotiated purchases and contracts made by the Coast Guard, since May 7, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES ACT OF 1950

A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Act of 1950 (Public Law 845–81) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON PERMITS AND LICENSES FOR HYDROELECTRIC PROJECTS ISSUED BY FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on permits and licenses for hydroelectric projects issued by that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF PACIFIC MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION

A letter from the Executive Director, Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission, Portland, Oreg., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the years 1963 and 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

AUTHORITY FOR PERFORMANCE OF CERTAIN FUNCTIONS OF THE FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the Federal Aviation Agency, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

ECONOMIC INQUIRY INTO FOOD MARKETING

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, an economic report by its staff, entitled "Economic Inquiry Into Food Marketing, Part III, the Canned Fruit, Juice, and Vegetable Industry" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Commerce.

PUBLICATION OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Vice Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a publication entitled "Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States, 1963, Publicly Owned" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Commerce.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act approved August 17, 1937, so as to facilitate the addition to the District of Columbia registration of a motor vehicle or trailer of the name of the spouse of the owner of any such motor vehicle or trailer (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 6 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, and to amend section 6 of the act approved July 2, 1940, as amended, to eliminate requirements that applications for motor vehicle title certificates and certain lien information related thereto be submitted under oath (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, and the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia, as amended, so as to bring within the provisions of such acts any person operating a motor vehicle while under the influence of a drug rendering such person incapable of operating the motor vehicle safely (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF OFFICE OF CIVIL DEFENSE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Office of Civil Defense of the District of Columbia, for the fiscal year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Agency, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF THE CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the vice president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that company for the year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF THE GEORGETOWN BARGE, DOCK, ELEVATOR & RAILWAY CO.

A letter from the firm of Steptoe & Johnson, attorneys at law, signed by Frederick S. Hill, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., Washington, D.C., for the year ended December 31, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

COMBINED STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS, EXPENDITURES, AND BALANCES OF THE U.S. GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a combined statement of receipts, expenditures, and balances of the U.S. Government, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF THE RENEGOTIATION BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, the Renegotiation Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for

the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON BALANCES OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES ACQUIRED WITHOUT PAYMENT OF DOLLARS

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on balances of foreign currencies acquired without payment of dollars, as of June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

VISIT OF POPE PAUL VI TO THE UNITED NATIONS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a letter from Msgr. Franco Brambilla, chargé d'affaires a.i. of the apostolic delegation, and a letter from His Holiness, Pope Paul VI, to the Members of the U.S. Senate, in acknowledgment of Senate Resolution 153, relating to his visit to the United Nations (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

A letter from the General Counsel, U.S. Information Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Agency, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON EXCHANGE SCHOLARS

A letter from the Chairman, the Board of Foreign Scholarships, Department of State, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on exchange scholars, dated October 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN FOREIGN EXCESS PERSONAL PROPERTY

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Department of Defense on the disposition of foreign excess personal property located in areas outside the United States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, for the fiscal year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON RESEARCH GRANTS AWARDED BY DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on research grants awarded by the Department of Agriculture during the fiscal year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON CERTAIN PERSONAL PROPERTY RECEIVED BY STATE SURPLUS PROPERTY AGENCIES

A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering personal property received by State surplus property agencies for distribution to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations, for the quarter ended September 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

QUESTIONABLE GRANT OF CORN TO UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

A letter from the Director, Congressional Liaison, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of that Agency's reply to the report of the Comptroller General in the matter of the questionable grant of corn to the United Arab Republic under title II, Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

ERRONEOUS PURCHASE OF TECHNICAL DATA PACKAGE FROM WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC CORP.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a copy of his letter to the Secretary of Defense in reference to the erroneous purchase of a technical data package from Westinghouse Electric Corp., dated December 31, 1963 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROCUREMENT OF HY-80 STEEL PLATE

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to request, a suggested reply to the letter received from A. H. Whitelaw, Tar Barrell Hill, North Stonington, Conn., which related to the report of the Comptroller General to the Congress in June 1965, on the procurement of HY-80 steel plate (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF ACTING COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on examination of Financial Status, fiscal year 1965, Export-Import Bank of Washington, dated November 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the audit of Federal Home Loan Banks supervised by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, for the period July 1, 1963, to December 31, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the audit of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, for the period July 1, 1963, to December 31, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on examination of financial status of Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., for the fiscal year 1965, dated December 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the savings in transportation costs through utilization of U.S. air carriers rather than foreign air carriers, Post Office Department, dated October 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the use of dollars rather than foreign currencies to pay U.S. expenses in the Republic of Korea, Agency for International Development, Treasury Department, and the Department of State, dated October 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the unauthorized acquisition of passenger vehicles by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, dated October 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of the assignment of enlisted personnel to nonmilitary activities, Department of Defense, dated December 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of investigations and actions by certain agencies pertaining to Government employees licensed to drive taxicabs in the District of Columbia, dated December 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the need for reappraisal of task system assignments for collection of refuse, Department of Sanitary Engineering, District of Columbia Government, dated December 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on potential savings through improved management controls over allowances paid to members of shore patrols, Department of the Navy, dated December 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on problems and additional costs expected to result from use of stage construction of the capital beltway, Interstate Route 495, in the State of Maryland, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, dated December 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on potential savings through the use of houses owned by the Federal Housing Administration as Government quarters for certain Coast Guard members in the St. Petersburg and Miami, Fla., areas, U.S. Coast Guard, Treasury Department, dated December 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on improvement in administrative audit of accrued-leave payments to reenlistees by the Finance Center, U.S. Army, Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indianapolis, Ind., Department of the Army, dated December 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on need for current evaluation of available community housing prior to construction of military housing, Department of the Navy, dated November 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the suspension of competitive rate accommodation exchange service for U.S. Government Personnel in Brazil, Treasury Department and Department of State, dated November 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Army aircraft grounded because of lack of required repair parts, Department of the Army, dated November 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on savings available through more extensive use of contract vehicle service and of certain mail-handling

equipment, Post Office Department, dated November 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on need to strengthen procedures for determining whether loan applicants are unable to obtain financing from private or cooperative credit sources, Farmers Home Administration, Department of Agriculture, dated January 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of policies and procedures applied in evaluating foreign source components and barter bids for an undersea cable communications system, Department of Defense, Department of Agriculture, Treasury Department, dated January 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on examination of financial statements, fiscal year 1965, Veterans Canteen Service, Veterans' Administration, dated January 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON CANCELLATIONS AND ADJUSTMENTS OF DEBTS AGAINST INDIANS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cancellations and adjustments of debts against certain individual Indians or tribes of Indians (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON RECLASSIFICATION OF CERTAIN LANDS OF NORTH PLATTE PROJECT, WYOMING AND NEBRASKA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that certain lands of the North Platte project, in the States of Wyoming and Nebraska, have been reclassified regarding their suitability for irrigation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT AND PARTICIPATING PROJECTS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the status of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON SOIL SURVEY AND LAND CLASSIFICATION OF LANDS IN BONNEVILLE UNIT, CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Bonneville unit, central Utah project, and that the lands to be irrigated are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LANDS IN TRUST FOR THE APACHE TRIBE OF INDIANS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to declare that 99.84 acres of Government-owned land acquired for Indian administrative purposes is held by the United States in trust for the Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL PARKS MEMORIAL BOARD

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation providing for the establishment of the National Capital Parks Memorial Board (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS ENACTED BY GUAM LEGISLATURE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Legislature of Guam, during the year 1965 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED CONCESSION CONTRACTS IN NATIONAL PARKS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession contract to provide services for the public in Mount Rainier National Park (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession contract to provide services for the public at the Bullfrog Basin site of the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, Utah (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession contract to provide services for the public at the Oregon Inlet Fishing Center, Cape Hatteras National Seashore, North Carolina (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS ON CLAIMS OF CERTAIN INDIANS

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claim of the Peoria Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma, docket No. 66 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claim of the Nooksack Tribe of Indians, on relation of Joseph Louis, chairman of the general council, docket No. 46 (with the accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claim of the Citizen Bank of Potawatomi Indians of Oklahoma, et al., Docket No. 71-A, and the Potawatomi Tribe of Indians, et al., Docket No. 15-J (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claim of the Absentee Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma, et al., Docket No. 334 amended (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claim of the Duwamish Tribe of Indians, Docket No. 109 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claim of Upper Chehalis Tribe, et. al., Docket No. 237 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claim of the Cherokee Nation or Tribe of Indians, Docket No. 173 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claim of the Otoe and Missouri Tribe of Indians, Docket No. 11-A (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claim of the Ottawa Tribe and Guy Jennison, Bronson Edwards, and Gene Jennison, as representatives of the Ottawa Tribe, Docket No. 303 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claim of the Vrow Tribe of Indians, Docket No. 54 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Chief Commissioner Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claim of the Chemehuevi Tribe of Indians, the Chemehuevi Tribe of Indians by Dan Eddy, Docket Nos. 351 and 351-A (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claim of the Peoria Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma, et al., Docket No. 314 Amended (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claims of the Yakima Tribe, Docket No. 161, the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation as the representatives of the Palous Band, et al., Docket No. 222, and the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation as the representatives of the Moses Band, et al., Docket No. 224 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claim of the Quechan Tribe of the Fort Yuma Reservation, Calif., Docket No. 319 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF ANNUAL MEETING OF JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the proceedings of the annual meeting of the Judicial Conference of the United States, held at Washington, D.C., September 22-23, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON EXEMPTIONS FROM THE ANTITRUST LAWS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on exemptions from the antitrust laws to assist in safeguarding the balance-of-payments position of the United States, dated January 1, 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON IDENTICAL BIDDING IN PUBLIC PROCUREMENT

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on identical bidding in public procurement, dated October 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON MILITARY PERSONNEL CLAIMS SETTLED BY DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military personnel claims settled by that Department, for fiscal year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RICHARD C. MOCKLER

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Richard C. Mockler (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DAMAGES FOR TIMBER TRESPASS ON LANDS AND CERTAIN OTHER INTERESTS IN LANDS UNDER JURISDICTION OF DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to prescribe the measure of damages for timber trespass on lands and certain other interests in lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, and on lands under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, Subversive Activities Control Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for the fiscal year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, relating to the failure of State and local officials in certain areas of the South to protect persons exercising constitutional rights and to prevent and punish racial violence (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

A letter from the Commissioner, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, El Paso, Tex., transmitting, pursuant to law, a final report of that Commission (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUDIT REPORT OF JEWISH WAR VETERANS, U.S.A. NATIONAL MEMORIAL, INC.

A letter from the President, Jewish War Veterans, U.S.A., National Memorial, Inc., for the period April 1, 1964, to March 31, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DEFECTOR ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJUSTMENT OF IMMIGRATION STATUS OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered relating to the adjustment of the immigration status of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS ACCORDING FIRST PREFERENCE CLASSIFICATION TO CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports according first preference classification to certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CATALOG OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS FOR INDIVIDUAL AND COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT

A letter from the Director, Office of Economic Opportunity, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a catalog of Federal programs for individual and community improvement, dated December 15, 1965 (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORTS ON SCIENTIFIC OR PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on scientific or professional positions in that Department (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on scientific or professional positions in that Department, for the fiscal year 1965 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter from the Director of Personnel, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on scientific or professional positions in that Department, for the fiscal year 1965 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a Civil Service Commission position in grade GS–18 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ON SCIENTIFIC AND PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS

A letter from the Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on scientific and professional positions in that Agency, for the calendar year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, reporting, pursuant to law, on positions in grades GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18 of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ON AUTOMOTIVE AIR POLLUTION

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on automotive air pollution, dated December 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT OF TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

A letter from the Chairman and directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, Knoxville, Tenn., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Authority for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1964, and ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT ON FEDERAL VOTING ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Federal voting assistance program for the period September 1963 to September 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORT OF GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

A letter from the Public Printer, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Office, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES (S. DOC. NO. 76)

A letter from the President, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Academy, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1962; ordered to be printed as a Senate document.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A proclamation issued by the Governor of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Whereas the United States of America is traditionally a nation of small businessmen and enterprisers; and

"Whereas those stalwarts, the independent businessmen of America, for generations have supplied leadership and sturdy qualities of greatness that have served our Nation well; and

"Whereas it is in our best interests that we recognize and foster the spirit of small business and enterprise, and the economy in which it can take root, grow, and flourish:

"Now, therefore, I, Otto Kerner, Governor of the State of Illinois, do hereby urge recognition of the vital role played by small business as a dramatic and integral part of our free enterprise system. I further urge that the gates of opportunity for small business firms be kept open, not only for our own generation but for those to come, in order that we may live in peace and prosperity in contrast to those who would destroy this Nation.

"In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State of Illinois to be affixed.

"Done at the capitol in the city of Springfield, this 28th day of September, in the year of our Lord 1965, and of the State of Illinois the 147th.

"OTTO KERNER,
"Governor.

"By the Governor:

"PAUL POWELL,
"Secretary of State."

A resolution of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to the Committee on Armed Services:

"RESOLUTION URGING THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TO REVOKE ITS DIRECTIVE ORDERING THE CLOSING OF THE SPRINGFIELD ARMORY

"Whereas the recent reaffirmation by the Department of Defense of its directive ordering the closing of the Springfield Armory has dealt a stunning blow to the thousands of skilled workers employed therein, and will unequivocally have a serious effect upon the economy of western Massachusetts and the entire Commonwealth; and

"Whereas the closing of the Springfield Armory, in the light of this country's commitment in Vietnam and other countries, is

contrary to good sense and foresight in view of the outstanding contributions made by the armory affecting the quality and effectiveness of the weapons of our fighting men and women; and

"Whereas the movement for the retention of the Springfield Armory has received the enthusiastic support of countless dedicated and interested citizens of the Commonwealth, the clergy, the college community, the elected public officials of the Commonwealth, labor organizations and countless private organizations; and

"Whereas the city of Springfield and surrounding communities have throughout the years demonstrated their ability to provide maximum standards of excellence in projects at the armory and, if the armory is retained, will fulfill once again the faith and confidence of the people of the Commonwealth and the Federal Government in the economy and natural resources of the area; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate respectfully urges the Department of Defense to revoke its directive ordering the closing of the Springfield Armory, and commends the efforts of all parties and groups working unceasingly to accomplish this vital goal; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress of the United States, and to each Member thereof from the Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the senate November 23, 1965.

"THOMAS A. CHADWICK,
"Clerk.

"Attest:

"KEVIN H. WHITE,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

A resolution of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"RESOLUTION COMMENDING PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON ON HIS ADMINISTRATION'S POSITION ON VIETNAM

"Whereas the policy of the United States continues to be that of promoting self-determination of the internal governmental structure in all countries of the world; and

"Whereas the crisis in Vietnam is a prime example of the Communist influence and disruptive effect of interference with the internal deliberations of a struggling, strife-torn country; and

"Whereas the Johnson administration's position on Vietnam merits the full support of the vast majority of our citizenry, despite the ill-tempered and ill-advised attitude of a relatively small minority in the country advocating withdrawal of American forces and assistance to that proud nation: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate commends President Johnson's judgment on meeting the crisis in Vietnam, and deplores the attitude and unpatriotic demonstrations employed by certain dissident groups and individuals in this country in regard to the Johnson administration's conduct of United States foreign policy in Vietnam; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each Member thereof from the Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the Senate November 1, 1965.

"THOMAS A. CHADWICK,
"Clerk.

"Attest:

"KEVIN H. WHITE,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

A resolution of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

"RESOLUTIONS URGING THE U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION TO SELECT THE CITY OF HAVERHILL AS THE LOCATION FOR ITS PROPOSED 200-BILLION-ELECTRON-VOLT ACCELERATOR

"Whereas the Greater Haverhill area, with its wide divergence of employment supply and economic and technical resources, is ideally suited as the location of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission's proposed 200-billion-electron-volt accelerator; and

"Whereas the location of said accelerator on a thirty-five-hundred acre site in the city of Haverhill has received the enthusiastic support of countless dedicated and interested citizens of said city together with the college community, the clergy, the various chambers of commerce, the elected public officials of the Commonwealth, and scores of private organizations; and

"Whereas the city of Haverhill has throughout the years demonstrated its ability to provide the best possible site for a project of the magnitude of said accelerator and will, if selected as the location thereof, fulfill once again the faith and confidence of the people of the Commonwealth and the Federal Government in its economy and natural resources; and

"Whereas a site evaluation team will arrive on November 3 in the current year to inspect the only area in the Commonwealth which has been proposed for the location of said accelerator, which team will be escorted by leading business and labor leaders, and high public officials of city and State: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Massachusetts senate respectfully urges the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission to select the city of Haverhill as the location for its proposed 200-billion-electron-volt accelerator, and unequivocally endorses and commends the efforts of all parties and groups working unceasingly to accomplish this worthwhile goal; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, and to each Member of the Congress of the United States from the Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the senate November 3, 1965.

"THOMAS A. CHADWICK,
"Clerk.

"Attest:

"KEVIN H. WHITE,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

A resolution of the House of Delegates of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 14

"Resolution expressing the support of the House of Delegates of Maryland for the present policies of the United States in Vietnam

"The House of Delegates of Maryland wishes to express on behalf of the people of the State of Maryland its support for the policies of the national administration and of Congress in Vietnam.

"The house of delegates takes this action, particularly in view of the many expressions of disapproval throughout the country as to these policies. This house notes with pride also that there have been no major demonstrations in the State of Maryland opposing the present policies of the administration and of Congress.

"Millions and millions of Americans without regard to politics have endorsed and are supporting the present policies of this country in Vietnam and the House of Delegates of Maryland is pleased to add its endorsement also: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Delegates of Maryland, That this body expresses its support and endorsement of the present policies of the administration and of the Congress with respect to Vietnam; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house is instructed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, as presiding officer in the Senate of Maryland, the Speaker of the House of Representatives in the Congress, and each member of the Maryland delegation in the Senate and House of Representatives.

"By the house of delegates, October 21, 1965.

"MARVIN MANDEL,
"Speaker of the House of Delegates.
"JAMES P. MAUSE,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Delegates."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 2

"Joint resolution making application to Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to apportionment of State legislatures

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That application is respectfully made to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. Nothing in this Constitution shall prohibit any State which shall have a bicameral legislature from apportioning the membership of one house of such legislature on factors other than population, provided that the plan of such apportionment shall have been submitted to and approved by a vote of the electorate of that State.

" 'SEC. 2. Nothing in this Constitution shall restrict or limit a State in its determination of how membership of governing bodies of its subordinate units shall be apportioned.

" 'SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress.'; and be it further

"Resolved, That if Congress has proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to June 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any effect; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each member of the New Mexico delegation to the Congress of the United States.

"Signed and sealed at the capitol, in the city of Santa Fe.

"MACK EASLEY,
"President of the Senate.
"BRUCE KING,
"Speaker, House of Representatives."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 34

"Joint resolution applying to the Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 84th General Assembly of the State of Tennessee (the Senate concurring), That

this general assembly respectfully applies to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. Nothing in this Constitution shall prohibit any State which shall have a bicameral legislature from apportioning the membership of one house of such legislature on factors other than population, provided that the plan of such apportionment shall have been submitted to and approved by a vote of the electorate of that State.

" 'SEC. 2. Nothing in this Constitution shall restrict or limit a State in its determination of how membership of governing bodies of its subordinate units shall be apportioned.

" 'SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress'; be it further

"Resolved, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to June 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; be it further

"Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"Adopted: February 23, 1965.

"WILLIAM N. BARRY,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"JAMES G. MADDOX,
"Speaker of the Senate.

"Approved.

"FRANK G. CLEMENT,
"Governor."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 1

"Resolution relative to ratification of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, proposed by the Congress of the United States, relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office.

"Whereas the 89th Congress of the United States of America has adopted Senate Joint Resolution 1, two-thirds of each House concurring therein, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, in the following words, to wit:

" 'Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office

" '*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United* States of *America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein)*, That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. In case of the removal of the President from office or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President.

" 'SEC. 2. Whenever there is a vacancy in the office of the Vice President, the President shall nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.

" 'SEC. 3. Whenever the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, and until he transmits to them a written declaration to the contrary, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.

" 'SEC. 4. Whenever the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive departments or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as Acting President.

" 'Thereafter, when the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that no inability exists, he shall resume the powers and duties of his office unless the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive department or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit within four days to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. Thereupon Congress shall decide the issue, assembling within forty-eight hours for that purpose if not in session. If the Congress, within twenty-one days after the receipt of the latter written declaration, or, if Congress is not in session, within twenty-one days after Congress is required to assemble, determines by two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall continue to discharge the same as Acting President; otherwise, the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office.' "; and whereas, said proposed amendment will be valid as part of the Constitution of the United States when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, a majority of all the members elected to each house of said Legislature voting in favor thereof, That the proposed amendment be and the same is hereby ratified by the Legislature of the State of California; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of the foregoing preamble and resolution be forwarded by the Governor of the State of California to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and the Secretary of State of the United States.

"CARLOS BEE,
"Speaker pro tempore of the Assembly.

"HUGH M. BURNS,
"President pro tempore of the Senate.

"Attest:

"FRANK M. JORDAN,
"Secretary of State."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION

"Joint resolution relative to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways

"Whereas the Federal law now requires the completion of the portion of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways in California by October 1, 1972; and

"Whereas this State will not be eligible for reimbursement from the Federal Government for any expenditures made by it after that date on the Interstate System; and

"Whereas the Federal Highway Administrator has recently announced that this State will probably not be able to complete the construction of certain portions of the Interstate System within the city and county of San Francisco by October 1, 1972, and that he has removed from this State a large portion of the mileage and funds which were available to reimburse this State for construction of the portion of the Interstate System within the city and county of San Francisco: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as may be necessary to extend the 1972 deadline on the availability of Federal funds for the reimbursement of States for expenditures made on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Federal Highway Administrator is requested not to take any action to reallocate to any other State any of the funds which were available to reimburse the State of California for the construction of that portion of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways within the city and county of San Francisco; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Federal Highway Administrator."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alabama; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 3

"Joint resolution applying to the Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Legislature of Alabama respectfully applies to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. Nothing in this Constitution shall prohibit any State which shall have a bicameral legislature from apportioning the membership of one house of such legislature on factors other than population, provided that the plan of such apportionment shall have been submitted to and approved by a vote of the electorate of that State.

" 'SEC. 2. Nothing in this Constitution shall restrict or limit a State in its determination of how membership of governing bodies of its subordinate units shall be apportioned.

" 'SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress'; be it further

"Resolved, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to June 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; be it further

"Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"Approved February 24, 1965.

"I hereby certify that the foregoing copy of an act of the Legislature of Alabama has

been compared with the enrolled act and it is a true and correct copy thereof.

"Given under my hand this 25th day of February 1965.

"McDowell Lee,
"*Secretary of Senate.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alabama; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"H.J. Res. 5

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to apportionment of State legislatures

"Whereas the U.S. Supreme Court has ruled recently that both houses of State legislatures must be elected on an equal population basis; and

"Whereas the decision struck down the time-honored practice for each State to organize its own legislative body in that manner which will best serve the people of the particular State concerned; and

"Whereas these decisions strike at the very heart of the type of representative government which existed in this country in the days of colonial government long before the adoption of the Constitution of the United States and from which the present organization in the Congress and the State legislatures was copied; and

"Whereas this body does not believe that it is equitable or in the best interest of the people of the entire country to apply a different and more drastic formula for apportioning representatives of the various legislatures of the States than the U.S. Constitution specifies for both Houses of the Congress; and

"Whereas the only recourse the States and the people have in preserving some discretion as to how to balance the varied interests and geographical considerations within their boundaries is through action by the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of Alabama (both houses thereof concurring)*, That the formula for determining the representation in the State legislatures should be sufficiently flexible to produce a legislative body reflecting the regional and local values which the State may deem appropriate; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That this body memorializes the Congress of the United States to give prompt consideration to proposing to the several States for ratification an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which will unequivocably empower a State, at its option, to achieve equality of representation in its legislative body by utilizing population in apportioning one house of its legislature and any criteria as in its wisdom may be in its individual best interest in apportioning the other house of its legislature, thereby permitting the States to retain the pattern of governmental structure which has withstood the test of time and has proven its merits both in the National Government and in the States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the several other States are urged to join this State in this petition; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Speaker and Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the President and Secretary of the Senate of the United States and to the clerks and secretaries of the legislative bodies of all other States.

"Approved August 13, 1964.

"I hereby certify that the foregoing copy of an act of the Legislature of Alabama has been compared with the enrolled act and it is a true and correct copy thereof.

"Given under my hand this 14 day of August 1964.

"John W. Pemberton,
"*Clerk of the House.*"

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Resolution 4

"Joint resolution ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States

"Whereas Senate Joint Resolution 1 of the 89th Congress, 1st session, proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; and

"Whereas the amendment so proposed shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution of the United States when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submisison by the Congress; and

"Whereas the purpose of the proposed amendment is in keeping with the desires of the people of this Commonwealth to insure an orderly and responsible exercise of the powers and duties vested in the highest executive office of the National Government; and to insure the proper discharge of the office of President of the United States and the office of Vice President of the United States: Now, therefore be it

"*Resolved by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky:*

"Section 1. The amendment to the Constitution of the United States proposed by Senate Joint Resolution 1 of the 89th Congress, 1st session, entitled 'Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office' and reading as follows, hereby is ratified:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'Section 1. In case of the removal of the President from office or his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President.

" 'Sec. 2. Whenever there is a vacancy in the office of the Vice President, the President shall nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.

" 'Sec. 3. Whenever the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, and until he transmits to them a written declaration to the contrary, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.

" 'Sec. 4. Whenever the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive departments or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as Acting President.

" 'Thereafter, when the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that no inability exists, he shall resume the powers and duties of his office unless the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive department or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit within 4 days to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. Thereupon Congress shall decide the issue, assembling within 48 hours for that purpose if not in session. If the Congress, within 21 days after receipt of the latter written declaration, or, if Congress is not in session, within 21 days after Congress is required to assemble, determines by two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall continue to discharge the same as Acting President; otherwise, the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office.'

"Sec. 2. The Governor of the Commonwealth shall cause certified copies of this resolution to be sent to the Administrator of General Services of the United States, to the Secretary of State of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of the U.S. Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States. The secretary of state of this Commonwealth shall cause certified copies of this resolution to be sent to the Governor of each of the United States.

"Harry Lee Waterfield,
"*President of the Senate.*

"Shelby McCallum,
"*Speaker, House of Representatives.*

"Attest:

"John W. Willis,
"*Chief Clerk of Senate.*

"Approved:

"Edward T. Breathitt,
"*Governor.*

"September 17, 1965."

The petition of Choko Kuwae, president, Association To Acquire Compensation for Damages Prior to Peace Treaty, of the island of Okinawa, praying for a solution of the prepeace treaty compensation issue; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Resolutions adopted by We, the People, National Coalition of Patriots To Protect Self-Government and Save American Freedom, of Phoenix, Ariz., favoring a declaration of war against North Vietnam, and that the Government should return the conduct of the war to the military; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Naval Reserve Association, Washington, D.C., expressing appreciation to the Congress for the enactment of the Armed Forces pay bill; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Minnesota Association of Public Accountants, favoring the enactment of House bill 10529, to prohibit banks from performing professional accounting services; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the California Association of Airport Executives, at Oakland, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation to require the Civil Aeronautics Board to assure that certificated airlines maintain service and schedules and to meet the need of the communities they serve; to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the State Executive Committee of the Socialist Party, Social Democratic Federation of Wisconsin, relating to the war in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Student Government Association of Nicholls State College, Thibodaux, La., commending the Congress and the President on the Government's stand on Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Petitions signed by Tomio Sato, chairman, Hirara City Assembly, Eiharu Nakamura, president, Okinawa City, Town and Village Governments Association, and Seiki Miyagi, president, Association of Chairmen of City, Town, and Village Assemblies in Okinawa, of the island of Okinawa, praying for a chief executive public election; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Two resolutions adopted by the United-Italian American Labor Council, Inc., of

New York, N.Y., relating to Vietnam and NATO; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A concurrent resolution adopted by the House of Man, signed by Saxton Doggett and sundry other citizens of the United States, favoring the convening of the Charter Review Conference of the United Nations, for the establishment of government, law, justice, peace, prosperity, and freedom for all the peoples of the earth; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Resolutions adopted by the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, U.S. section, Washington, D.C., relating to (1) Vietnam; (2) International Cooperation Year; (3) China; (4) intervention in Latin America; (5) chemical, biological, and radiological warfare; (6) Japan relations; and (7) Disarmament Conference and Multilateral Force (MLF); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the southern California branch of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, in Los Angeles, Calif., favoring the assumption of leadership by the United States in the matter of the improvement of the world's underprivileged, through the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the southern California branch of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, in Los Angeles, Calif., favoring the creation of a U.S. Department of Peace; to the Committee on Government Operations.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Anchorage, Alaska, favoring donations of Federal surplus property to cities; to the Committee on Government Operations.

A resolution adopted by the National District Attorneys' Association, Stockton, Calif., favoring the enactment of Senate bill 1636, regarding Federal-State conflict over water rights; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Greater South Dakota Association, of Huron, S. Dak., favoring the authorization of the Oahe Irrigation Unit in central South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Resolutions adopted at a joint convention of the North Dakota Water Users Association, the North Dakota Water Management Districts Association, Inc., and the North Dakota Irrigation Districts Association, at Grand Forks, N. Dak., favoring an acceleration of the water resources program in the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of Becker County, Minn., relating to funds to place a bituminous surface on a road in that county being constructed by the Bureau of Indian Affairs; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the 1965 annual convention of the Western States Land Commissioners' Association, favoring the enactment of legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make a loan and grant to the State of Hawaii for the construction of the Kokee water project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the New Jersey Society, Sons of the American Revolution, Newark, N.J., relating to the employment of Prof. Eugene Genovese by Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by Bryant D. Rowland, of San Pablo, Calif., enclosing his letter of congratulations to the secretary of state of California for his decision to run for reelection; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, U.S. section, Washington, D.C., relating to acts of violence in the South; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Jack Bright and John W. Oliver, citizens of the United States, praying for an investigation of the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in releasing the Communists in America from registering with the U.S. Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Gandy-Brown Post No. 4588, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Bossier City, La., protesting against the dissemination of communistic ideology by self-acclaimed Marxists in our Nation's colleges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the United-Italian American Labor Council, Inc., of New York, N.Y., favoring the designation of Columbus Day, October 12 of each year, as a national holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the southern California branch of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, at Los Angeles, Calif., relating to human rights in the southern California area; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Resolutions adopted by the Idaho Cooperative Council, Inc., of Boise, Idaho, relating to agricultural cooperatives, reapportionment of State legislatures, administration of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, agricultural exemptions in the Fair Labor Standards Act and voluntary participation in organizations; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Oklahoma State Pipe Trades Association at Tulsa, Okla., commending the President and his legislative programs for the health and welfare of the working people of our Nation; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the 1965 convention of the Virginia AFL–CIO, favoring the enactment of Senate bill 1781, to prohibit the interstate trafficking in strikebreakers; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A memorial signed by Rev. Christian C. Christopher, and sundry other persons, members of the Bath, N.Y., Church of the Nazarene, remonstrating against the enactment of Senate bill 1211, to provide for the conduct of national elections on the first Sunday in November; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

A resolution adopted by the Missouri Credit Union League, at St. Louis, Mo., expressing its endorsement of the enabling legislation that made it possible to extend the credit union idea beyond the borders of the United States to provide further emphasis on the brotherhood of man; ordered to lie on the table.

A paper in the nature of a petition, signed by Gordon T. Nesvig, clerk of the board of supervisors of Los Angeles County, Calif., relating to the custom of standing when the national anthem is played, originated by Russell Galbraith O'Brien in 1893; ordered to lie on the table.

AUTHORIZATION OF EXPENDITURE OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 170) authorizing the expenditure of additional funds from the contingent fund for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. RES. 170

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eighty-ninth Congress, $10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purpose, specified in section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 171) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. RES. 171

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to Indian affairs; irrigation and reclamation; minerals, materials, and fuels; public lands; and territories and insular affairs.

SEC. 2. Pursuant to its authority under section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, the committee is authorized to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, documents and to take such testimony on matters within its jurisdiction as it deems advisable.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $105,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR INVESTIGATION OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MUSKIE, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 174) providing additional funds for an investigation of intergovernmental relations, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That S. Res. 59, Eighty-ninth Congress, agreed to February 8, 1965 (authorizing an investigation of intergovernmental relations), is hereby amended on page 2, line 23, by striking out "$129,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$137,000".

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. TOWER, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. MUNDT):

S. 2732. A bill to make the direct home loan benefits of section 1811 of title 38, United States Code, available to veterans of the Vietnam conflict; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. LAUSCHE):

S. 2733. A bill to provide for the free entry of one Weissenberg rheogoniometer for the use of Case Institute of Technology; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. BURDICK):

S. 2734. A bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1948 to adjust sugar quotas for domestic areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 2735. A bill to declare that 99.84 acres of Government-owned land acquired for Indian administrative purposes is held by the United States in trust for the Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

S. 2736. A bill for the relief of Drs. Renato C. and Amparo Castro;

S. 2737. A bill for the relief of Drs. Jaime E. and Lydia L. Lazaro;

S. 2738. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ezzat N. Asaad; and

S. 2739. A bill for the relief of Dr. Blanche L. Asaad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BASS:

S. 2740. A bill for the relief of Rama I. Mani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina:

S. 2741. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to corporations for contributions to colleges and universities; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. McINTYRE:

S. 2742. A bill for the relief of Rosario Ilardi; and

S. 2743. A bill for the relief of Nocolo Vitale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 2744. A bill to provide for cost-of-living adjustments in star route contract prices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 2745. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to treat sintering or burning as a mining process in the case of shale, clay, and slate used or sold for use, as lightweight concrete aggregates; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 2746. A bill to amend section 3203, title 38, United States Code, to restrict the conditions under which benefits are immediately reduced upon readmission of veterans for hospitalization or other institutional care; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 2747. A bill to authorize conclusion of an agreement with Mexico for joint measures for solution of the lower Rio Grande salinity problem; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 2748. A bill to assure adequate and complete medical care for veterans by providing for participation by the Veterans' Administration in medical community planning and for the sharing of advanced medical technology and equipment between the Veterans' Administration and other public and private hospitals; and

S. 2749. A bill to amend section 111 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the prepayment of certain expenses associated with the travel of veterans to or from a Veterans' Administration facility or other place, in connection with vocational rehabilitation or counseling, or for the purpose of examination, treatment, or care; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. YARBOROUGH when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S. 2750. A bill for the relief of You I Souk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 2751. A bill for the relief of David R. Slemon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 2752. A bill to amend section 2(a) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2753. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain phosphate rights to Willard Roe and Fred Roe, Polk County, Fla.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2754. A bill for the relief of Dr. Julio Valdes-Rodriguez;

S. 2755. A bill for the relief of Ena Herminia Mourino de Moya;

S. 2756. A bill for the relief of Rita Maria Garmendia de Alsina;

S. 2757. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alberto Fernandez-Bravo y Amat;

S. 2758. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose Carlos Cilvino Dominguez y Del Rosal;

S. 2759. A bill for the relief of Carlos Miguel Calonge-Diaz;

S. 2760. A bill for the relief of Armando Jose Alonso-Garcia;

S. 2761. A bill for the relief of Dr. Julio Sanguily, Jr.;

S. 2762. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rafael Jacinto Novo y Pividal (Rafael Nobo); and

S. 2763. A bill for the relief of Dr. Marcial Alfredo Marti Prieto (Alfredo Marti); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 2764. A bill for the relief of Jotu Advani; and

S. 2765. A bill for the relief of Frank Doral Cutler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2766. A bill to amend section 6 of the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act so as to eliminate the provision thereof limiting payments thereunder to plans provided by carriers licensed to operate in all States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CARLSON (for himself and Mr. MUNDT):

S. 2767. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to permit the duty free entry of gifts not exceeding $100 in retail value from members of the Armed Forces serving in a combat zone; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. INOUYE:

S. 2768. A bill for the relief of Juliana Maguay Sugitan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 2769. A bill relating to the establishment of parking facilities in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 2770. A bill to control the use of the design of the great seal of the United States and of the seal of the President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S.J. Res. 123. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week beginning March 14, 1966, as National Citrus Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

S.J. Res. 124. Joint resolution to establish the Golden Spike Centennial Celebration Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Moss when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PROXMIRE (for Mr. DOUGLAS):

S.J. Res. 125. Joint resolution extending the date for transmission of the economic report; considered and passed.

(See the remarks of Mr. PROXMIRE when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF CHARTERING BY ACT OF CONGRESS OF THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

Mr. HAYDEN (for himself, Mr. HILL, Mr. McNAMARA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. PROUTY, and Mr. DOMINICK) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 68), which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. CON. RES. 68

Whereas June 15, 1966 will mark the fiftieth anniversary of the granting by Act of Congress of the Charter of the Boy Scouts of America;

Whereas the Boy Scouts of America was the first youth organization to be granted a charter by Act of Congress;

Whereas the Congress has been kept informed of the programs and activities of the Boy Scouts of America through the annual reports made to it each year by this organization in accordance with such charter;

Whereas these programs and activities have been designed to instill in boys the moral and ethical principles, and the habits, practices and attitudes, which are conducive to good character, citizenship, and health; and

Whereas, by fostering in the youth of the Nation those qualities upon which our strength as a nation is dependent, the Boy Scouts of America has made a contribution of inestimable value to the welfare of the entire Nation: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress hereby pays tribute to the Boy Scouts of America on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the granting by Act of Congress of the charter of the Boy Scouts of America, and expresses its recognition of and appreciation for the public service performed by this organization through its contributions to the lives of the Nation's youth.

RESOLUTIONS

ELECTION OF ROBERT G. DUNPHY, SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER OF THE SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 168) electing Robert G.

Dunphy, Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate, which was considered and agreed to.

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

CHANGES IN MEMBERSHIP OF CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 169) making changes in the membership of certain standing committees of the Senate, which was considered and agreed to.

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

AUTHORIZATION OF EXPENDITURE OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 170) authorizing the expenditure of additional funds from the contingent fund for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eighty-ninth Congress, $10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purpose, specified in section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 171) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. RES. 171

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of all matters pertaining to Indian affairs; irrigation and reclamation; minerals, materials, and fuels; public lands; and territories and insular affairs.

SEC. 2. Pursuant to its authority under section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, the committee is authorized to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, documents and to take such testimony on matters within its jurisdiction as it deems advisable.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $105,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ROBERTSON (for himself, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. TOWER) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 172); which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. RES. 172

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to public and private housing.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $138,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO MAKE CERTAIN INVESTIGATIONS, AND TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL FUNDS THEREFOR

Mr. ROBERTSON (for himself and Mr. BENNETT) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 173); which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. RES. 173

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) banking and currency generally;

(2) financial aid to commerce and industry;

(3) deposit insurance;

(4) the Federal Reserve System, including monetary and credit policies;

(5) economic stabilization, production, and mobilization;

(6) valuation and revaluation of the dollar;

(7) prices of commodities, rents, and services;

(8) securities and exchange regulation;

(9) credit problems of small business; and

(10) international finance through agencies within the legislative jurisdiction of the committee.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $110,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR INVESTIGATION OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. MUSKIE, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 174) providing additional funds for an investigation of intergovernmental relations, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That S. Res. 59, Eighty-ninth Congress, agreed to February 8, 1965 (authorizing an investigation of intergovernmental relations), is hereby amended on page 2, line 23, by striking out "$129,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$137,000".

APPOINTMENT OF MR. LONG OF LOUISIANA AS CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. BREWSTER submitted an original resolution (S. Res. 175), which was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That Mr. LONG of Louisiana be, and he is hereby, elected Chairman of the Committee on Finance, in lieu of Mr. Harry F. Byrd, Sr., of Virginia, resigned from the Senate.

DEATH OF HON. HERBERT C. BONNER, OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. ERVIN (for himself and Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 176) relative to the death

of Hon. Herbert C. Bonner, of North Carolina, which was considered and agreed to.

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

EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION AND OPINION BETWEEN THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD AND OTHER ECONOMIC AGENCIES

Mr. PROXMIRE submitted a resolution (S. Res. 177) to provide for information and exchange of opinion between the Federal Reserve Board and other economic agencies, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

DIRECT HOME LOAN BENEFITS FOR VETERANS OF VIETNAM CONFLICT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], I am introducing a bill that would make veterans who have served on active duty during the Vietnam conflict eligible to obtain direct loans for housing from the Veterans' Administration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2732) to make the direct home loan benefits of section 1811 of title 38, United States Code, available to veterans of the Vietnam conflict, introduced by Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, may I inquire of the distinguished majority leader whether the provisions for loans to veterans in the Vietnamese conflict are similar to those that are available to the GIs of World War II?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That I cannot say. I am complying with the request of Senators.

Mr. KUCHEL subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier the distinguished majority leader introduced for certain Members of the Senate legislation to provide certain benefits to American GIs serving in the present tragic conflict in southeast Asia. There is no reason why those in uniform serving there should be discriminated against as compared with those who served in uniform in World War II. I have consistently taken that position.

I ask unanimous consent that my name be added to the legislation introduced earlier.

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

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] quite appropriately expressed my feelings in connection with legislation introduced today to bring benefits to the Vietnam combat veterans now engaged in this very disagreeable and disastrous war in Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent that my name may be added to the legislation introduced today.

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

LANDS HELD IN TRUST FOR APACHE TRIBE OF MESCALERO RESERVATION

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I am today introducing a bill to declare that 99.84 acres of Government-owned land acquired for Indian administration purposes is held by the United States in trust for the Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation.

The Mescalero Tribe is moving ahead in its efforts to develop the economy of the reservation and to raise the health and living standards of the members of the tribe. In order to protect certain existing water and sewage systems, sewage treatment facilities, and telephone and power lines, and to provide needed land on which to build low-rent housing for the Indians, this land should be held in trust by the United States for the Mescalero Indians.

The land is entirely within the boundaries of the Mescalero Indian Reservation as set apart by Executive order of May 29, 1873. However, it developed, that the property had been settled prior to that time by a non-Indian. The non-Indian's right was not determined until 1915, by which time various buildings and facilities of the Mescalero Indian School and agency had been constructed on the land. The non-Indian's interest in the land was purchased by the Government in 1918 for $10,000.

The Government discontinued use of the property for agency and school purposes about 13 years ago and since that time it has been beneficially used by the tribe for agricultural purposes on a permit basis.

The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife have entered into a lease with the tribe for the use of 18.15 acres of tribal land, adjoining the land in question, for the Mescalero National Fish Hatchery. A 12.49-acre parcel of the 99.84-acre tract is presently being used by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries in connection with the hatchery. The tribe has passed a resolution agreeing to execute a lease to continue to make this tract available to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries upon enactment of this bill.

There is a scarcity of tribal land suitable for contemplated Indian housing. A portion of the tract in question is ideally situated for this purpose, but before an agreement can be reached with the Public Housing Administration, title to the land must be in the tribe.

In view of these circumstances and the need of the Indians, I request that this bill be appropriately referred and be given early consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2735) to declare that 99.84 acres of Government-owned land acquired for Indian administrative purposes is held by the United States in trust for the Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CREDIT AGAINST INCOME TAX TO CORPORATIONS FOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. Mr. President, I am introducing today legislation which would allow a credit against income tax to corporations for contributions to colleges and universities.

This proposal is designed to encourage greater financial support for our higher educational institutions without unnecessary Federal interference and control. The need for such financial support, in the face of booming enrollments, is obvious.

However, I am aware that the country faces a serious revenue situation with the conflict in southeast Asia. Even so, I introduce this legislation in order that it may receive the full attention of the Nation and the Congress; that it may be studied and discussed; that it may be considered by appropriate committees; and that, when we can afford it, it may be enacted into law.

If events favor us so as to relieve the military demand upon our revenues before this current session of Congress adjourns, then I would hope that the Congress will act favorably on the legislation which I have introduced.

If we must wait a year, or 2 years, or more, so be it. But whenever the Nation can afford to act again in the field of higher education assistance, I feel that the approach embodied in this bill should be incorporated into our programs.

I ask unanimous consent that my remarks on this subject, delivered in North Augusta, S.C., on November 23, be included in the RECORD as a further argument for this legislation.

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

REMARKS OF SENATOR DONALD RUSSELL, DEMOCRAT, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO NORTH AUGUSTA LIONS CLUB, NORTH AUGUSTA, S.C., NOVEMBER 23, 1965

It has been said that the future rides with the progress of education. And this is just as true of the individual as of a nation or a State. The new era in which we live and will live for the foreseeable future is one which demands far greater competency of the individual than ever before. It is no longer enough that one is strong and anxious to work. Far more important—indeed, the first and the primary test for employment—despite a few unfortunate Federal requirements—are educational qualifications. Such qualifications, it must be noted, too, are being pushed upward and some form of post-high-school education is being given growing importance. It may be argued that this emphasis on educational qualifications may be excessive and often unnecessary but the hard fact remains that it does exist and it must be taken into account in planning for the future. Accordingly, every State or society has a direct concern in seeing that there exists complete opportunity for all its

qualified youths to secure college or university education of such character as suits their special talents.

The financial burden, of this obligation, though, is taxing our resources, both private and public. Such burden is compounded by our explosion of population as well as by the phenomenal inflation of costs. And the future offers little hope of a relaxation in either demand for services or in costs of operation.

For the private college and university this problem is especially acute and undoubtedly will become more so. Lacking the financial resources to expand to meet rising demand and oppressed by rising costs, such institutions are threatened with a sharp drop in their relative position vis-a-vis public supported institutions.

I believe and believe fervently in both the need for, and the value of, publicly supported educational institutions at all levels. I am a product of such institutions and I have spent a considerable part of my time, both as student, and as administrator, in a system of public education. But I have never felt—and here I think I express the feeling generally of all publicly supported colleges and universities—that publicly supported institutions of higher learning should carry the exclusive burden of college and university education. The deadening uniformity of a single publicly supported and publicly controlled system of higher education would not be conducive to that form of intellectual innovation which must be the symbol of tomorrow. The publicly supported institutions—and society in general—need and require the stimulus of competition in ideas, in methods, and in philosophy provided by strong and growing independent and sectarian private institutions. The dual system of private and publicly supported colleges and universities has sparked in the past our progress, culturally, and technologically, and must continue our intellectual bastion for the future.

Unfortunately, the private institutions are facing a desperate future, unless given significantly greater financial support to enable them to continue to play their proper role in educational progress and to provide that necessary complement to publicly supported institutions.

To some extent, this need has been generally recognized. It has found expression in congressional legislation during the last and earlier Congresses. Federal aid, designed to aid both public and private colleges and universities, has been enacted. Many objections, however, have been raised to such aid for private institutions. These objections are often contradictory.

On the one hand, many sincere people object to any public support of private or sectarian institutions. Some of these base their objections on constitutional grounds. Others of them express reservations on the propriety of public support for institutions which are beyond governmental control. On the other hand, many—especially those involved in private or sectarian education—feel honestly and sincerely that Federal aid, long continued, can destroy the independence of the private institutions. In some instances, too, there is a feeling that such aid will destroy that separation of church and state, a matter of fundamental moment to many. This issue has recently arisen in connection with one of our outstanding denominational universities.

I shall not attempt to weigh these conflicting views. It is sufficient that many sincere and honest citizens, whose opinions must be respected, entertain these fears. And yet it is unthinkable that, in some way, we cannot fashion an acceptable remedy for the plight of the private college and university—that we cannot find some formula which will permit us to open up new avenues of support for such institutions without violating any of the sincere reservations of many earnest citizens.

The Congress has already recognized this problem and sought to solve it. It has authorized corporations to contribute up to 5 percent of their income for, among other purposes, educational purposes as a tax deduction. Unfortunately, this has not met the problem; it does not provide the needed remedy. It has not induced that level of corporate giving that is demanded. The reason is obvious. Under this legislation, the corporation actually receives credit for only one-half of its gifts.

I propose that, instead of permitting a mere income deduction, the corporation be given full credit against its tax bill for all gifts for educational purposes (up to 2½ percent of its tax liability). This is what the Congress has already authorized, except that there must be a matching by the corporation. Under this proposal of mine, the matching requirement is eliminated. And since the gift is treated as a credit against the tax itself, the corporation has every incentive to make the gift. It actually loses nothing from the making of the gift. It either pays the sum in taxes to the Government or it gives it to an educational institution of its own choosing for a purpose determined by it. It is difficult to see why any corporation will elect not to exercise this choice.

It is thus reasonable to believe that practically every corporation will avail itself of this right. At present levels of corporate income, this would mean a fund of about three-quarters of a billion dollars annually available from private giving for the benefit of the educational institutions of this Nation.

And since such fund will be contributed by private corporations, it will be free from constitutional objectives or reservations about the separation of church and state. It will involve no threat of governmental control of an educational institution. The separation of church and state will not be violated. The argument over governmental support of a sectarian institution will be avoided.

It will be argued, I am sure, that the government is the real loser in this transaction. Actually, however, it is losing no more, at least theoretically, than it would if all corporations took advantage of the existing law. And it will be accomplishing what the vast majority of our thoughtful citizens feel most important and what most legislators profess to be their purpose in proposed legislation. It will be providing real and substantial aid to both public and private institutions of higher learning, at less cost, and without the heavy hand of bureaucracy. It will not involve any new governmental department to administer it, no new bureaucracy to forge new requirements, no broad expansion of government employees. And it will permit free enterprise to compete with government in support of higher education. It will, also, provide new opportunities for our private institutions to compete more effectively with public institutions, to the benefit of both.

This, of course, does not mean that public institutions may not participate in these gifts but they will do so in full competition with the private institution. It would seem reasonable, too, that the corporate giver would give special attention to the more limited resources of the private institutions in the selection of the beneficiaries of its gifts.

Because I feel that this remedy will be of benefit to our whole program of higher education, I expect to offer legislation incorporating this plan at the next session of Congress. I hope it will receive wide acceptance and may be enthusiastically agreed to.

I would like to make clear that I do not offer this suggestion as a substitute for any existing legislation or as an objection to other legislation that may be proposed to aid higher education. I offer it rather as a supplement to these, recognizing the growing need for financial support on the part of all institutions of higher learning, both public and private. I offer it as a means of giving to the colleges and universities in this Nation more options and broader opportunities, free from conscientious objections entertained by many, and with full recognition of the fact that the strength of the America of the future depends upon the strength and vitality of its colleges and universities, public and private.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2741) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to corporations for contributions to colleges and universities introduced by Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

RESTRICTION OF CONDITIONS GOVERNING REDUCTION OF VETERANS' BENEFITS UPON READMISSION OF VETERANS FOR MEDICAL CARE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 3203, title 38, United States Code, to restrict the conditions under which benefits are immediately reduced upon readmission of veterans for hospitalization or other institutional care.

Under existing law (38 U.S.C. 3203(a)(1)) the monthly compensation or retirement pay otherwise payable to a veteran without wife, child, or dependent parent who is being furnished hospitalization or other institutional care by the Veterans' Administration is reduced by one-half, but not below $30 per month, beginning the first day of the seventh calendar month following the month of admission. This requirement also applies to pension under laws in effect prior to enactment of the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959. Generally, the amounts withheld under this provision are paid in a lump sum upon the veteran's discharge from the institution. Amounts withheld from an incompetent veteran are not payable to him until 6 months after a finding of competency. If any veteran leaves a veterans' hospital against medical advice or as the result of disciplinary action the withheld benefits may not be paid to him until 6 months after departure.

If the veteran's monthly benefit payment has been reduced under these provisions and he leaves the hospital against medical advice or as the result of disciplinary action the existing law further provides that the reduction shall be effective immediately upon his being readmitted by the Veterans' Administration for further care, irrespective of how long a period has elapsed.

In the related area of discontinuance of aid and attendance allowance during VA institutional care these allowances are ordinarily discontinued during hospitalization beginning with the first day of the second calendar month following the date of admission (38 U.S.C. 3203(f)). These discontinued benefits are not paid

to the veteran upon discharge. Moreover, the law provides that if the veteran leaves the hospital against medical advice and is thereafter readmitted the aid and attendance allowance will be discontinued from the date of readmission, regardless of the time between episodes of hospitalization.

Section 1 of the bill would amend section 3203(a)(1) of title 38, United States Code, to provide that reduction of the benefit immediately upon readmission following discharge against medical advice or as the result of disciplinary action shall apply only where the readmission occurs within 6 months following the prior termination of care. Section 2 of the bill would correspondingly amend section 3203(f) of the title to provide the same time limitation with respect to discontinuing aid and attendance allowance immediately upon readmission of a veteran who departed contrary to medical advice.

These amendments would soften the existing requirements for immediate reduction or discontinuance of benefits upon rehospitalization by preventing them from operating in an unduly punitive manner detrimental to the veteran's health and well-being. One obvious purpose of the existing provision was to discourage premature departures before hospital and medical treatment has been completed. Another apparent purpose was to deter veterans from leaving the VA institution before completion of treatment with the deliberate purpose of reentering shortly thereafter in order to initiate a new period of care during which the reduction would not be applicable until after the first 6 months or, with respect to aid and attendance allowance, until the first of the second calendar month after the date of admission.

These basic purposes will be adequately served by applying the requirement for reduction or discontinuance upon readmission only to those cases in which the veteran returns within 6 months. This would not appreciably affect the deterrent value of the basic provision. That provision would no longer operate to discourage veterans from applying for needed hospital care after the lapse of 6 months, particularly where such care may be required for a relatively short period.

It is important to note that in a good many instances rehospitalization after a 6-month interval may be due either to a new condition or a marked change in the disability or disease for which the veteran was previously hospitalized.

Finally, it should be noted that these amendments will alleviate some administrative problems which have arisen under the existing law. As matters now stand, it is necessary to maintain suitable administrative controls for indefinite periods after veterans leave the VA institution against medical advice in order to assure that upon a readmission, even 5 or more years later, the veteran's award will be promptly reduced. This presents difficulties and, in some cases, delays in making reductions result from a failure to make a timely discovery, when the veteran is readmitted, of the facts concerning prior hospitalization. This sometimes results in establishing overpayments against the veterans concerned.

Because of the relatively small number of veterans involved, the additional cost to the Government would be small.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2746) to amend section 3203, title 38, United States Code, to restrict the conditions under which benefits are immediately reduced upon readmission of veterans for hospitalization or other institutional care, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2746

A bill to amend section 3203, title 38, United States Code, to restrict the conditions under which benefits are immediately reduced upon readmission of veterans for hospitalization or other institutional care

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the last sentence of section 3203(a)(1) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by deleting the comma immediately after the words "upon a succeeding readmission for treatment or care" and inserting "within six months from the date of such departure,".

SEC. 2. Section 3203(f) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by deleting the comma immediately after "admitted to hospitalization" in the third sentence and inserting "within six months from the date of such departure,".

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall also apply to cases in which pension eligibility is subject to the provisions of section 9(b) of the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959.

A BILL TO AUTHORIZE AN AGREEMENT WITH MEXICO TO ELIMINATE SALINITY IN THE LOWER RIO GRANDE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to carry out the agreement between the United States and Mexico announced December 30, 1965, aimed at reducing the salt content of the lower Rio Grande.

Discharge of saline water through the Mexican El Morillo drain has endangered the usefulness of the Rio Grande water for irrigation by U.S. users. The International Boundary and Water Commission has recommended a solution which has been endorsed by the United States and Mexican Governments, to construct a canal or drain in Mexico diverting the saline waters of El Morillo drain from the Rio Grande to the Gulf of Mexico.

The United States and Mexico would share equally in the costs of construction and operation of the diversion canal, and a portion of the U.S. costs are expected to be repaid by the water users.

The bill I introduce today follows the recommendation of the administration and would authorize the United States to participate in this needed project.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2747) to authorize conclusion of an agreement with Mexico for joint measures for solution of the lower Rio Grande salinity problem, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2747

A bill to authorize conclusion of an agreement with Mexico for joint measures for solution of the lower Rio Grande salinity problem

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of State, acting through the United States Commissioner, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, is authorized, notwithstanding any other provision of law and subject to the conditions provided in this Act, to conclude an agreement or agreements with the appropriate official or officials of the Government of the United Mexican States for the construction, operation, and maintenance by the United Mexican States under the supervision of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, of a drainage conveyance canal through Mexican territory for the discharge of waters of El Morillo and other drains in the United Mexican States into the Gulf of Mexico in the manner, and having substantially the characteristics, described in said Commission's Minute No. 223, dated November 30, 1965. The agreement or agreements shall provide that the costs of construction, including costs of design and right of way, and the costs of operation and maintenance, shall be equally divided between the United Mexican States and the United States. Before concluding the agreement or agreements, the Secretary of State shall receive satisfactory assurances from private citizens or a responsible local group that they or it will pay to the United States Treasury one-half of the actual United States costs of such construction, including costs of design and right of way, and so long as such agreement or agreements remain in force, one-half of the actual costs of operation and maintenance allocated under such agreement or agreements to the United States.

SEC. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State for use of the United States section, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, without fiscal year limitation, such sums as may be necessary to defray costs that accrue to the United States under such agreement or agreements for the construction, operation, and maintenance of such drainage conveyance canal project.

PARTICIPATION BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION IN MEDICAL COMMUNITY PLANNING AND SHARING OF MODERN TECHNOLOGY AND EQUIPMENT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, by request, for appropriate reference, a bill to assure adequate and

complete medical care for veterans by providing for participation by the Veterans' Administration in medical community planning and for the sharing of advanced medical technology and equipment between the Veterans' Administration and other public and private hospitals.

The proposed legislation would authorize the Administrator, when he determines it to be in the best interest of the prevailing standards of the Veterans' Administration medical care program, to enter into agreements providing for the exchange of use—or under certain conditions the mutual use—of specialized medical facilities between Veterans' Administration hospitals and other public and private hospitals or medical schools in a medical community.

Any such arrangement would include a provision for reciprocal reimbursement based on a charge, unit or otherwise, which covers the full cost of services rendered or supplies used. Any proceeds to the Government resulting from such arrangements would be credited to the applicable Veterans' Administration medical appropriation.

As indicated by its title this legislation has a dual purpose: to assure—

First, adequate and complete medical care for veterans; and

Second, optimum effective utilization of specialized medical resources, under the direct control of the Veterans' Administration, during periods when immediate needs do not require maximum usage.

In the past decade the dramatic advances in medical science and technology have produced highly specialized and costly staff, procedures, and equipment. Because of the cost of such equipment, and the scarcity of the technical staff required, the availability of such resources is extremely limited. In the ever-changing complex of medicine with all its ramifications, the cost of medical care and treatment will continue to climb for all users. This applies to the Veterans' Administration Department of Medicine and Surgery as well as to community medical facilities.

The Veterans' Administration, which operates the largest single system of medical facilities in the world, has within its system a portion of these scarce medical resources in various locations, and has provided considerable leadership in the field of medical research. This leadership, however, has its attending obligations. Today the health needs of many communities are not being met either because of the complexity of the problems, or the magnitude or the resources required.

While current law permits the use of our facilities by nonveterans in emergencies for humanitarian reasons, the Veterans' Administration is unable to permit the use of such facilities and equipment, as well as expertise of its staff, for nonemergent situations even if there are no similar facilities available. This situation exists even though these scarce medical facilities are not always utilized to the maximum and could be available to the community, without detriment to the care and treatment of veteran-beneficiaries, during periods when our immediate needs do not require maximum utilization.

Possession of the newer complex medical diagnostic or treatment modalities in the Veterans' Administration, and others by affiliated or local hospitals, with shared use of each by both groups, would make for more efficient utilization of such diagnostic or treatment modalities at lower unit costs for all. For example, very special facilities, staff, and equipment are necessary for hemodialysis. Sharing some of the costs for such services by mutual use on a time available basis could have the effect of increasing the Nation's limited supply of scientists and equipment in this field.

In the treatment of certain tumors, two very expensive instruments can provide the high level of energy radiation needed, but with different characteristics. These two instruments complement each other. Rarely can a single hospital afford to own or maintain both machines nor can they be used to maximum capacity when use is restricted to the immediate patient population of the individual institution. An agreement, whereby the Veterans' Administration would only be required to furnish one of these machines, in order to provide complete medical care for veterans thus obviating the need for providing the other in a Veterans' Administration facility, is an example of the economic efficiency which could be achieved under the proposed authority. Moreover, to attract high quality personnel and to maintain staff skills at their peak, it is necessary that such facilities not only be available but that they be regularly and actively employed.

Again, most open heart surgery is done for the correction of congenital defects early in life or for malfunctioning heart valves in older patients. While the Veterans' Administration does not have a large number of patients requiring this type of surgery, there is a distinct hope that surgical treatment may become available for coronary artery disease, a frequent killer of veteran patients. The advantage of interchange of available know-how, personnel, and experience, with that of the medical schools is needed to further develop Veterans' Administration capabilities in this area.

Benefits will be gained by both the Veterans' Administration and the entire medical community if agreements can be entered into for the mutual use, or exchange of use, of specialized medical resources. Cooperative use of such equipment should result in a much broader therapeutic armamentarium. In addition, such shared usage of facilities would reduce the need for each hospital to have on its staff highly trained scarce categories of professional personnel. Accordingly, I believe that the proposed agreement will improve the Veterans' Administration capability to provide complete medical care for veterans.

It is not anticipated that the enactment of the proposed legislation will result in any additional expenditure of public funds. It should, instead, reduce the overall medical costs to the Government for certain of its complex medical care obligations. As a result, such legislation will in the long run, undoubtedly, result in economic gain to the Government as its full potential is achieved.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2748) to assure adequate and complete medical care for veterans by providing for participation by the Veterans' Administration in medical community planning and for the sharing of advanced medical technology and equipment between the Veterans' Administration and other public and private hospitals, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2748

A bill to assure adequate and complete medical care for veterans by providing for participation by the Veterans' Administration in medical community planning and for the sharing of advanced medical technology and equipment between the Veterans' Administration and other public and private hospitals

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subchapter I of chapter 81 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 5007. SPECIALIZED MEDICAL RESOURCES

"(a) To secure certain specialized medical resources which otherwise might not be feasibly available, or to effectively utilize certain other medical resources, the Administrator may, when he determines it to be in the best interest of the prevailing standards of the Veterans' Administration medical care program, make arrangements, by contract or other form of agreement, as set forth in paragraphs (1) and (2) below, between Veterans' Administration hospitals and other public or private hospitals (or medical schools or other medical installations having hospital facilities) in the medical community:

"(1) for the exchange of use of specialized medical resources when such an agreement will obviate the need for a similar resource to be provided in a Veterans' Administration facility; or

"(2) for the mutual use, or exchange of use of specialized medical resources in a Veterans' Administration facility, which have been justified on the basis of veterans' care, but which are not utilized to their maximum effective capacity.

The Administrator may determine the geographical limitations of a medical community as used in this section.

"(b) Arrangements entered into under this section shall provide for reciprocal reimbursement based on a charge which covers the full cost of services rendered, supplies used, and including normal depreciation and amortization costs of equipment. Any proceeds to the Government received therefrom shall be credited to the applicable Veterans' Administration medical appropriation.

"(c) For the purpose of this section the term 'specialized medical resources' means medical resources (whether equipment, space or personnel) which because of cost, limited availability, or unusual nature, are either unique in the medical community or are subject to maximum utilization only through mutual use.

"(d) Eligibility for hospital care and medical services furnished any veteran pursuant to this section shall be subject to the same terms as though provided in a Veterans' Administration facility, and provisions of this title applicable to persons receiving hospital care or medical services in a Veterans' Administration facility shall apply to veterans treated hereunder."

(b) Such chapter 81 is further amended by adding at the end of the table of sections relating to subchapter I the following:

"5007. Specialized medical resources."

PREPAYMENT OF VETERANS' VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION TRAVEL EXPENSES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 111 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the prepayment of certain expenses associated with the travel of veterans to or from a Veterans' Administration facility or other place, in connection with vocational rehabilitation or counseling, or for the purpose of examination, treatment, or care.

Section 111 of title 38, United States Code, authorizes the payment of the actual necessary travel expenses, or in lieu thereof an allowance based upon mileage traveled, of any person to or from a Veterans' Administration facility or other place in connection with vocational rehabilitation, counseling required pursuant to the war orphans' educational assistance program, or for the purpose of examination, treatment, or care. Subsection (b) of such section 111 currently authorizes the prepayment of the mileage allowance paid in lieu of actual travel expenses. Section 529 of title 31, United States Code, prohibits the advance of public money "unless authorized by the appropriation concerned or by other law."

This bill would amend this statutory prepayment provision (38 U.S.C. 111 (b)), to authorize similar action with respect to: first, the round-trip local travel expenses of a person eligible therefor; second, the expense of hiring an automobile or ambulance; and third, the fee authorized for the services of a nonemployee attendant, where required by a person eligible therefor.

Experience has demonstrated that on occasions individuals eligible for travel expense payment do not have sufficient funds for completing their travel. Attendants assigned to accompany a beneficiary during travel, and ambulance or hired-car owners who transport the beneficiary, must now await final payment for services rendered until they return to their point of origin, after which a claim must be filed and processed by correspondence. This legislation will remedy these situations and will authorize the payment of the prescribed expenses and allowances before the individual leaves the Veterans Administration station. Such a course of action will eliminate the need for adjudicating and processing the claim by correspondence. It will also simplify our administrative fiscal procedures and, in addition, will improve public relations between the Veterans Administration and the claimant.

The enactment of this legislation will result in no additional cost to the Government. Instead, it is anticipated that some savings in administrative costs will occur.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2749) to amend section 111 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the prepayment of certain expenses associated with the travel of veterans to or from a Veterans' Administration facility or other place, in connection with vocational rehabilitation or counseling, or for the purpose of examination, treatment, or care, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2749

A bill to amend section 111 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the prepayment of certain expenses associated with the travel of veterans to or from a Veterans' Administration facility or other place, in connection with vocational rehabilitation or counseling, or for the purpose of examination, treatment, or care

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection 111(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Payment of the following expenses or allowances in connection with vocational rehabilitation, counseling, or upon termination of examination, treatment, or care, may be made before the completion of travel:

"(1) the mileage allowance authorized by subsection (a) hereof;

"(2) actual local travel expenses;

"(3) the expense of hiring an automobile or ambulance, or the fee authorized for the services of a nonemployee attendant."

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 2(A) OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK ACT OF 1945

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I recently had called to my attention that the Export-Import Bank granted a hard loan to the Government of Morocco for the expansion of the phosphate industry of that country. I understand that the expansion which will be undertaken will have an adverse effect upon the phosphate industry in this country.

In looking into this matter I found that the Export-Import Bank is not required, under the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, to consider the effect loans approved by the Bank would have on the domestic economy.

Mr. President, without going into detail with specific reference to the phosphate industry, I can visualize other instances whereby loans approved by the Bank would have a decided effect on our economy. Accordingly, I send to the desk a bill to amend section 2(a) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, which, if enacted, would require the Board of Directors of the Bank to make a finding that the domestic economy will not be adversely affected prior to approving any loan, and, if it finds to the contrary, such loan shall not be approved. I ask that this bill be received and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2752) to amend section 2(a) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, introduced by Mr. HOLLAND, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

DUTY-FREE GIFTS TO ARMED FORCES IN VIETNAM

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I am today introducing a bill that will permit members of our Armed Forces serving in a combat zone to ship, duty free, gifts not exceeding $100. As Senators know, the law now states that gifts, in order to be duty free, must not exceed a $10 value.

My purpose in introducing this bill at this time, of course, is for the benefit of our military men serving in Vietnam. The story was brought quite close to home this past Christmas. As most Senators know, the 1st Division from Fort Riley, Kans., is in Vietnam, but many of the wives and families of these fighting men remained in Junction City, Kans. Christmas for these families was not one of their better Christmases, but they tried to make the best of it. However, those that had to pay duty at the local post office for their own Christmas presents were a little bitter, and I do not blame them. As is pointed out in the editorial from the Junction City Daily Union, which I would like printed in the RECORD at this point, this particular wife had to pay a considerable amount for her own Christmas present. Had her husband shipped these two sweaters in separate boxes on separate days, there would have been no duty. However, one problem in Vietnam is getting one box, enough paper, string, and so forth, to mail it and then getting it mailed.

I would like to point out that this bill is limited to only members of the U.S. Armed Forces serving in a combat zone. Senators will recall a similar law was in effect during World War II, and then last session we changed our postage laws in order to allow these particular troops free postage. So I am most hopeful that we can get early action on this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the editorial will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2767) to amend the tariff schedules of the United States to permit the duty-free entry of gifts not exceeding $100 in retail value from members of the Armed Forces serving in a combat zone, introduced by Mr. CARLSON (for himself and Mr. MUNDT), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The editorial presented by Mr. CARLSON is as follows:

[From the Junction City Daily Union, Nov. 24, 1965]

SOMETHING NEEDS TO BE DONE

An unfortunate situation was brought to the attention of the Daily Union Tuesday after the wife of a Fort Riley soldier now in Vietnam received a shipment of Christmas gifts from her husband. She was required to pay customs duties. For example, two sweaters valued at $19 required an additional 42 percent, or about $8 more.

As nearly as the Union can learn, the duties are fixed by act of Congress and the post office workers act only as agents for the Treasury Department in collecting duties on shipments having a wholesale value of more than $10 if more than one shipment is made each day. Even purchases made at the post exchanges are subject to a duty if the article was made in a foreign country.

It seems unjust to order military personnel overseas and then require them to pay a duty on Christmas gifts when they can make the purchases only in a foreign land, even providing they have a chance to enter a store or shop.

Such instances may become numerous in the next 30 days because many of the gifts purchased abroad now are on the high seas, en route to relatives and friends here in the States.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added to the bill introduced by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] because it deals with the problem brought to my attention today also in connection with Christmas gifts being forwarded to South Dakota by soldiers in Vietnam.

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

ESTABLISHMENT OF PARKING FACILITIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill relating to the establishment of parking facilities in the District of Columbia.

Preliminary hearings on the parking situation in the District of Columbia, as well as conferences with experts in the fields of urban planning, District of Columbia officials and Federal and local organizations, have convinced me that legislation is urgently needed to establish a public parking agency in the District. The bill I have introduced today is based upon the draft prepared by the Commissioners' Citizens Advisory Committee and the experiences of other major cities, as described in our preliminary hearings.

The bill creates a Parking Board composed of the three District of Columbia Commissioners. The Parking Board will be assisted by a nine-man Advisory Council composed of the Secretaries of Interior and Commerce, the General Services Administrator and the Chairmen of the National Capital Transportation Agency and the National Capital Planning Commission.

The Board is authorized to acquire land by purchase, by grant from any Government agency, or by condemnation. The condemnation power is carefully circumscribed to insure that it is sparingly and fairly invoked. The Board could operate a parking facility through a private management firm or it could lease or sell a parking facility while retaining control over rates and quality of service. Private parking facilities would be required to file schedules of rates and new garages could not be constructed at locations that would be inconsistent with sound planning or interfere with efficient traffic flow.

The overriding philosophy of my bill is that parking is an integral part of a balanced transportation system. The bill requires comprehensive study every 5 years to determine the available transportation resources in the National Capital area and to analyze what additional parking facilities, if any, are required to implement an efficient and economical transportation system. Rates in public parking facilities would be established to encourage short-term parking by shoppers, businessmen, and others who wish to draw upon the financial, commercial, cultural, and other resources of the central city.

The Parking Board would also be authorized to establish fringe lots in the District of Columbia and in the suburbs to accommodate commuters, tourists, and other long-term visitors to the Nation's Capital. The fringe lots could be built on Government or acquired land, and authority is expressly included to construct parking facilities under the Mall and in air rights over any freeways. This would enable those who use the freeways to drive directly into a parking garage, without ever crossing a city street, and either walk or take a short rail or bus ride to their destination.

Hearings on this bill will be held on January 19, 20, and 25.

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

The bill (S. 2769) relating to the establishment of parking facilities in the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. TYDINGS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PROTECTING OUR NATIONAL EMBLEMS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill to provide protection to the great seal of the United States and the seal of the President.

It is regrettable, Mr. President, that punitive measures are necessary to prevent the reproduction of the great seal of the United States and the Presidential seal for commercial gain and to falsely indicate Federal agency, but such abuses are a daily occurrence.

The Secretary of State has long been charged with the custody of the great seal die and press, whose uses are strictly regulated, but there has never been any means of regulating private reproduction of the emblem. In the absence of any statutory power to prohibit abuses, the State Department has often sought to dissuade private organizations and commercial concerns from using the seal. Facsimiles of our national coat of arms have, nevertheless, appeared on letterheads, on program cards, newspaper advertisements and various types of merchandise such as jewelry and leathergoods.

When I first inquired of the State Department about these abuses, I was informed by letter that "such instances of private exploitation or proposed exploitation of the coat of arms are becoming more numerous and more various." Later in the letter I was told that "the Department is convinced that the Government should begin to exercise suitable control over use of the coat of arms."

Mr. President, there is now before the Judiciary Committee, S. 1597, which I introduced last spring in order to prohibit the reproduction of the great seal for certain commercial purposes or to falsely indicate Federal agency. Both the State Department and the Justice Department have noted their support for the objectives of my bill; however, the State Department has suggested other procedures for implementing these objectives—procedures designed to give more effective protection and apply additionally to the seal of the President. These suggestions, which are viewed favorably by the Justice Department, are incorporated in the bill I am introducing today.

In brief, the bill will authorize the President to prescribe rules and regulations for the use and reproduction of both seals. The Attorney General will be empowered to enjoin reported violations, and violators will be subject to fine of not more than $250 or imprisonment of not more than 6 months, or both.

It is my sincere hope that in response to this bill and S. 1597, the Judiciary Committee will conduct hearings as soon as possible in order to determine the most effective means of affording the needed protection.

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

The bill (S. 2770) to control the use of the design of the great seal of the United States and of the seal of the President of the United States, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GOLDEN SPIKE CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION COMMISSION

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I am today introducing a joint resolution to provide for the establishment of a Golden Spike Centennial Celebration Commission to work with a similar group set up by the Utah State Legislature in planning an appropriate commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the linking of the United States by transcontinental railroad.

That centennial comes up on May 10, 1969. It was a hundred years ago that the twin bands of steel were joined at Promontory, Utah, welding the Nation from sea to sea, and opening up a new era of development for a struggling young nation. Its commemoration offers an opportunity to pay tribute to the leadership and vision which produced the railroad and to the endurance of the men who laid the rails. It also gives us a time and a place to pay special tribute to the

railroad industry of today and all of the men and women who are a part of it.

Utah is already planning to make the centennial a great event. The colorful history of the laying of the rails, and of the driving of the spike itself, offer an opportunity for drama and pageantry. The passage of my bill last session to establish the Golden Spike National Historical site has given the National Park Service the authority to undertake, and I trust complete, a broad program of development in time for the celebration. The purpose of the resolution I am introducing today is to provide the machinery through which the Federal Government can cooperate with the Utah Golden Spike Centennial Commission, with patriotic and civic organizations, and with the railroads themselves in planning the most appropriate and effective celebration possible. The driving of the Golden Spike was not only an event of national importance, it was a turning point in our history. It marked the end of an era, and the beginning of a new one. The day of the covered wagon and stagecoach was largely over, America was on its way to becoming a modern industrial giant.

The resolution calls for the establishment of a 13-member Commission, composed of 8 Members from the House and Senate and 5 members appointed by the President. It authorizes a modest sum of money for payment of the expenses of those who participate in its work, and provides for its dissolution as soon as the celebration has been concluded.

Appropriate celebration of significant events is always the result of careful and coordinated planning. I feel that the passage of the resolution I am introducing today will be an essential step to the appropriate celebration 3 years hence of the centennial of the driving of the Golden Spike at Promontory, Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 124) to establish the Golden Spike Centennial Celebration Commission, introduced by Mr. Moss, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR TRANSMISSION OF THE ECONOMIC REPORT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I introduce a joint resolution extending the date for transmission of of the economic report. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

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

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 125) extending the date for transmission of the economic report, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That notwithstanding the provisions of Section 3 of the Act of February 20, 1946, as amended (15 U.S.C. 1022), the President shall transmit to the Congress not later than January 27, 1966, the 1966 Economic Report.

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

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANNOUNCEMENT—TRAFFIC SAFETY HEARINGS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization of the Senate Committee on Government Operations will resume hearings on the Federal role in traffic safety on February 1 when it will receive testimony from Mr. Ralph Nader, author of the recently published book "Unsafe At Any Speed." On February 2, Mr. Howard Pyle, president, National Safety Council will testify. On February 3, New York State Senators Simon J. Liebowitz and Edward J. Speno will describe New York's experiences in the safe-car field and the work of the Joint Legislative Committee on Motor Vehicles, Traffic, and Highway Safety. The hearings will be held in room 3304, New Senate Office Building and will commence at 10 a.m. each day.

NOTICE OF JOINT HEARINGS ON MILITARY JUSTICE

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, as chairman of both the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights and a specially appointed subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, I wish to announce that joint hearings will be held by the two subcommittees on 18 bills (S. 745–S. 762) designed to improve the quality of military justice and to more effectively safeguard the constitutional rights of military personnel involved in judicial and administrative proceedings.

The hearings are scheduled for January 18, 19, 20 and 25, 26, and 27, at 10.30 a.m. each day, in room 2228 of the New Senate Office Building. Any person who wishes to testify or submit statements pertaining to the bills should communicate with the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON S. 2729, TO AMEND THE SMALL BUSINESS ACT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I should like to announce that the Subcommittee on Small Business of the Banking and Currency Committee will hold a hearing on S. 2729, a bill to amend the Small Business Act with respect to provisions of the act relating to the revolving fund.

The hearing will be held on Tuesday, January 18, 1966, at 10 a.m., in room 5302, New Senate Office Building.

Any persons who wish to appear and testify in connection with this bill are requested to notify Reginald Barnes, assistant counsel, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., telephone 225–3921.

HEARINGS ON NOMINATION FOR DIRECTOR OF BUREAU OF MINES, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I wish to announce that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will hold a public hearing next Tuesday, January 18, on the nomination by President Johnson of Dr. Walter R. Hibbard, Jr., to be Director of the U.S. Bureau of Mines. The hearing will be at 11 a.m. in the committee room, 3110 New Senate Office Building.

Prior to his appointment, Dr. Hibbard was manager of the metallurgy and ceramics research programs of General Electric at Schenectady, N.Y. He is the president-elect of the American Institute of Mining, Metallurgical, and Petroleum Engineers for 1966 and chairman of the National Academy of Science's Materials Advisory Board.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that a biographical sketch of Dr. Hibbard be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF WALTER R. HIBBARD, JR., DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF MINES, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Dr. Walter R. Hibbard, Jr., one of the Nation's outstanding metallurgists, became Director of the Bureau of Mines on December 1, 1965, following earlier successes as an educator, researcher, and as an industry manager of scientific and engineering research.

Born in Bridgeport, Conn., January 20, 1918, Dr. Hibbard was graduated from Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn., and received a doctor of engineering degree from Yale University in 1942. Following his military service in World War II as an officer in the Navy Department's Bureau of Ships, he joined the Yale faculty as an assistant professor and later became associate professor.

Dr. Hibbard's growing reputation in teaching and research attracted industry, and in 1951 the General Electric Co. enlisted him for its Research and Development Center in Schenectady, N.Y. There he progressed to the position of manager of metallurgy and ceramics research, which he held until he was beckoned to public service by President Johnson as Director of the Bureau of Mines.

As an expert in such fields as the plastic deformation of metals and the metallurgy of copper and its alloys, Dr. Hibbard has won wide recognition from many professional societies. In 1950 he received the Raymond Award of the American Institute of Mining, Metallurgical & Petroleum Engineers. From 1957 to 1961 he served as a director of the institute, and is now its president-elect for 1966. In addition, Dr. Hibbard belongs to the British Institute of Metals and the New York Academy of Sciences, and is a fellow of both the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and the American Association for the Advancement of Science. He is also a member of the Materials Advisory Board of the National Academy of Sciences, and is currently its Chairman.

Dr. Hibbard has been elected to many honorary and professional fraternities including Phi Beta Kappa, Sigma Xi, Alpha Chi Sigma, and Gamma Alpha. He is the author

of more than 70 scientific papers and has been widely recognized as a major contributor to the science of metallurgy.

Dr. and Mrs. Hibbard have three children and reside in Rockville, Md.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON THE NOMINATIONS OF ROBERT C. WEAVER, OF NEW YORK, TO BE SECRETARY, AND ROBERT C. WOOD, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY, OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I should like to announce that the Committee on Banking and Currency will hold a hearing on the nominations of Robert C. Weaver, of New York, to be Secretary, and Robert C. Wood, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary, of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The hearing is scheduled to be held on Monday, January 17, 1966, in room 5302, New Senate Office Building, at 10 a.m.

Any persons who wish to appear and testify in connection with these nominations are requested to notify Matthew Hale, chief of staff, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, telephone 225-3921.

I ask unanimous consent that the biographies released by the White House about Dr. Weaver and Dr. Wood be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION ON ROBERT C. WEAVER

Mr. Robert C. Weaver was born in Washington, D.C., on December 29, 1907. He was educated at Harvard University, receiving a B.S. in 1929, an M.A. in 1931, and a Ph. D. in 1934.

From 1933 to 1937 he was the Adviser for Negro Affairs, Department of the Interior, and from 1937 to 1940 he served as the special assistant to the Administrator, U.S. Housing Authority. He also worked from 1940 to 1944 as an official on the War Production Board, where he became Chief of the Minority Group Service Division. From 1945 to 1948 Mr. Weaver was a member of the American Council on Race Relations.

After teaching at Northwestern University, Columbia Teachers College, and New York University, Mr. Weaver became the director of opportunity fellowships, John Hay Whitney Foundation, a position he held until 1954.

In 1954, Mr. Weaver was named the deputy commissioner of the New York State Division of Housing and from 1955 to 1959 served as the State rent administrator, New York. From 1960 to 1961 he was the vice chairman of the New York City Housing and Redevelopment Board.

Mr. Weaver became the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency in 1961, a position he has held since that time.

He is the author of "Negro Labor, A National Problem" (1946), "The Negro Ghetto" (1948), and "The Urban Complex" (1964).

He lives at 4600 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. Mr. Weaver is married to the former Ella V. Haith.

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION ON ROBERT C. WOOD

Prof. Robert C. Wood, a native of Jacksonville, Fla., is chairman of the political science department at Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Born in St. Louis, Mo., on September 16, 1923, he served with the 76th Infantry during World War II. He received an A.B. from Princeton University in 1946. At Harvard University, he was awarded an M.A. in 1947, a master of public administration in 1948, and a Ph. D. in 1950.

From 1949 to 1951 he was associate director, Legislative Reference Bureau of the State of Florida. At the U.S. Bureau of the Budget from 1951 to 1954, Mr. Wood served as a management organization expert in the housing field.

Mr. Wood became a lecturer and then an assistant professor of government at Harvard University in 1954. In 1957 he left Harvard to join the faculty at MIT where he taught as an assistant professor of political science from 1957 to 1959, and as an associate professor from 1959 to 1962. In 1962, Mr. Wood was named professor of political science; and in 1965, he became the chairman of the Political Science Department at MIT.

He is a member of the Advisory Board of the National Capital Transportation Agency, the Committee for Economic Development, and the American Academy for Arts and Sciences. He was elected to Phi Beta Kappa at Princeton.

He is the author of "Suburbia, Its People and Their Politics" (1958); "Metropolis Against Itself" (1959); "1400 Governments, the Political Economy of the New York Region" (1960); and the coauthor of "School Men and Politics" (1962), and "Government and Politics of the U.S." (1965).

Mr. Wood lives on Trapelo Road, Lincoln, Mass., with his wife, the former Margaret Byers, and three children, Francis, Margaret, and Frank.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. CHURCH:

Article entitled "This Must Be a Citizen Action Program," consisting of an interview with Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, of Maine, and dealing with a program of natural beautification, published in the General Electric Forum.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send a resolution to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 169), as follows:

S. RES. 169

Resolved, That Mr. METCALF be, and he is hereby, assigned to service on the Committee on Finance, in lieu of Mr. Harry F. Byrd, Sr., of Virginia, resigned from the Senate;

That Mr. TYDINGS be, and he is hereby, assigned to the Committee on Public Works, in lieu of Mr. METCALF, resigned;

That Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR., of Virginia, be and he is hereby, assigned to the Committee on Armed Services, in lieu of Mr. Harry F. Byrd, Sr., resigned from the Senate, and that Mr. BYRD be, and he is hereby assigned to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, in lieu of Mr. TYDINGS, resigned.

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

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

THE 1966 HOLIDAY RECESS SCHEDULE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the holiday recess schedule for calendar year 1966 which has been discussed with and approved by the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and a copy of which has also been sent this day to every Member of the Senate.

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

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

Lincoln's Birthday (Saturday, February 12, 1966): From conclusion of business Thursday, February 10, until noon, Wednesday, February 16. Pro forma meeting, Monday, February 14.

Washington's Birthday (Tuesday, February 22, 1966): No business after the reading of the Farewell Address.

Easter (Sunday, April 10, 1966): From conclusion of business Thursday, April 7, until noon, Wednesday, April 13. Pro forma meeting, Monday, April 11.

Memorial Day (Monday, May 30, 1966): From conclusion of business Friday, May 27, until noon, Wednesday, June 1. Pro forma meeting, Tuesday, May 31.

July 4 (Monday): From conclusion of business Friday, July 1, until noon, Wednesday, July 6. Pro forma meeting, Tuesday, July 5.

WILD RIVERS SYSTEM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider Calendar No. 778, Senate bill 1446.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1446) to reserve certain public lands for a National Wild Rivers System, to provide a procedure for adding additional public lands and other lands to the System, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Wild Rivers Act".

STATEMENT OF POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds that some of the free-flowing rivers of the United States possess unique water conservation, scenic, fish, wildlife, and outdoor recreation values of present and potential benefit to the American people. The Congress also finds that our established national policy of dam and other construction at appropriate sections of the rivers of the United States needs to be complemented by a policy that would preserve other selected rivers or sections thereof in their free-flowing condition to protect the water quality of such rivers and to fulfill other vital national conservation purposes. It is the policy of Congress to preserve, develop, reclaim, and make accessible for the benefit of all of the American people selected parts of the Nation's di-

minishing resource of free-flowing rivers. For this purpose there is hereby established a National Wild Rivers System to be composed of the areas that are designated as "wild river areas" in this Act, and the additional areas that may be designated in subsequent Acts of Congress. Areas designated as "wild river areas" by subsequent Acts of Congress shall be administered in accordance with the provisions of this Act unless the subsequent Acts provide otherwise.

DEFINITION OF WILD RIVER AREA

(b) A wild river area eligible to be included in the System is a stream or section of a stream, tributary, or river—and the related adjacent land area—that should be left in its free-flowing condition, or that should be restored to such condition, in order to promote sound water conservation, and promote the public use and enjoyment of the scenic, fish, wildlife, and outdoor recreation values.

NATIONAL WILD RIVERS SYSTEM

SEC. 3. (a) The following rivers, or segments thereof, and related, adjacent lands, most of which are public lands, as depicted on maps numbered "NWR–SAL–1001, NWR–CLE–1001, NWR–ROG–1001, NWR–RIO–1000 and NWR–ELE–1000" are hereby designated as "wild river areas":

(1) Salmon, Idaho—the Salmon from town of North Fork downstream to its confluence with the Snake River and the entire Middle Fork.

(2) Clearwater, Middle Fork, Idaho—the Middle Fork from the town of Kooskia upstream to the town of Lowell; the Lochsa River from its junction with the Selway at Lowell forming the Middle Fork, upstream to the Powell Ranger Station; and the Selway River from Lowell upstream to its origin.

(3) Rogue, Oregon—the segment extending from the Applegate River to the Route 101 highway bridge above Gold Beach.

(4) Rio Grande, New Mexico—the segment extending from the Colorado State line downstream to near the town of Pilar, and the lower four miles of the Red River.

(5) Eleven Point, Missouri—the segment of the river extending from a point near Greer Spring downstream to State Highway 142.

Said maps shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture.

FEDERAL-STATE PLANNING FOR ADDITIONS TO SYSTEM

(b) The Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Agriculture where national forest lands are involved, after consultation with interested Federal agencies, are directed to consult with the Governors and officials of the States in which the rivers listed below are located to ascertain whether a joint Federal-State plan is feasible and desirable in the public interest to conserve segments of these rivers. They shall submit to the President their recommendations for inclusion of any or all of them in the National Wild Rivers System, and the President shall submit to the Congress his recommendations for such legislation as he deems appropriate:

(1) Buffalo, Tennessee—The entire river from its beginning in Lawrence County to its confluence with the Duck River.

(2) Cacapon, West Virginia—entire river and its tributary, the Lost River.

(3) Green, Wyoming—the segment extending from its origin in the Bridger Wilderness Area, south to its confluence with Horse Creek.

(4) Hudson, New York—the segment of the mainstem extending from its origin in the Adirondack Park downstream to the vicinity of the town of Luzerne: Boreas River from its mouth to Durgin Brook; Indian River from its mouth to Abanakee Dam; and Cedar River from its mouth to Cedar River flow.

(5) Missouri, Montana—the segment upstream from Fort Peck Reservoir toward the town of Fort Benton.

(6) Niobrara, Nebraska—the mainstem segment lying betwen the confluence of Antelope Creek downstream to the headwaters of the proposed Norden Reservoir east of the town of Valentine, and the lower eight miles of its Snake River tributary.

(7) Skagit, Washington—the Skagit from the town of Mount Vernon upstream to Gorge powerhouse near the town of Newhalem; the Cascade River from its mouth to the confluence of the North and South Forks; the Sauk from its mouth to Elliott Creek; and the Suiattle from its mouth to Milk Creek.

(8) Susquehanna, New York and Pennsylvania—the segment of the Susquehanna River from a dam at Cooperstown, New York, downstream to the town of Pittston, Pennsylvania.

(9) Wolf, Wisconsin—the segment reaching from the confluence of the Hunting River downstream to the town of Keshena.

(10) Suwanee, Georgia and Florida—entire river from its source in the Okefenokee Swamp in Georgia to the gulf, and the outlying Ichetucknee Springs, Florida.

(11) Youghiogheny, Maryland and Pennsylvania—from Oakland, Maryland, to the Youghiogheny Reservoir, and from the Youghiogheny Dam, downstream to the town of Connellsville, Pennsylvania.

RIVER BASIN PLANNING FOR ADDITIONS TO SYSTEM

(c) In all planning for the use and development of water and related land resources, consideration shall be given by all Federal agencies involved to potential wild river areas, and all river basin and project plan reports submitted to the Congress shall discuss any such potentials. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall make specific studies and investigations to determine which additional wild river areas within the United States shall be evaluated in planning reports by all Federal agencies as potential alternative uses of the water and related land resources involved.

OTHER ADDITIONS TO SYSTEM

(d) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall also submit to the President from time to time their recommendations for inclusion in the National Wild Rivers System of any other river or segment thereof. The President shall submit to the Congress his recommendations for such legislation as he deems appropriate.

(e) Recommendations made under this section shall be developed in consultation with the States, those Federal agencies which normally participate in the development of recreation plans and comprehensive river basin plans, any commissions established pursuant to interstate compacts the assigned responsibilities of which would be affected, and commissions or other bodies which may be established for the purpose of developing a comprehensive plan for the river basin within which the contemplated wild river area would be located. Each such recommendation shall be accompanied by (1) expressions of any views which the agencies and States consulted pursuant to the foregoing may submit within ninety days after having been been notified of the proposed recommendation, (2) a statement setting forth the probable effect of the recommended action on any comprehensive river basin plan that may have been adopted by Congress or that is serving as a guide for coordinating Federal or Federal and State programs in the basin, and (3) in the absence of such plan, a statement indicating the probable effect of the recommended action on alternative beneficial uses of the resources of the basin.

(f) Whenever it is proposed to add a river or segment thereof to the National Wild Rivers System, and the river or segment runs through non-Federal land, recommendations with respect to its addition and with respect to whether it should be wholly or partly acquired, protected, and managed pursuant to exclusive State authority shall be made to the President by the Governor of each State concerned. Such recommendation to the President shall be accompanied by or based upon a general State plan which assures the effectuation of the purposes of this Act in perpetuity. The President shall submit to the Congress his recommendations with respect to the designation of such river or segment thereof as a part of the National Wild Rivers System and the administration of such area by State authority, together with such draft legislation that he deems appropriate.

NEED FOR LAND ACQUISITION

(g) Any recommendation for an addition to the National Wild Rivers System shall indicate the extent to which land will need to be acquired by the State and by the Federal Government, and the extent to which the acquisition of scenic easements or other interests in land may be an adequate substitute for the acquisition of a fee title.

ADMINISTRATION OF SYSTEM

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary of the Interior shall administer the wild river area designated by subsection 3(a), paragraph (4) and the Secretary of Agriculture shall administer the areas designated by paragraphs (2) and (5). The area designated by paragraphs (1) and (3) shall be administered in a manner agreed upon by the two Secretaries, or as directed by the President.

(b) Wild river areas designated by subsequent Acts of Congress shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior, except that when the wild river area is wholly within, partly within, or closely adjacent to, a national forest such area shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture unless it is also partly within, or closely adjacent to, an area administered by the Secretary of the Interior, in which event the wild river area shall be administered in such manner as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, or as directed by the President. The Secretary charged with the administration of a wild river area or portion thereof designated by this Act or by subsequent Acts may agree with the Governor of the State for State or local governmental agency participation in the administration of the area. The States shall be encouraged to cooperate in the planning and administration of such wild river areas where they include State-owned or county-owned lands. Any Federal land located within a wild river area may, with the consent of the head of the agency having jurisdiction thereof, be transferred to the jurisdiction of the appropriate Secretary or State for administration as part of the wild river area. Any land transferred hereunder to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture for administration as part of a wild river area in connection with the National Forest System shall become national forest land.

(c) Within the exterior boundaries of a wild river area as defined by section 3 of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture may acquire lands or interests therein by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, exchange, or otherwise: *Provided,* That neither Secretary may acquire lands, waters, or interests therein by condemnation without the owner's consent when 75 per centum or more of the acreage or stream bank within the entire wild river area is owned by Federal, State, or local governmental agencies, but this limitation shall not apply to the acquisition of scenic easements. Lands owned by an Indian tribe may be acquired only with the consent of the tribal governing body. In the exercise of his exchange authority the

Secretary of the Interior may accept title to any non-Federal property within a wild river area, and in exchange therefor he may convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property under his jurisdiction within the State in which the river or segment thereof runs, except lands within the National Park System or the National Wildlife Refuge System, which he classifies as suitable for exchange or other disposal. The properties so exchanged shall be of approximately equal fair market value. If they are not of approximately equal fair market value, the Secretary of the Interior may accept cash from, or pay cash to, the grantor in order to equalize the values of the properties exchanged. The Secretary of Agriculture, in the exercise of his exchange authority, may utilize authorities and procedures available to him in connection with exchanges of national forest lands. Any such lands acquired by the Secretary of Agriculture within or adjacent to a national forest shall upon acquisition become national forest lands. Money appropriated for Federal or State purposes from the land and water conservation fund shall be available for the acquisition of property for the purposes of this Act. As used in this Act the term "scenic easement" means the right to control the use of land (including the air space above such land) for the purpose of protecting the scenic view from the river for the purposes of this Act, but such control shall not affect any regular use exercised prior to the acquisition of the easement.

(d) Neither the Secretary of the Interior nor the Secretary of Agriculture may acquire lands by condemnation, for the purpose of including such lands in any wild river area, if such lands are located within any incorporated city, village, or borough within such area, when such entities shall have in force and applicable to such lands a duly adopted, valid zoning ordinance that is satisfactory to the Secretary.

(e) Neither the Secretary of the Interior nor the Secretary of Agriculture may exercise any authority to acquire county-owned lands within any wild river area without the consent of said county as long as the county is following a plan for the management and protection of such lands that is satisfactory to the Secretary.

(f) Wherever the power of condemnation has been conferred by this Act, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture may acquire in fee title by condemnation an area which may not extend more than three hundred feet on either side of the stream, tributary, or river; and either Secretary may acquire by condemnation for scenic easements, or other interests in land other than fee title, an area which extends no more than one thousand three hundred and twenty feet from either side of the stream, tributary, or river.

(g) A wild river area shall be administered for the purposes of water conservation, scenic, fish, wildlife, and outdoor recreation values contributing to public enjoyment, but without limitation on other uses, including timber harvesting and livestock grazing, that do not substantially interfere with these purposes. The Secretary of the Interior, in administering such areas, may utilize such statutory authorities relating to areas of the national park system and such statutory authorities otherwise available to him for recreation and preservation purposes, and the conservation and management of natural resources, as he deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act. The Secretary of Agriculture, in administering such areas, shall utilize the statutory authorities relating to the national forests in such manner as he deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(h) No lands, waters, or interests therein other than scenic easements may be administered under this Act as a part of the National Wild Rivers System if such lands, waters, or interests were acquired by a State under its power of condemnation for the specific purpose of making such lands, waters, or interests therein a part of the National Wild Rivers System under this Act.

SPECIAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 5. (a) The Federal Power Commission shall not authorize the construction, operation, or maintenance of any dam or other project work under the Federal Power Act (41 Stat. 1063), as amended (16 U.S.C. 791a et seq.), in any wild river area except as specifically authorized by the Congress.

(b) Nothing in this Act shall affect the applicability of the United States mining and mineral leasing laws within the National Wild Rivers System, except that all mining claims located after the effective date of this Act shall be subject to such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior, or the Secretary of Agriculture in the case of national forest lands, may prescribe to effectuate the purposes of this Act. Any patent issued shall recite this limitation. All such regulations shall provide among other things for safeguards against pollution of the river. Any portion of a wild river area that is within the national wilderness preservation system shall be subject to the mining and mineral leasing provisions of both the Wilderness Act and this Act, and in case of conflict the more restrictive provisions shall apply.

(c) The head of any Federal or State agency administering a wild river area shall cooperate with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and with the appropriate State water pollution control agencies, for the purpose of eliminating or diminishing the pollution of waters within a wild river area.

(d) The jurisdiction of the States and the United States over waters of any stream included in a wild river area shall be determined by established principles of law. Under the provisions of this Act, any taking by the United States of a water right which is vested under either State or Federal law at the time such river is included in the Wild Rivers System shall entitle the owner thereof to just compensation. Nothing in this Act shall constitute an express or implied claim or denial on the part of the Federal Government as to exemption from State water laws.

(e) Nothing in this Act shall affect the jurisdiction or responsibilities of the States under other provisions of law with respect to fish and wildlife.

(f) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to alter, amend, repeal, construe, interpret, modify or be in conflict with any interstate compact made by any States which contain any portion of the National Wild Rivers System.

(g) A State shall have such rights as may be necessary to assure adequate access by such State to the beds of navigable streams, tributaries, or rivers (or segments thereof) which are vested in the State, in case such beds are located in a wild river area.

(h) Designation of any stream or portion thereof shall not be construed as a reservation of the waters of such streams for purposes other than those specified in this Act, or in quantities greater than necessary to accomplish these purposes.

SEC. 6. In recognition of the fact that changes may occur in the circumstances of wild river areas included in the National Wild Rivers System or in the needs for the resources associated with such areas, which will require future Congresses to make changes in the System, and in order to assure that the Congress is kept informed of such changes in circumstances or needs, there is created a National Wild Rivers Review Board, to make reviews and furnish reports to the Congress as hereinafter provided.

The National Wild Rivers Review Board shall consist of the Secretary of the Interior, who shall be its Chairman, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Army, the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, and the Governors of the several States for the purpose of consideration of the status of any river included within the National Wild Rivers System which lies within their States.

Within sixty days after the convening of a new Congress, commencing with the second Congress after the enactment of this bill, the National Wild Rivers Review Board shall file a report and recommendations with the President of the Senate and with the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Such report shall contain a discussion of any significant developments since the date of enactment of the bill, or since the last report, including but not limited to the following subjects: technology of passage of fish over dams; status and trends of anadromous fish runs; activities by way of construction or otherwise pursuant to international agreements relating to any basin in which wild rivers are designated; Federal or State legislative changes which affect the financing of river development projects, including basin account authorizations relative to any basin in which wild rivers are designated; projected national, regional, or local demand for additional electrical generating capacity, particularly as related to existence or possibility of declarations of national emergency.

SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the bill will not be called up for consideration until Monday of next week?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the further information of the Senate, though not necessarily in this order, following S. 1446, the Wild Rivers Act, which is now the pending business, it is hoped to be able to bring up Calendar No. 850, H.R. 8126, an act to amend the District of Columbia minimum wage law; Calendar No. 879, H.R. 3349, an act for the relief of certain retired officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force; Calendar No. 917, H.R. 30, an act to provide for participation of the United States in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Dade County, Fla.: and also Calendar No. 795, S. 2271, a bill to authorize the payment of an allowance to certain employees assigned to duty at the Nevada Test Site of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

The last bill must be cleared with certain Senators before it can be brought up.

Concerning the District of Columbia minimum wage bill and the Interama bill, commitments to bring them up early in the 2d session were made in the closing days of the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

Following, it is anticipated that the measure providing for repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act will be called up.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me ask the majority leader whether he intends to bring these bills up by motion.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Approximately in that order. If the distinguished minority leader will allow me a little flexibility,

I shall discuss this matter before any of them are called up.

Mr. President, those are the first five bills before the proposal for repeal of section 14(b) will be called up.

REPEAL OF SECTION 103(b) OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1965

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, last week, I was asked by the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] to announce that he would be unavoidably absent until January 17.

He is presently on a mission and had announced his intention to introduce a bill to repeal section 103(b) of the Social Security Amendments Act of 1965, a provision in the medical care program which requires a loyalty oath of some 2 million older citizens.

The Senator has asked me to advise Senators that the bill will be introduced on Monday, January 17, and will lie on the table for 1 week thereafter for additional cosponsors.

FREE ENTERPRISE AWARDS ASSOCIATION CITATIONS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on December 21, 1965, the Free Enterprise Awards Association, Inc., an organization to promote incentive and champion the cause of the American democratic system, made its 14th annual awards.

The 10 recipients came from all over the United States to praise and credit the American way of life for making success possible. Mr. Talbot T. Speer, who rose to own America's oldest paper, the 238-year-old Maryland Gazette, a newspaper chain, and Baltimore Business Forms, Inc., was the FEAA's awards chairman for the Waldorf-Astoria ceremonies.

I am happy to say that 2 of the 10 award winners are from my State of Illinois. They are Mr. Everette E. Ballard, president of All American Life & Casualty Co., Park Ridge, Ill.; and Mr. Morris B. Beschloss, of Flossmoor, Ill., the president of Hammond Valve Corp., Hammond, Ind.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article concerning these success awards, and the names and backgrounds of the recipients, along with statements made by each of them praising America's free enterprise democracy and advice to those seeking success.

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

TEN MEN WHO ROSE FROM THE RANKS PRESENTED FEAA'S 14TH ANNUAL 1965 AMERICAN SUCCESS STORY AWARDS TODAY—EXAMPLES OF SUCCESS POSSIBLE UNDER AMERICA'S DEMOCRACY PRAISE U.S. FREEDOMS AND OPPORTUNITIES—EX-EDITOR, NEWSBOY, CLERK, INSURANCEMAN, OTHERS CITED—AMERICANS VOTE AMERICANISM OVER ANY "ISM," SAYS SPEER

NEW YORK CITY, December 21.—The 14th annual, 1965 American Success Story Awards were presented today to 10 men who symbolize the success possible to all under America's free enterprise democracy. They came from all over the United States to praise and credit the American way of life for making success possible.

Mr. Talbot T. Speer who rose to own one of America's oldest papers, the 238-year-old Maryland Gazette, a newspaper chain and the Baltimore Business Forms, Inc. presented the awards as FEAA's awards chairman at the Waldorf-Astoria ceremonies in the gold room.

Mr. Speer read the citations which stated that the recipients, "had won an enduring place in the history of American endeavor by achieving success despite adversity through industry, sacrifice, and ethics, symbolizing the success possible to all under America's free enterprise system." He cited them for their contributions to the economic growth of their communities, to their industries and their dedicated work in civic, religious, philanthropic causes.

Mr. Speer urged edtiors, leaders, and Americans in all fields to, "Get on a soapbox too to counteract the Communist-organized anti-American demonstrations staged to subvert our people to communism and disloyalty. He said that despite years of Red propaganda, Americans, free to vote any "ism" have always chosen Americanism. The Cuban exodus is further proof that the American way of life pays off and that millions want to get into America—nobody wants out. He warned that our Nation's life was at stake in these days of crisis and urged all Americans to cherish, champion, and defend our democracy which allows private enterprise, religious freedom, and the highest standard of living.

The Free Enterprise Awards Association, Inc., was chartered in 1952. With leaders in all fields it carries out its charter duties, "to promote incentive and champion the cause of the American democratic system to bolster the faith of all people in the American way of life."

The recipients, selected from various U.S. trades and areas to show the opportunities and success possible in all parts of the United States were:

JAMES S. HUNT

James S. Hunt, 67 (residence, 4040 Galt Ocean Drive, Fort Lauderdale, Fla.) founder, president, chairman, Coral Ridge Properties, Inc., Fort Lauderdale, Fla; director, member executive committees, of Alleghany Corp., New York City, and Investors Diversified Services, Minneapolis, Minn.; director: New York Central Railroad System, New York World's Fair Corp., New York City, Florida State Development Commission. Chairman, Bank of Commerce, Bank of Florida, Financial Life Insurance Co., Financial Fire & Casualty Co., Fort Lauderdale, and others. Orphaned at 12. Was newsboy, car polisher, busboy, odd jobs. Joined Royal Air Force in 1915 at 18. Won Croix de Guerre, other honors. Won Silver Star in World War II as small boats invasion commander, retired as rear admiral USCGR. Was world's largest Chevrolet dealer. Originated "Blue Book." in 1945, at age 47, sold dealership and risked savings to start Coral Ridge Properties with 95 acres. His leadership, integrity, and acumen built company into Nation's most honored and largest builder-developers. His Coral Ridge development, 6½ miles (including Galt Ocean Mile he purchased for $19 million) has 7,000 homes. Company-owned oceanfront hotels, high-rise cooperative, condominimum and rental apartments, shopping centers, banks, insurance companies, other properties earn millions of dollars. Still expanding, Hunt has strated the city of Coral Springs on a 10,000-acre site for 60,000 residents. Cited as an example of free enterprise in action, for his rise from orphan to war hero, outstanding citizen and builder-developer.

KENNETH S. KELLEHER

Kenneth S. Kelleher, 42 (residence, 7116 Marine Drive, Alexandria, Va.). President, founder, Keltec Industries, Inc. (formerly Aero Geo Astro Corp.), Alexandria, Va. Subsidiaries: AGAI Corp., GBL Associates, Inc., SSI, Inc., Alexandria, Va.; Astro Communication Laboratory, Inc., Gaithersburg, Md.; RFD, Inc., Tampa, Fla.; Western Microwave Laboratories, Inc., Santa Clara, Calif. Affiliates: General Testing Laboratories, Inc., AGAC-Derritron, Alexandria, Va. Was scrap metal laborer, weighmaster. Worked way to earn B.A. and M.A. in math at North Carolina and Maryland Universities in 1958, after years of achievement in antenna and aerospace fields he left security of top positions with major companies and Government, risked savings and founded Aero Geo Astro Corp., now Keltec Industries, Inc. He started with $10,000, three employees, small space, no customers or products. In 7 years his dynamic direction, engineering, and executive genius built Keltec to 21 plants in 5 States, employes 1,000 technicians in the research, design, and production of military, aerospace and commercial equipment. It makes receivers, antennas, computers, environmental and water processing, and other equipment, with $15 million yearly sales worldwide. He is acclaimed for developments in electronic scanning and "dish" replacement antennas, and his 50 technical papers. Cited for contributions to his field and space age electronics vital to national defense.

TED C. WETTERAU

Ted C. Wetterau, Sr., 76 (residence, 32 Country Lane, Frontenac, Md.). Chairman, Wetterau Foods, Inc., Hazelwood, Mo. Divisions: Mexico, Scott City, Mo.; Bloomington, Ind. (IGA Foodliners Franchise Area: Missouri, Illinois, Iowa, Arkansas, Tennessee, Indiana, Kentucky. Subsidiaries: Non-Foods, Inc., Desloge, Mo.; Wetterau Finance Co., Monroe Realty & Investment Co., Mo.; president, Grocers Company of Chicago. Director, Independent Grocers' Alliance (IGA), Jefferson Bank & Trust Co., St. Louis, Mo. Was clerk in father's small wholesale grocery. Under his marketing genius Wetterau Foods, Inc., grew to IGA franchises in seven States. Its 634 employees and 256 trailers supply hundreds of IGA foodliners with one-stop source of meats, dairy frozen-foods, all grocery products from four modernized distribution centers which occupy 99 acres, 800,000 square feet of warehouse, 69,000 square feet of freezer area. To enable IGA members to compete with giant chains WFI also provides merchandising, financing, bookkeeping, and other services. WFI's varisized package stores can be equipped and opened in 10 weeks. WFI stocks 5,100 items with $145 million in sales, spends $2½ million on IGA foodliner advertising, $2½ million for new stores and expansion. Cited for preserving free enterprise and independent ownership by supplying IGA members with merchandise, service and know-how to secure success and raising the living standards in the areas it serves.

EVERETTE E. BALLARD

Everette E. Ballard, 64 (residence, 501 Edgemont Lane, Park Ridge, Ill.). President, All American Life & Casualty Co., Park Ridge, Ill. Went to one-room school and worked father's farm even while attending Southern Illinois University at 15. At 18, rode horseback to one-room country school to teach all eight grades and clerked in grocery summers. In 10 years he left teaching to sell insurance in the dedicated belief that it was a public service and protection against all hazards. In 29 years became an outstanding insurance executive. In 1952 he left a secure position to join newly formed All American Life & Casualty Co. as sales director. It had a two-room office, no salesmen or policies. In 2 years he became president. Today, E. E. Ballard's years of experience, wisdom, and dynamic drive has built All American into leadership. It is licensed in 48 States, has $675 million of life insurance, $20 million

premium income, $41 million assets, 1,136 field representatives, 673 full-time brokers, and 300 employees in its large, efficient home office. Ballard created a full line of policies with matchless benefits to serve the changing needs of all types of people and inflationary trends. Everette E. Ballard was cited for his dedication and contributions to the American free enterprise system through his services to the personal insurance business. (The company's prompt handling of claims has made it a model in its field.)

HARRY C. GRAVELY

Harry C. Gravely, 47 (residence, 1200 Sam Lions Trail, Martinsville, Va.). President, Gravely Furniture Co.; divisions: Ridgeway Clock Co., Ridgeway Table Co., Worth Furniture Co., Ridgeway, Va. Director, Virginia Furniture Co., Martinsville, Va. Earned B.S. in chemistry at William & Mary College while learning family furniture business starting as packer. Gave up chemist job to work up to president at Gravely. When industry conditions closed one of his plants he courageously improved his Ridgeway tables, Worth bedroom, dining and living room furniture and gambled on making Ridgeway "grandfathers," "grandmother" and "granddaughter" floor clocks traditionally European made. He imported fine 8-day clock movements, had Virginia craftsmen make cabinets and became world's largest supplier of floor clocks with various designs, heights, colors, woods, and chimes, selling for $200—an industry first. Still expanding, he has completed a $1 million conveyorized, 200,000 square foot factory on an 11-acre site, has a $1½ million payroll, nationwide sales force, and display rooms with multimillion in sales to thousands of retail stores nationwide. Cited for his enterprise to bring a new floor clock industry to Virginia and America and bucking its traditional European domination.

MORRIS B. BESCHLOSS

Morris B. Beschloss, 36 (residence, 1800 Western Avenue, Flossmoor, Ill.). President, Hammond Valve Corp., Hammond, Ind. Director, press relations chairman, Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Information Bureau. Director, Valve Manufacturing Association. Was Berlin immigrant raised in small Illinois town. Earned B.S. at University of Illinois, daily Illini sports editor (Sigma Delta Chi). Was Army captain, taught military science at University of Illinois, and Army psychological warfare division. Started at Hammond as advertising manager in 1956, worked up to president. His leadership sparked sales, new products, and expansion. He originated overnight delivery servicenters. He entered competitive industrial valve field, broadened line of gate, globe, and check valves to make Hammond a leading supplier to the plumbing and other industries selling over 800 items with multimillion in sales through distributors. A new $1 million, 2-acre addition will expand its 125,000-square-feet plant. Cited as an example of small-town boy makes good, for his young executive ability, selfless contributions to his industry.

ROBERT F. HAYES

Robert F. Hayes, 61 (residence, 1054 Lynwood Boulevard, Nashville, Tenn.). President, chairman, founder, Hayes Garment Co., Nashville, Tenn. Divisions: Hopkinsville Clothing Manufacturing Co., Hopkinsville, Ky.; Todd Manufacturing Co., Elkton, Ky.; Simpson Manufacturing Co., Franklin, Ky.; Monroe Manufacturing Co., Gamaliel, Ky.; Roswell Manufacturing Co., Roswell and Alpharetta, Ga. Chairman, H-K Corp., Atlanta, Ga. Earned University of Kentucky Engineering B.S. Was rural teacher, engineer, rag baler. In 1949 he risked savings and built Hayes Garment Co. through grit and genius from one plant to eight, employing 2,200 people to become a leading maker of casual pants, utility and work wear for men, boys, the rental laundry trade, and the military with $24 million in U.S. and worldwide sales. Cited for his up-from-the-ranks career and leadership which has built thriving industries in his communities.

JAMES W. SIKES

James W. Sikes, 36 (residence, 2427 Nevada Road, Lakeland, Fla.). President, founder, Florida Tile Industries, Inc. Earned business administration degree at University of Florida. Was insuranceman. In 1954, with no experience, he mortgaged home and risked buying an indebted, decrepit tile factory. When his one sill product failed he ventured a $189,000 loan from SBA and paid off in 2 years. Sikes programs built FTI to sixth largest in fierce field. On FTI's 15 acres he installed modern automated equipment that made a complete quality tile line for all fields in all sizes, shapes, colors, and textures. Its 400 employees, a truck fleet, help speed orders to 60 distributors and warehouses in 15 States with $17 million in ceramic tile sales. Cited as a beginner whose success in a competitive industry also contributed to its progress and his area.

GEORGE PERRIN

George Perrin, 38 (3008 Dallas Drive, Fort Smith, Ark.). President, founder, Plastics Research & Development Corp., General Industries Corps., Fort Smith, Ark. Was salesman, picture framemaker. His genius built firm to a 60,000-square-feet plant employing hundreds making products for manufacturers. He grew to modern coordinated facilities for product development, mold building, custom molding, assembly, packaging, distribution. PRDC makes and sells worldwide, home decorative items, toys, military identification, making kits, and fishing tackle. He is acclaimed for his 124 models of realistic rebel fishing lures. Cited for one man's ability to build a prestige independent business by seeking out and filling needs of industry.

PAUL C. GREEN

Paul C. Green, 67 (1741 South Main Street, Aberdeen, S. Dak.). President, Hub City Iron Co., Hub City Iron Store, Aberdeen, S. Dak. Director, Aberdeen National Bank. Had ninth grade (pioneer area) schooling. Was radio operator World War I. Took mail business course. Bought father's indebted small machine shop in which he had worked since age 12. His skill built Hub into a 12-building, 200,000-square-feet modern plant and foundry. Hundreds of craftsmen make gear boxes, engine valve guides, sleeves and inserts, shop equipment and parts for automotive and industrial engines and farm implements. Cited for his vital contributions to his field, to American industry, and our national defense.

STATEMENTS MADE BY FEAA'S 1965 AMERICAN SUCCESS STORY AWARDS RECIPIENTS PRAISING AMERICA'S FREE ENTERPRISE DEMOCRACY AND ADVICE TO THOSE SEEKING SUCCESS.

James S. Hunt, president, chairman, Coral Ridge Properties, Inc.: "Americans start with success because they have the advantages of freedom and opportunity to create their own destiny and achieve their goals. Then the harder you work the luckier you get. The payoff is seeing your fellowmen enjoying the fruits of your labors."

Kenneth S. Kelleher, president, Keltec Industries, Inc.: "It is vital to our Nation's survival that space electronics be permitted to develop with a minimum of restrictions. Only in this way will there be opportunity of opening new electronics fields for success."

Ted C. Wetterau, Sr., chairman, Wetterau Foods, Inc.: "Free enterprise is expanding in America due to organizations in many fields that supply guidance, merchandise, and financing to enable beginners to compete and achieve big business success."

Everette E. Ballard, president, All American Life & Casualty Co.: "The multi-billion-dollar insurance industry is free enterprise in action wherein any American can insure education, retirement, and security for his family and protection against all hazards."

Harry C. Gravely, president, Gravely Furniture Co.: "In America anyone is free to compete in any field. American craftsmen and production methods can excel in fields dominated by foreign manufacturers."

Morris B. Beschloss, president, Hammond Valve Corp.: "Under America's free enterprise democracy any person from any walk of life or origin can succeed in any field of his choice by doing a better job that the competition."

Robert F. Hayes, president, chairman, Hayes Garment Co.: "Free enterprise competition is the policeman that eliminates shoddy products and services and awards success to quality in all fields, thus building a stronger America."

James W. Sikes, president, Florida Tile Industries, Inc.: "A company's success is due to making a better product, teamwork, fair play, and loyalty between employer and employees and participation in community and civic projects."

George Perrin, president, Plastics Research & Development Corp.: "Success is inevitable if you serve your customers and your country with integrity and seek out and supply their needs."

Paul C. Green, president, Hub City Iron Co.: "My success in Aberdeen, S. Dak. is proof that under America's free enterprise system any U.S. area can supply loyal, skilled manpower, and opportunities for worldwide expansion."

SENATOR HERMAN E. TALMADGE—1965 AWARD AS MAN OF THE YEAR IN GEORGIA AGRICULTURE

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, on Monday of last week, before returning to the Capital, I had the privilege of attending a most enjoyable occasion in Atlanta in honor of my friend and colleague, Senator TALMADGE.

The occasion was the formal presentation to Senator TALMADGE of the 1965 award as Man of the Year in Georgia Agriculture by the Progressive Farmer magazine.

It would not be possible to have selected a more worthy and deserving recipient than the Senator from Georgia for this award. The Members of the Senate are well aware of his many contributions as a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in promoting a prosperous and healthy agriculture. He has labored to see that farm families receive a fair and equitable share of the national income.

His efforts during the last session in connection with the new farm legislation bore telling evidence of the diligence and dedication with which he has worked to secure an overall farm program that is good for the farmer, the consumer and the taxpayers. He, of course, is the principal author of the new cotton program which all of us hope will help to solve the difficult problems that long have plagued the entire cotton textile industry in the United States.

But Senator TALMADGE's undisputed credentials as a foremost agriculture author are not based solely on his legislative accomplishments, formidable though they are. He is, himself, a son of the soil. He grew up on his family's farm in

south Georgia and has never lost his love for the land and its products. He is today a highly successful farmer in his own right, and when his official duties do not require his presence here or elsewhere, he may be found at his lovely old farm home in Henry County, Ga.

I know that all of Senator TALMADGE's many friends share my great pride that this richly deserved honor has come his way.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD a citation from the Progressive Farmer of the record of leadership and distinguished service that Senator TALMADGE has rendered to agriculture in Georgia and in America.

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

SENATOR HERMAN E. TALMADGE—MAN OF THE YEAR IN AGRICULTURE

No one has more claim to the title "Friend of the Farmer" than Georgia's Senator HERMAN E. TALMADGE.

Born and reared on a farm in Telfair County where he was a 4-H and FFA member, HERMAN TALMADGE grew up as as son of Georgia's commissioner of agriculture. He then followed in his father's footstep as Governor of the State.

He is now earning a reputation in Congress as a friend of the farmer, particularly the cotton farmer of the Southeast. He has labored long and hard to help farm people achieve a fair share of the national income.

Senator TALMADGE's feet are firmly fixed on Georgia soil. He operates two farms of his own—one at Lovejoy where he lives and another, the old family homestead, at Forsyth 35 miles away.

Senator TALMADGE served as Governor for 6 years before being elected to the Senate in 1956. His administration was marked by positive accomplishments of a lasting nature with emphasis on a broad program of social services. During his terms nearly a billion dollars of new permanent improvements were provided, including school and college buildings, road and highways, hospitals, and health centers.

Improved educational opportunities were made available to all Georgia children. Youth centers were established. Parks were expanded. Hospitals were built. Welfare benefits were doubled. Rural roadbuilding took place at an unprecedented rate. A statewide forestry improvement and protection program was inaugurated.

Much of the credit for the Rock Eagle 4-H Center goes to HERMAN TALMADGE. The auditorium there is named for him. As Governor, he matched private donations with State money to assure its completion.

As a Member of the Senate, Mr. TALMADGE soon won national recognition as a student of government and as an authority on agriculture.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is absent on a mission, and probably will be absent until the end of January. I ask that he be given leave of absence.

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

COLIN F. STAM

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, last week, in the passing of Colin F. Stam, the Nation lost one of its outstanding authorities on taxation. For over one-third of a century he was counselor and adviser to the House Ways and Means Committee, to the Senate Finance Committee, and the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue and Taxation.

He received an honorary doctor of law degree from Dartmouth College in 1958 and the Rockefeller Public Service Award in 1961. Colin Stam's outstanding public service was recognized by the Tax Foundation on December 4, 1964, when he was honored as the recipient of the Tax Foundation's annual award for distinguished public service. He considered this award, conferred on him after he retired from public life, as one of the high honors of his long career.

In the 37 years he served the Congress, Mr. Stam was known as one of the most dedicated public servants on the Hill. His legacy to the Nation, among other things, is the constructive tax legislation which is now a part of our tax structure.

Those of us who had the privilege of working with him appreciated his knowledge, his courtesy, and his interest in our individual problems. He was always most cooperative and will be truly missed.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the January 8 issue of the Washington Daily News.

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

COLIN STAM, AN AUTHORITY

In Washington the other day Colin F. Stam, aged 69, died of a stroke.

Outside Washington, almost no one would know of him. Even in the Capital he never was a headline man. To those relative few who did know him, or were acquainted with his work, he was a top authority in his field, a Government employee who was the soul of nonpartisanship, a man who devoted most of his life to one job and neither asked nor wanted public acclaim.

Mr. Stam retired in 1964, but for the previous 37 years he had been either assistant or chief counsel to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, a special agency of Congress. If it was facts, or expert judgment in the tax field you wanted, Mr. Stam was your man. Others handled the politics or the policy of tax law.

Facts he would supply to any who asked, Congressmen, news reporters, anyone who needed facts. Otherwise, he usually had a pencil in his teeth—and a man with a pencil in his teeth doesn't talk much. Colin Stam was a man in the Government who knew his business and did it—which probably accounted for his being so widely unsung.

CITY AND COUNTRYSIDE DEPENDENT ON SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I want to bring to the attention of the Senate an address made by my colleague, the Senator from Kansas, JAMES B. PEARSON, before the Kansas Association of Conservation Districts at their annual meeting on December 6, 1965.

Senator PEARSON covered a broad range of subject matter dealing with the conservation and development of natural resources. He made what I consider to be one particularly important point on cooperation. He said:

> We must stress cooperation as a necessity. This means that we must bring the urban areas into the total conservation picture. The city is as dependent upon sound soil and water conservation practices as the countryside. City and county officials and residents need—desperately, in many cases—to be informed about their interest and responsibility in the conservation effort.

There are other significant points, too, in this address which I think will be of interest. I ask unanimous consent to have Senator PEARSON's address printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR JAMES B. PEARSON TO THE KANSAS ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS ANNUAL CONVENTION, WICHITA, KANS., DECEMBER 6, 1965

It was my pleasure to meet with many of you several days ago at the annual meeting of the State Association of Kansas Watersheds in Topeka. I am pleased to have the opportunity to meet again with this distinguished group of natural resource conservationists.

There has never been a time in the history of our Nation when the conservation and development of our natural resources was more in the public mind than it is today. Never before have the national, State and local governments found so firm a common cause as in conservation matters. Never have soil and water conservation districts, and other active conservationist organizations, had so great a fund of knowledge, experience, financial support, and opportunity as they have today.

This broad acceptance and widespread support of the conservation movement is a source of great satisfaction to those who are dedicated to making the best possible use of the Nation's natural resources for the larger benefit of all the people—today and in the days of the future.

The soil and water conservation districts have done a good job in bringing the conservation message to rural landowners and operators throughout the Nation. Here in Kansas, the entire State is covered by soil and water conservation districts—105 of them. Seventy-nine of these districts have signed modernized agreements with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, allowing their cooperators to benefit by the new multiple purpose conservation programs supported by the Federal Government.

The district leadership in Kansas has a right to be proud of the large number of cooperators in the State and the great number of soil conservation plans which have been drawn up. However, the total acreage of land on which basic plans have been fully applied—about 2,400,000 acres—is disappointing when compared with the 24 million acres of land covered by basic soil conservation plans. Here is a case of not enough support to get the job done. There aren't enough soil conservation technicians, not enough financial support, not enough firm interest in getting these plans applied for everybody's benefit. Many farmers and ranchers are not taking advantage of the long-range conservation programs available to them.

And so soil and water conservation districts are charged with a challenging opportunity here—to help public officials, landowners, land users, and other responsible citizens to understand the importance of resource conservation and development to Kansas and to the Nation.

We Kansans cannot be satisfied that 34 percent of needed soil and water conservation work on farms and ranches has been

completed, and that approximately 1½ percent is being completed annually. We are going to have to do better than 1½ percent a year if we are going to meet future demands upon our land, water and related resources. I am confident that we will do better than this; circumstances will compel it. Progress often is born of necessity. Yet, often, too, much has been lost because progress waited for necessity. It is wise to plan ahead—to avoid crisis by anticipating it and acting to prevent it from arising.

Kansas, as we know, is not alone with this problem of making resource conservation a more vital force in the State. The percentage of completed soil and water conservation work is higher in Kansas than in many other States. The currently anticipated rate of completion of remaining work is about the same as for most States. We are confronted with a serious national problem and a dynamic national challenge. But the basic responsibility for meeting the challenge and solving the problem rests within each State.

The record clearly shows that Congress recognizes the importance of conserving and developing our natural resources. Federal legislation has been far-seeing and far-reaching over the years. Without it there could not have been the advances made in soil and water conservation work. Congress continues to be aware of the need. I am pleased to have had a part in the passage of recent legislation that contributes significantly to the conservation of our soil and water resources. Let me mention several of these recent acts.

The Agricultural Act of 1965 puts the cropland adjustment program on a long-term basis, making it possible to plan land requirements for agricultural and nonagricultural purposes more effectively.

The Public Works and Economic Development Act provides for Federal assistance to State and local economic development organizations, and for studies, information, and advice to communities on solving unemployment problems. Soil conservation districts may act as the local legal body to sponsor projects proposed for community development.

The Rural Water and Sanitation Facilities Act provides for grants and increased loans for development of rural water systems, and for the extension of sewer lines into rural areas.

These acts and other Federal legislation assure a continuing national interest in soil and water conservation and development. It therefore follows that we may expect a comparable effort at the State and local levels to improve the outlook for realization of conservation objectives.

As I remarked at the recent watershed meeting, I am opposed to what amounts to taxing individual landowners and operators for technical services which traditionally have been provided without charge by the Federal Government, because now, as in the past, these services have benefited the general public, not only in the rural areas but in the towns and cities, too.

Take, for example, small watershed projects, where the rural landowner is required to perform certain land conservation practices even before construction of the dam which protects and serves a broad area. These farmers and ranchers are, it seems to me, entitled to some public help in bringing soil and water conservation measures to their land. And, with the multiple-purpose projects, the general benefit is greatly emphasized. The city—its residents, commercial houses, and industries—uses the project reservoirs for water supply. Both urban and rural residents use them for many forms of recreation, for wildlife habitat, for park-like setting that combines beauty and utility.

There is, certainly, broad public interest in the conservation of our natural resources that justifies the expenditure of public money—including Federal money—for this purpose. But I do not favor the Federal Government getting any more involved in State and local problems than is absolutely necessary. I don't think you do, either. I am persuaded that the gap between Federal expenditures for resource conservation and development, and support from State and local governments must be narrowed.

An estimated $34 million in Federal funds is involved in completing watershed projects authorized for construction in Kansas. This amount may be contrasted with the $345,000 in total State funds appropriated by the Kansas Legislature for soil and water conservation work in fiscal year 1966, and the $187,000 in local governmental contributions for this work in the current fiscal year. Yet, Kansas is ahead of some other States in its support of soil and water conservation work.

The wise concern of Kansas lawmakers and government officials for the conservation and use of soil and water resources is indicated in the Kansas soil conservation district law, which has made available State financial assistance to soil conservation districts, and the State Water Plan Act, which provides for State participation in water conservation programs. Let us resolve, as citizens deeply interested in the future welfare of Kansas, that these acts will become increasingly more significant in the development of our soil and water resources.

We must stress cooperation as a necessity. This means that we must bring the urban areas into the total conservation picture. The city is as dependent upon sound soil and water conservation practices as the countryside. City and county officials and residents need—desperately, in many cases—to be informed about their interest and responsibility in the conservation effort.

With nearly 2,000 nonfarm landowners and operators in Kansas receiving technical assistance through soil conservation districts in fiscal 1965, the town and country nature of the conservation endeavor is clear. This trend will, of course, continue and become even more significant in the years ahead.

There are many ways to measure the value of soil and water conservation work. But none, I think, is more important than the generation of local spirit, initiative, and cooperation to accomplish a task of common concern. This is where the soil and water conservation districts make their greatest contribution.

Kansas is a land of great open spaces where the fields seem to stretch endlessly away. Kansas remains essentially an agricultural State, with 95 percent of the total land area still in farms today, even though approximately 75 percent of the more than 2 million residents of the State live in urban communities. Kansas must expect dramatic change, occasioned by dynamic national growth.

The broad acres of Kansas beckon further development. The conversion of cropland to nonagricultural uses has increased. Permit me to cite a few statistics, then comment briefly on this point. In fiscal year 1965 alone, nearly 88,000 acres of cropland were converted to grass and trees as a result of soil and water conservation work, and an additional 3,700 acres of cropland were converted to nonagricultural uses as a result of the watershed protection program. More than 67,000 acres of cropland will be converted to grass under Great Plains conservation program contracts. Eighty-five district cooperators have switched 10,500 acres from farming activity to recreation as a primary source of income.

I said at Topeka that I favored conversion of land not needed or suitable for growing crops to grass or trees, for pasture, wildlife conservation and recreation—so that it will be preserved in a protective and useful state. But I said, also, that tomorrow's America is going to need efficient crop production when all demands upon the land and its resources are going to be much greater than they are now. Let me expand on that statement here.

There is going to be a good deal more conversion of crop acreage in future years as the Nation's population continues to grow and with it increasing demands upon the land for urban, recreational, and other uses. Yet, even with greater efficiency in the production of crops, we'll need vast acreages to grow the food and fiber our future population will require. And we need to look beyond our borders and consider how this rich production might change the course of history in far-off lands—if we take advantage of the opportunity.

Let us not be misled by so-called crop surpluses. We know very well that there are no crop surpluses in the world as a whole. There is, however, an inadequate distribution system of the world's food products. There are, indeed, underfed and undernourished people right in our own country. Millions of people in the world go hungry every day, and countless numbers starve to death each year. Revolutions, with their threat to all peoples are born of want and deprivation.

We can view the matter as an ideological, moral or military issue, however we wish. In any case, we owe it to ourselves, as people living in a free and lavishly endowed society, to be sure not only that our own are adequately fed, but to see to it that everything possible is done so that our food production—current and potential—helps to satisfy a desperate need of mankind. When we do this, and we have not done it to the extent of our ability, we will reach a new level of maturity as a nation; and we will prove ourselves, in a way more significant than our possession of superior military power, that we qualify for leadership of all free peoples and those aspiring to be free.

Let us not talk down agricultural production. We can't afford to do so. Let us, rather, develop additional outlets for what we produce so that the undernourished people of the world may, in larger measure, benefit by the productive capacity of our fields.

Mindful of the challenges that confront us, I am confident that the people of Kansas will continue to strive for the highest development of the State's rich and varied resources, and for the best possible use that can be made of these endowments. In this vital effort, the soil and water conservation districts are charged with a rewarding responsibility. Your experience, knowledge and dedication, and the respect you have earned through years of productive service to your communities, make you uniquely qualified for your challenging role in the accelerated conservation movement of tomorrow. I wish you well, because I wish Kansas and the Nation well. And I want to play a part in the success that surely will be yours.

DEATH OF AMBASSADOR MYRON M. COWEN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, during the recess of the Senate an able and valued American, Myron M. Cowen, passed away. Myron Cowen served our country with distinction, ability, and diligence as Ambassador to the Philippines during the time of the Huk Rebellion. He contributed immensely to the betterment of American-Philippine relations. He was a man of keen intelligence and sound judgment, who represented this country always with distinction and integrity, not only as Ambassador to the Philippines, but also as Ambassador to Belgium and Australia. We shall miss his services. We shall miss them now, and in the years ahead. And I know I

speak for the Members of the Senate when I express to his family our deep sorrow and appreciation for his many contributions to our country in its relations throughout the world.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Manila Chronicle, entitled "Ambassador Myron M. Cowen," be printed at this point in my remarks, as well as an editorial from the New York World-Telegram.

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

[From the Manila Chronicle, Nov. 4, 1965]

AMBASSADOR MYRON M. COWEN

It was during the tenure of Myron M. Cowen as U.S. Ambassador to the Philippines that a good measure of rapport was established between the Filipinos and the Americans.

Ambassador Cowen, in certain ways, was blustering in his manners but perhaps it was precisely because of his unorthodoxy that he was able to get the understanding of many Filipino officials and with them work out a modus vivendi.

There were problems between Filipinos and Americans, some of them of grave importance, but always Ambassador Cowen, without abandoning his primary duty of protecting the interests of his country, tried and often succeeded in seeing the Philippine side and arriving at some sort of compromise which somehow eased the tension and paved the way for closer relationship.

And so it was that when Ambassador Cowen had to leave, many Filipinos, some of them stern critics of American policy in the Philippines, regretted his departure.

But never since his departure had the Ambassador lost interest in the country he had learned to love. For during the last few months, he was engaged in an educational project which, when consummated, would bring benefit to the Ateneo de Manila.

Yesterday, the shocking news was flashed across the wires that Ambassador Myron M. Cowen was dead. The measure of his worth to the Filipinos may be measured by the fact that to a great many of them, his passing is almost like the passing of a beloved countryman.

[From the New York World-Telegram, Nov. 4, 1965]

MYRON COWEN

Fifteen years ago the Communist Huks in the Philippines were starting off about as menacingly as did the Vietcong subsequently in South Vietnam. And financial problems in the Philippines were even more troublesome.

But America, and the anti-Communist Western World, were fortunate to have as U.S. Ambassador in Manila a skilled diplomat and businessman, Myron M. Cowen. Working closely with President Elpidio Quirino and Defense Minister Ramon Magsaysay, Mr. Cowen lent a most effective hand in helping to solve both problems. The eminent Philippines stature in Asia today stems from surmounting those crises of 1950.

Mr. Cowen's death Monday night at 67, in Washington, will be widely mourned. His illustrious career included ambassadorships also in Australia and Belgium. He distinguished himself as a diplomat, lawyer, and businessman of consistent achievement.

MYRON MELVIN COWEN, 1898–1965

(Eulogy delivered by Francis O. Wilcox, Nov. 3, 1965)

We are gathered here today to honor the memory of a distinguished American whose life and works constructively and helpfully affected the lives of many thousands of people both at home and abroad.

Wordsworth has reminded us in his famous ode, "Intimations of Immortality" of the nature of birth and life and immortality.

"Our birth is but a sleep and a forgetting;
The soul that rises with us—our life's star
Hath had elsewhere its setting
And cometh from afar.
Not in entire forgetfulness
And not in utter nakedness
But trailing clouds of glory
Do we come from God who is our home."

Myron Cowen was born in Logan, Iowa, in 1898. After his schooling at Wofford College and at Drake University, he rose to national prominence first as a practicing attorney then as U.S. Ambassador to Australia, the Philippines, and to Belgium. He attended many international conferences, representing our country with unusual ability and distinction.

Although he achieved outstanding success in the practice of law it was the field of international relations that eventually claimed his first interest and his first loyalty. He was a modest man so that even his closest friends might not fully appreciate the extent of his commitment to world affairs.

It was his privilege to serve our country abroad during a very exciting and important period in its history. During his tour of duty in the Philippines, for example, the Philippine Government was in the process of taking effective action to crush the Huk rebellion and Myron was in a position, as the American Ambassador in Manila, to be helpful to the great President, Ramon Magsaysay, in many ways. He served as Ambassador to Belgium at a time when the North Atlantic Treaty Organization was in its formative stages and when the preliminary discussions that later resulted in the European Economic Community were taking place. He also served as a member of the U.S. delegation to the San Francisco Conference of 1951 to conclude the treaty of peace with Japan.

Even after his retirement from active service abroad his keen interest in international affairs continued unabated. Merely to list his activities is to suggest to a certain degree the breadth of his interests. He was a member of the board of directors of DACOR which is designed to promote the interests of retired Foreign Service officers. He was an active member of the Council on Foreign Relations in New York. He was a charter member of the council's Washington counterpart—the Washington Institute of Foreign Affairs—and served as its treasurer since its inception some 5 years ago. I think it is safe to say that without Myron's enthusiastic support during its early stages the institute, which performs a very valuable service in our Nation's Capital, might not now be in existence.

Some years ago he also recognized the great need for a club in the Washington area where younger diplomats might come to relax and meet their colleagues from other lands. Largely as a result of his persistent efforts the International Club came into being. Myron was a life member of the club and served on its board of directors.

There can be no doubt about his deep dedication to the task of training young people in the important field of diplomacy and international relations. He was, I believe, the only person in Washington who served as a member of the board of advisers or the advisory councils of the three great institutions here engaged in this task—the School of International Service of the American University, the Georgetown School of Foreign Service, and the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies.

Nor were these memberships of a pro forma character. On a number of occasions Myron reminded me that as a member of the advisory council of the school of advanced international studies he was much interested in our program and was anxious to help in any way that he could. I took him at his word and from time to time I sought his advice and counsel. He was never too busy to help. I am sure the other institutions found him—as we did—a very thoughtful and a very helpful counselor and friend.

I have spoken of Myron Cowen the diplomat and statesman. Now let me say just a few words about Myron Cowen the man.

In this country we like to think of sincerity, kindness, courage, integrity, and humility as great Judeo-Christian virtues. These qualities he had in abundance and with their help—and with the help of a charming and devoted wife—he carved an enviable place in the hearts and minds of his countrymen.

He was a loving husband, a devoted father, a successful attorney, a loyal and able public servant, and a generous contributor to many worthy causes.

One of the finest tributes I can pay to any man is to say that he is a gentleman. Myron Cowen was a gentleman in every sense of that term. He was thoughtful and considerate of others and he was deeply interested in doing what he could to promote the interests of the common man. His kindly smile and his warm and friendly manner endeared him to all those who knew him well.

I was always impressed by his democratic attitude. He eschewed arrogance and he was always willing to listen with patience and respect to points of view that differed from his own. He approached life with a humility that was refreshing, an interest in humankind that was inspiring, and a cooperative spirit that was reassuring.

The story of Myron Cowen's life is a wonderful story of an American boy born in humble circumstances in a small town in the Middle West who worked his way to a position of leadership and prominence in this great country of ours. It is a remarkable tribute to his capacity, his industry, his integrity, his sound moral standards, and his ability to get along with other people. It is also a remarkable tribute to the American way of life.

William Cullen Bryant has admonished us that we should:

"So live, that when thy summons comes to join
The innumerable caravan which moves
To that mysterious realm, where each shall take
His chamber in the silent halls of death,
Thou go not, like the quarry-slave at night,
Scourged to his dungeon, but, sustained and soothed
By an unfaltering trust, approach thy grave,
Like one that wraps the drapery of his couch
About him, and lies down to pleasant dreams."

I am sure that Myron Cowen has lived the kind of life that will enable him to approach his God with the serenity of spirit and the faith about which William Cullen Bryant and the psalmists of the Old Testament have written so beautifully.

It is only natural that when a loved one is taken from our midst we should give way to sorrow. Yet when that individual has lived a rich and full life, when he has, by his thoughtfulness and his good deeds, helped to make the world a better place for us all, then we should rejoice that we have been privileged to share his friendship. We should express our gratitude for the splendid contribution he has made to the well-being of his fellow man and to the cause of peace among the nations. There can be no finer achievements than these.

GEORGE DIXON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, during the adjournment of Congress a very

dear friend of many of us, George Dixon, passed to his reward. He was known by many Senators.

George Dixon was a man with a sense of humor appreciated by all. While at times some may have criticized his views, all will remember always that George Dixon was sympathetic and sensitive. For he appreciated the problems of the people of the country and of the world. And, too, he understood well the work of the Senate and the House. George Dixon was devoted to his country. His contributions were countless and his career illustrious as was evidenced by the hundreds of newspapers syndicating his column throughout the country and in Canada. His advice and counsel which many of us had valued so highly through the years, will be sorely missed.

He is survived by his sister, Mrs. Thomas Smith of Vancouver, British Columbia, by a niece, Mrs. Norman Hopkins of Toronto, Canada, by his wife, whom so many of us know, and for whom we have a great deal of love and affection, Mrs. Ymelda Chavez Miller Dixon, and by two daughters, who are two of the finest girls I have ever known, Mrs. Ismael Gonzales and Miss Stanlee Miller.

To all of the family Mrs. Mansfield, my daughter Ann, and I extend our deepest sympathy and great regret and sadness at the passing of this outstanding friend and most trustworthy columnist.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, George Dixon was one of my closest friends. It happens that my three very closest personal friends have died within the last few years—Senator Clair Engle, my neighbor Ed Murrow, and George Dixon. George Dixon was an internationally known columnist and one of the best known and most admired men in Washington. George was a friend of the great—indeed he was himself a great man—a very great man. His sudden and unexpected death from a heart attack deeply saddened all who knew him personally and the millions of Americans who regularly read his columns and felt a kinship with this great journalist. His humor as well as his compassion for his fellowmen will be missed by all.

Mr. President, I desire also to pay tribute to Mrs. Ymelda Dixon, an outstanding woman. She is a great lady and their years of married life together were radiant with successes, happiness, and love. Mrs. Young and I again express our deepest and heartfelt sympathy to Ymelda Dixon and her lovely daughters. Also to his mother-in-law, Mrs. Ymelda Chavez, the widow of our late beloved colleague, Senator Dennis Chavez of New Mexico. I know of the great love George had for Mrs. Chavez.

YOUNG AMERICANS FOR FREEDOM

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that last Saturday night at Constitution Hall there was an inspiring and stirring program which was sponsored by area chapters of Young Americans for Freedom. It was publicized as a freedom rally. It was designed to bring together young Americans from this part of the country in support of the determination of the United States not to accept defeat in Vietnam.

This nationally publicized event was a very dramatic rejoinder and refutation to the street walkers, the teach-ins, the draft-card burners, and other misguided Americans, young and old, who have been publicly taking actions and making statements, giving aid and comfort to the aggressor in Vietnam.

It was my pleasure, along with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] to represent the U.S. Senate at that meeting and on that program, which also included addresses by two distinguished Members of the House of Representatives, by Admiral Arleigh, and a number of other prominent Americans.

I regret that I do not have transcripts of all the addresses but I have the excellent one prepared by Senator DODD of Connecticut, who, because of illness in the family, was unable to attend, but whose talented son, Prof. Tom Dodd, Jr., of this city, read it with great emphasis and persuasion before this audience of more than 2,500 Americans, most of them of draft age, and most of them young Americans attending colleges and universities throughout the country.

I ask unanimous consent that the address of Senator DODD, along with the statements I made at Constitution Hall last Saturday night be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

In my opinion, Mr. President, great credit should go to the fine student organization, Young Americans for Freedom, for arranging this freedom rally and for the great audience which attended it. It was one of a series of patriotic rallies sponsored by YAF throughout the country generally under the able leadership of Tom Charles Huston, its national chairman. This program is also widely publicized in the New Guard, the official monthly magazine of Young Americans for Freedom.

In the words of National Chairman Huston, this young American crusade was devised "to demonstrate to the world that American and Asian and all youth are united in their strong support of United States policy in Vietnam and in their fervent desire to see freedom, not Communist tyranny, prevail in Vietnam.

I now call attention to the two addresses alluded to earlier in my remarks.

There being no objection, the addresses of Senator DODD and Senator MUNDT were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR DODD

I regret very much that my commitments make it impossible for me to be with you here tonight. But I want to take this opportunity to express my personal admiration for the young men and young women who have taken the initiative in organizing this meeting. I also want to commend the many hundreds of young people of the Washington area who have turned out to bear witness to the fact that the youth of our country, in their overwhelming majority, support the commitment of our Government to stem the tide of Communist aggression in Vietnam.

In every generation the strength of idealism and the hold of moral values manifest themselves primarily in the attitude of youth. And I believe that the swelling chorus of support for our Vietnam policy on our campuses and across the Nation has given more than ample proof that our young people are sound.

It has demonstrated, if this needed demonstration, that our young people have a remarkable understanding of the world in which we live, that they have a profound sense of moral values, that they are motivated by the same ideals which gave birth to our Nation, and that, in defense of these ideals, they are prepared, like their forebears, to pledge their lives and their sacred honor.

Not so many months ago, our press and our radio were lavishing so much attention on the anti-Vietnam teach-ins and on the burning of draft cards and on the other antics of a noisy minority on our campuses, that many people were led to believe that this minority represented a substantial sector of American public opinion. But the massive reaction to the Vietnik demonstrations in recent months has demonstrated beyond challenge how little this minority truly represents.

Polls taken on campus after campus, for example, have revealed that 75 to 80 percent, and in some places more, of the student body in our universities, support our commitment to the freedom and independence of Vietnam.

Across the Nation, the young Democrats, the young Republicans, and the junior chambers of commerce have united in a massive effort to collect and send gifts of needed items from the people of America to the people of South Vietnam.

In drives on various campuses, scores of thousands of volunteers have lined up to donate their blood in support of our forces in Vietnam.

In many of our major cities there have been parades and mass rallies, such as the rally you have organized in Washington tonight, for the purpose of letting the administration know and letting the world know the true feelings of the American people.

But, although their numbers may be small, the opposition to our Vietnam policy is highly organized and disposes of apparently limitless funds for repeated full-page advertisements in the press of the country and for rallies requiring the mobilization and transportation of many thousands of people. Because of these advantages they have been able to obtain a degree of attention from the world press that is out of all proportion to their actual strength.

There are many honest critics of our Vietnam policy, and the traditions of our society demand that their voices be heard. It is unfortunate, however, that, in the clamor of the anti-Vietnam agitation, the voices of many thousands of loyal Americans who oppose the war because they are pacifists or because they do not understand the issues, have become confused and blended with the voices of the Communists and other pseudo-Americans masquerading as pacifists.

There is no point in appealing to the Communists, because their commitment is not to the peaceful settlement of the Vietnam war but to the Communist subjugation of Vietnam and ultimately of our own society.

I believe, however, that we should all seek to appeal to those loyal Americans who are unaware of the facts or who have been misled by the anti-Vietnam agitation.

We must seek to make them understand, as the great majority of the American people understand, that communism is not an agrarian reformer movement, that it is on the contrary the most total and brutal tyranny ever devised by man for the subjugation of his fellow man.

We must seek to make them understand that in this respect there is no difference between communism in South Vietnam and communism in North Vietnam and communism in the Soviet Union or Red China or Hungary or Tibet or anywhere else.

We must seek to make them understand that the Communists mean business, as the Nazis meant business, when they speak of the goal of world conquest. We must strive

to persuade them to ponder the writings of Lenin and Stalin and Mao Tse tung and the recent statement of Chinese Communist Defense Minister, Marshal Lin Piao, in which he frankly discussed the role of the Vietnam war and of other so-called wars of national liberation in their master plan for the destruction of American power and world conquest.

We must ask them whether they are prepared to draw a line against the expansion of Communist power or whether they are not prepared to draw such a line. And if they agree with us that this line must be drawn—as every loyal American must do—we must then ask them where they propose to draw the line if Vietnam falls. For it is a total illusion to believe that the Communist conquest of Vietnam would produce peace in the area. It would, on the contrary, prepare the way for new and larger aggression, directed against all the free countries on the periphery of Asian communism.

The choice before us in Vietnam, therefore, is not the simple choice between war and peace. The choice is whether to make whatever effort may be necessary to defeat Communist expansion in Vietnam, or whether to fight at a later date and under much more difficult circumstances to fend off Communist aggression and subversion in the Philippines or Japan or India or even Australia.

I would therefore urge the young people who are assembled at this gathering tonight not to content themselves with voicing approval of the administration's policy.

It is good that you should do so.

But the convictions which we share imposes on each one of us the duty to master the facts and master the arguments necessary to expose the lies of Communist propaganda.

It imposes on each one of us, in short, the duty to become both a missionary and a fighter on the home front in the cause of freedom for ourselves and for other peoples. This is the least that we can do to show our support for American policy in Vietnam and for the American boys who are today suffering and dying on the ramparts of freedom.

ADDRESS OF SENATOR MUNDT

Freedom in Asia, American world leadership, and peace in our time are all at stake in the outcome of the Vietnamese war now involving both our military forces and our diplomatic leadership in Washington. The disruptive and disillusioning demonstrations by misguided and misled Americans which range all the way from draft card burnings to White House picketing and teach-ins, to offers of aid in terms of blood and dollars to the Communist North Vietnamese fighters who are killing American boys do not represent the vast majority of Americans; they render a great and costly disservice to our American servicemen abroad; they create false and dangerous foreign misconceptions about American attitudes; and they make less likely to succeed both our sacrifices in the fighting areas and our overseas missions engaged in the current peace offensive.

The question is not whether people in high public office or in private life have the legal right to stimulate these demonstrations of dissent and disservice, but whether any American has the ethical right when we are deep in this war to give aid and comfort to the enemy, to expand our casualty lists, to place in greater jeopardy perhaps hundreds of thousands of young Americans not yet in uniform, and to prolong the enemy's will to fight and hope for victory by creating across the world an impression that we are sharply and widely divided in support of our American position that aggressive, militaristic communism must not be permitted to win a victory by force and intrigue in southeast Asia.

The current lull in our effective military effort in Vietnam and the prevailing pressures being applied to win world support for an equitable and lasting peace at the conference table, are both handicapped by the mischievous road blocks already placed in the path to peace by those whose deeds, actions, and words have caused the Communist high command in Saigon, Peiping, and Moscow unfortunately and erroneously to mistake every sincere offer of peace by the United States as a manifestation of weakness and indecision on our part rather than a constructive desire to work out a just and lasting peace formula in southeast Asia.

Whether this current abatement in our military pressures and our air strikes together with the acceleration of our American efforts to induce conditions whereby negotiations replace strife and talks are substituted for expanded killing becomes known simply as the lull before the storm which results in larger battles and growing casualty lists or as a lull in the fighting which ushers in the dawn of peace and the universally desired conclusion of the war in Vietnam on equitable, enforceable, and enduring terms is not yet known to any man. But we do know now that the tasks both of our peace planners and of our battle commanders have been made greater, more certain, and far more difficult by the unsettling and unseeming demonstrations and actions here at home—whether inspired by local Communists or led by people of good will—which when reported globally and played up by foreign propagandists give the impression that the United States is ready to junk its role of world leadership and willing to buy a temporary peace by selling its friends into slavery. As a consequence, some of those in the Communist camp have deluded themselves into believing we Americans are so badly divided at home that all that is required for a Communist victory and a takeover of all of Asia is a stubborn and sustained refusal by the Communist leadership to consider any basis for ending the war and promoting a peace other than an unconditional defeat for the United States in Vietnam and a valid American national policy of permitting militant communism to succeed anywhere so long as its foreign invaders actually do not drop bombs or land armies on American soil.

Let us all hope and devoutly pray, therefore, that this great demonstration of national unity here in historic Constitution Hall tonight will give the lie to those fair-weather friends of freedom whose decibels of dissent and manifestations of malice toward American policy have injured both the cause of early peace and eventual victory.

Let us tell the world by our presence here tonight and by this program in support of a resolute refusal to accept defeat from communism that America continues to be the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Let us support rather than sabotage the sacrifices and the purposes of the brave young men now fighting to protect the freedoms of us all.

Let us, of course, retain and exercise our American concepts of free speech and our right and duty to criticize the methods employed both in our crusade for peace and in the conduct of the war when conscience or judgment compel us to do so but by all means let such criticism and comment be both constructive and consistent with our determination not to sell freedom short in Asia.

Let us make sure, in short, when we offer counsel or criticism that it is of such a nature that no Communist warmonger, dictator, or propagandist anywhere can find comfort in our words or deeds or can twist their meanings or motivations in such a manner as to convince either himself or others that they represent a weakening of our will to win or a divided American attitude in our resistance to Communist war gains.

Our suggestions and criticisms should be directed toward making America's position stronger and more successful and never be of such a nature as to strengthen the enemy's determination or desire to continue or expand the war.

Let us also continuously reexamine the tools and methods which we are employing to achieve success in Vietnam so as to identify and correct any shortcomings on our side. In this area, I sincerely hope this session of Congress opening on Monday will speedily approve legislation to create a Freedom Academy in America designed to provide our citizens and others with the professional training in depth required to enable American civilians abroad to operate as effectively and successfully on the peace front in projecting cold war programs and in holding and improving liberated areas as our men in uniform have demonstrated their abilities to win victories and to halt invasions on the war front. Otherwise, we shall continue to lose to subversives and agitators the areas brought into the sunlight of freedom by tremendous sacrifices by ourselves and others.

A House of Representatives committee has unanimously reported and approved the Freedom Academy legislation; experience clearly teaches the sad lesson of how badly we need its trainees in Vietnam, in the Dominican Republic, and in many other areas. The time is clearly here when we should cease employing amateurs against professionals in our political and economic efforts overseas just as we learned long, long ago not to utilize inadequately trained manpower or inferior weapons in our military operations.

Let us now unite, equip, and thoroughly train Uncle Sam's other arm so we can utilize all our potential talents and techniques in resisting the expansionist efforts of communism. Military efforts and battlefield techniques alone cannot win and hold the peace so essential to existence in this atomic age. We need a Freedom Academy to train nonmilitary experts in cold war tactics today fully as much as we need our great military academies at Annapolis, West Point, and Colorado Springs.

Finally, my good Americans, let us hope and pray for peace—an early, equitable, enforceable, and enduring peace.

Let us unanimously resolve, however, until it comes to continue to convince the Communist aggressor that while we will always welcome and embrace peace we shall likewise always abhor and reject surrender.

History is filled with bloody testimony teaching the lesson that to appease communism or any other marauding and aggressive tyranny in minor matters is to invite the time and to create the cricumstances necessitating bigger and bloodier wars, closer to home, and more damaging in their consequences if our free civilization is to survive.

There is no security or peace available under the umbrella of another Chamberlain which will protect the freedom and inspire the people who look to the American Eagle as a symbol of human justice, of human liberty, as a safeguard against the rule of tyrants, and as the protector of conditions making possible an enduring peace.

REMARKS OF MAJORITY LEADER ON STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in his third annual state of the Union message, President Johnson has set forth a course of action which is at once realistic, responsive, and imaginative. His concepts are designed to pursue human goals worthy of a great people and to seek peace in Vietnam. It was inevitable that the President should have addressed

himself to the seriousness of the situation in Vietnam. He leaves no doubt that he will continue to strive for a just and reasonable end to the unfortunate conflict in that war-torn land without compromising the right of the Vietnamese people to choose their own future.

Yet despite his concern and the concern of the Nation with the war in Vietnam, the President has not asked for a choice between the needs of war abroad and the demands of a decent and dignified society at home, between honoring our commitments to the world and honoring our obligations to fellow-Americans. He believes we are big enough and sensible and competent enough as a nation to do both. And in this connection he has promised us realistic and prudent management of the budget, a decreased deficit and an improvement in the balance of payments.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorials from the Baltimore Sun and the New York Times of January 13, 1966, commenting on the President's state of the Union message be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Baltimore Sun, Jan. 13, 1966]

THE PRESIDENT'S SPEECH

President Johnson laid out a realistic course for the Nation last night in his report to Congress on the state of the Union. He could not promise peace in Vietnam, but he could promise an honest effort to find a basis for peace. He aimed no new threats at North Vietnam but renewed his promise to stand firm against the Communist move to take over South Vietnam by force. He shows every intention of trying to keep the war under control, and in perspective, while the United States stresses its desire for a settlement on reasonable terms, and in this position the President deserves public support.

On the domestic side his handling of the budget and the related issue of inflation also seems realistic. His forecast of $112.8 billion in expenditures for the next fiscal year, after allowing for increases in defense items, indicates that he has carried out his pledge to hold down on nondefense items without sacrificing the continuing objectives of his Great Society program. If his forecast of $111 billion in revenues proves accurate—and it reflects an increase anticipated because of the rise in the gross national product—the deficit will be held to $1.8 billion without new income taxes. This would keep inflationary pressures within control and would be a mark of prudent management, all the more so in conjunction with his estimate that the deficit in our balance of payments for last year was down to $1.3 billion.

His proposals for new legislation—on the selection of juries and on crimes against civil rights workers, for a new Department of Transportation, for greater attention to the problems of the cities and pollution, for a 4-year term for Congressmen—will come into clearer focus after details are spelled out. The list is more modest than last year.

"I believe," he said, "we can continue the Great Society while we fight in Vietnam." He can expect wide support on both points so long as his approach continues to be realistic.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 13, 1966]

THE STATE OF THE UNION

President Johnson's state of the Union message was an eloquent but troubled rendering of the contradictory situation in which the country finds itself. Rebutting those who set up a false choice of "guns or butter," he pointed the way for an affluent, confident society whose problems are many but whose resources are great, whose mood is confident, and whose horizons are bright with hope. Looking at Vietnam, however, Mr. Johnson had to sketch a scene that is much grayer, where the issues are in doubt, and where the outcome does not wholly depend upon the Nation's will or its soldiers' valor.

Mr. Johnson's discussion of the war and the probing for peace was carefully balanced. He reaffirmed the Nation's determination to resist Communist use of force. But he made equally plain to Hanoi and to Peiping that he earnestly seeks peace. He could offer no results of his latest diplomatic overtures, but he did give assurance that he will persist in searching for a way to begin fruitful negotiations. He made no threats and issued no ultimatums. His language was notable for its sober tone and its unmistakable commitment to peace.

On domestic problems, the President's message set forth a comprehensive program which had in it something for everybody—and in some cases a bit too much. But he did place the Nation's serious domestic needs in their proper relationship to the war in Vietnam and to the other heavy burdens this country bears in the world. To those who would use that war and those burdens as pretexts to halt necessary reforms and to require sacrifices from those least able to make them, Mr. Johnson has returned the right answer: the United States is rich enough and strong enough to act responsibly both at home and abroad.

Slums, poverty, racial injustice, polluted rivers, and inadequate schools are sources of grave national weakness. If this session of Congress responds to the President's forthright call for action to overcome those weaknesses, this country will be in a much better—not a worse—position to meet whatever challenges the future may bring. But to meet this challenge will be expensive; and we doubt that Mr. Johnson's approach to his difficult tax and budget decisions is really bold enough. Without ruling out a substantial tax rise later, the President chose to rely for the present upon a mere speedup in personal withholding and corporate tax payments and small increases in automobile and telephone excises.

This city's transit strike has apparently had the unintended good effect of directing Mr. Johnson's attention forcibly to the long-evaded problem of improving Taft-Hartley procedures for coping with national emergency strikes. But instead of going on to propose a general revision of Taft-Hartley to give it better balance and bring it up to date—something that is also sorely needed—Mr. Johnson once again emphasized labor's demand for repeal of the right-to-work provision (sec. 14(b))—something that is not at all needed.

The President's civil rights recommendations are excellent. It is imperative that Congress strengthen the authority of the Federal courts to deal with the murder of civil rights workers and Negroes in the South. His recommendations to deal with discrimination in the sale and rental of housing and to improve the system of jury selection are also welcome.

A striking feature of Mr. Johnson's message is his vigorous, reformist approach to the Nation's political institutions. His request for a thorough overhaul of the laws regulating campaign expenditures is one that we have long urged on this page; Mr. Johnson's affirmation of the need for reform is most encouraging. Other of his proposals which have great merit include a 4-year term for Members of the House of Representatives, home rule for the District of Columbia, and a Cabinet-level Department of Transportation. His suggested Highway Safety Act of 1966 is recognition of the fact that the dreadful carnage on the highways is reaching the proportions of a national crisis that requires a national solution.

The theme of the President's message is epitomized in his words: "We must change to master change." It is the true theme for the United States both at home and abroad in the coming year.

RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR INFORMATION AND OPINION EXCHANGE BETWEEN THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD AND OTHER ECONOMIC AGENCIES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I submit a simple resolution calling for greater coordination among the fiscal and monetary policymakers of the Federal Government.

Although this resolution results from recent hearings held by the Joint Economic Committee on the Federal Reserve Board's latest discount rate increase, it is expressly designed not to compromise the independence of the Board in any way. In fact the language of the resolution explicity recognizes the independence of the Federal Reserve Board.

At the same time the resolution recognizes that there has been an almost comic breakdown in communication between the great economic policymaking arms of our Government.

The Federal Reserve Board's announcement last month of the increase in the rediscount rate not only contradicted the views of the President and the Secretary of the Treasury, but it was taken in ignorance of the biggest fact in economic policy: the shape of the upcoming budget.

It was made crystal clear in the hearings on December 13 and 14 that the Federal Reserve Board members who voted to increase the rediscount rate had not the slightest idea what would be in the President's budget as revealed to the Congress last Wednesday night. The Board, of course, was free to guess. And the hearings disclosed that their guesses were consistently and uniformly wrong.

Most of the Board members expressed a desire for a tax increase instead of a discount rate increase. But all clearly assumed there would be no tax increase, that there would be no step-up in income tax withholding, that there would be no speed-up of $3 billion in corporation income tax collections.

The projected deficit of less than $2 billion and the proposed cash surplus in the upcoming budget were factors none of them had anticipated.

And yet, Mr. President, every economist in the Nation would agree that these wholly unanticipated plans of the President will have a serious and profound effect on our economy, and on the prospects of inflation which the discount rate increase was designed to curb.

Mr. President, the need for the exchange of information and opinion—and I might add the acquiescence of Governor Martin in the desirability of exploring this need—was summarized in an exchange between Governor Martin and myself on December 14 in the hearings before the Joint Economic Committee. I ask unanimous consent that a short

excerpt from those hearings be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

EXCERPTS, RELATIVE TO COORDINATION, FROM HEARINGS HELD BEFORE THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE ON RECENT ACTIONS OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

(From vol. 2, 1965, Dec. 14, 1965, pp. 301–305)

Senator PROXMIRE. I am not talking about independent or more dependence or taking orders or taking directions. I am simply talking about the greatest possible amount of mutual information going both ways, frank, full, blunt discussion on the part of members of the Federal Reserve Board on fiscal policy and members of the administration on monetary policy, not with any feeling you are dictating to them what they should do, but making clear what is your best judgment, which is excellent and very valuable judgment to them. It should be.

I would like to get at whether or not you think it would be worthwhile considering one of the following four alternative methods of increasing coordination:

No. 1, regular meetings, weekly or monthly or four times a year, at any rate as often as possible, of all members of the Federal Reserve Board and some top members of these other agencies that are involved, the Budget, the Council, and the Treasury.

That is one possibility and maybe there are reasons why it can't be accomplished. What I am deeply concerned about is, Governor Martin, you have one vote, the other members have six votes. They have the ability therefore to determine policy as you know. You are the Chairman but as I understand it, the law does not give you any extraordinary power except that you are the chief executive officer. There is no other influence you have that they don't have. The majority leader cannot have any more influence in determination of policy than I have as an individual Senator. I think all members of the Board should have the greatest opportunity to be briefed. That is one alternative.

The second is the possibility of position papers prepared and circulated regularly with the arguments adduced from each of the other three important economic policy agencies. I can see that there would be problems involved here but I think it might be very, very helpful, particularly if they were kept in confidence and you had an opportunity to decide on a free and frank discussion that way in writing.

A third is for you to follow the same policy you do now but to keep a recorded transcript of the kind we have here of your discussions with the Council, Treasury, and Budget which would be made available in full promptly, the next day, to the other six members of the Board, and then maybe some opportunity for them to comment if they wish.

A fourth would be to establish a formal secretariat to work with all four agencies and to work directly with them to keep them all informed fully and to work for the greatest amount of understanding on the part of all members of the Federal Reserve Board and all members of these other three agencies not with a notion that the President would dominate or that the administration would dominate but that you would be fully and completely informed, not simply you but the other six members of the Board.

What is your reaction to these four possibilities? Do you think they might be considered and explored seriously?

Mr. MARTIN. I think we ought to explore carefully and conscientiously every avenue of improving coordination within the Government.

The independence we are talking about is independence within the Government, not independence of the Government. All four of these methods and several others that you have suggested have from time to time been discussed and evaluated and there are problems with all of them as you yourself recognized in outlining them.

I don't say that any one of them ought to be discarded, per se. I think our purpose ought to be to get better coordination throughout the Government not only in the Federal Reserve but in other areas of Government and the only thing that we ought to be careful about is that we do not substitute dictation for coordination.

Senator PROXMIRE. But you would feel that there might be further consideration, particularly since there is a feeling in the country I think, and some feeling in the Congress, that it may be a matter of misunderstanding.

Mr. MARTIN. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. In 1961 a former Board Chairman, Marriner Eccles, said:

There must be a liaison, a responsible relationship between the administration and the monetary system. This does not mean political control in the undesirable sense which is often implied.

My resolution simply attempts to insure that such a relationship exists without compromising the independent decisionmaking powers of the Board.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed at this point.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 177) was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

S. RES. 177

Whereas the monetary powers of the Federal Reserve System, particularly its open market operations and the establishment of bank discount rates, have a substantial effect on the Nation's fiscal policy as determined and applied by the President, the Bureau of the Budget, the Treasury Department, and the Council of Economic Advisers;

Whereas the coordination of fiscal and monetary policies is essential to a sound national economy;

Whereas the Employment Act of 1946 requires the Federal Government "to use all practicable means consistent with its needs * * * to coordinate and utilize all its plans, functions and resources for the purpose of creating and maintaining conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities * * * and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power,"; and

Whereas, the independence of the Federal Reserve System is an established policy of our Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That in order to achieve a greater coordination of the Nation's monetary and fiscal policies in accordance with the objectives of the Employment Act of 1946, it is the sense of the Senate that the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, together with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Council of Economic Advisers, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, should adopt procedures for the regular, formal, and frequent interchange of information and viewpoints on the fiscal and monetary policies of the Government. Such procedures should assure the fullest interchange of information and viewpoints possible, but nothing herein should be construed as affecting or abridging in any way the independence of the Federal Reserve System.

SEC. 2. The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Council of Economic Advisers, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget are requested to jointly report to the Senate, on or before June 30, 1966, with respect to any procedures which have been adopted in accordance with the sense of this resolution.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be recognized for 3 more minutes.

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

SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM SACRIFICED FOR NONEXISTENT BOOKKEEPING SAVINGS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I was shocked to learn upon my return to Washington for the opening of this second session that the Bureau of the Budget had crippled the special milk program with a directive that $3 million appropriated for reimbursing school districts dispensing milk under the program was to be withheld. As a result the reimbursement rate, which had already decreased by 5 percent due to program growth coupled with insufficient appropriations, was cut by an additional 5 percent for a total cut of 10 percent.

This has a number of serious consequences.

First. Less milk will be used under the program because local school districts will have to assume an increased share of the costs of the program or pass them on to the schoolchildren.

Second. More milk will have to be purchased under the price support program because less milk will be used in the special milk program. This means that the $3 million saved by depriving schoolchildren of nature's perfect food will be paid out by the Federal Government for purchasing and storing milk under the price support program that ordinarily would go into the special milk program. In other words, instead of going into children's stomachs the milk will be powdered and stored in warehouses at Government expense.

Third. The poor children who benefit most from the special milk program will be the first to drop out of the program if the increased cost created by a reduction in Federal participation is passed on to the schoolchildren, as it undoubtedly will be in some instances.

Finally, this action reaffirms a regressive approach by the Bureau of the Budget toward an important social welfare program at the very time that expenditures for other new society programs are increasing. Last year $103 million was spent on the program. This year, despite a growth in the school population and percentage of participation, the program was cut back.

Mr. President, I serve notice that as a member of the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Committee on Appropriations I intend to do everything in my power to rectify this grave mistake. Furthermore, until this outrageous situation is rectified this Senator intends to rise on the floor day after day throughout what promises to be a long session to hammer into the heads of this Government the detailed reasons why schoolchildren should be drinking milk which

otherwise—at the same cost to the Federal Government—will rot in storage.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I completely agree with the statement just made by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin concerning the action of the Bureau of the Budget in arbitrarily cutting the appropriations made by Congress for the purchase of milk for schoolchildren. The Senator from Wisconsin is exactly correct. The Bureau of the Budget has ignored the fact that Congress did not see eye to eye with the Bureau, and in raising slightly the appropriation for that purpose expected its final action to be carried out, and still expects it to be carried out.

I shall strongly support the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in behalf of the people of my State and, I am sure, the schoolchildren of America and the dairy farmers as well, I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida, who has rendered magnificent service, year after year, in fighting for this appropriation under most difficult circumstances. He has been more responsible than any other Senator in obtaining more adequate appropriations than would otherwise have been made, in view of the opposition both in the House and by the Bureau of the Budget. I am extremely grateful to him.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his gracious remark. The Senator from Wisconsin has, of course, been the spearhead of this effort. The Senator from Florida has agreed with him completely on this subject.

LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, as we mourn the death of Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri, of India, we feel the loss of a man who on the day of his passing had reached new heights in his search for peace on the Asian subcontinent. It is never an easy task for a man to succeed a great national hero; yet Mr. Shastri, as successor to the late Jawaharal Nehru, who was revered as a saint by the Indian masses, had shown during his 19 months in office a combination of strength and gentleness that had brought him close to the hearts of his people and indeed had earned a special place for him in the hearts of people the world over.

The name of Shastri now joins those of Gandhi and Nehru as three Indian immortals of our own times.

Prime Minister Shastri was a devoted seeker after peace, and a man determined to free his country from poverty. He was a friend of America; a friend of mankind. His gentle strength conveyed to us something of the mystical nature of the Indian soul.

DEATH OF HON. HERBERT C. BONNER, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 632

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable Herbert C. Bonner, a Representative from the State of North Carolina.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect, the House do now adjourn.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], and myself, I submit a resolution relating to the death of the very able and much loved Representative from North Carolina, Herbert C. Bonner, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. 176), as follows:

S. RES. 176

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of the Honorable Herbert C. Bonner, late a Representative from the State of North Carolina.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, shortly after the 1st session of the 89th Congress adjourned, the United States lost one of its truly outstanding citizens in the death of the Honorable Herbert C. Bonner, the Representative for the First District of North Carolina and chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The many friends Herbert Bonner had over the years felt a very deep personal loss in his passing. He was a very down-to-earth person who always put the welfare of the public ahead of other considerations. I am sure he did this because he loved just plain people so much and because he knew them and their problems.

I knew Herbert Bonner for many, many years, and I have never known a more conscientious, honest, and dedicated man in my life.

Although we have lost a dear friend and the Nation has lost a dedicated public servant, all of us are better off for having known Herbert Bonner and benefited from the work he did in the Congress of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution is considered and unanimously agreed to.

TRENDS IN COUNTY GOVERNMENT

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article on the subject of trends in county government be printed in the RECORD following my remarks. This article from American County Governments, published by the National Association of Counties, was written by my good friend John Alexander McMahon, who until recently served as general counsel of the North Carolina Association of County Commissioners.

Mr. McMahon, a graduate of Duke University and Harvard Law School, drew from many years of his experience as assistant director of the Institute of Government in Chapel Hill, N.C., and as chief officer of our State's vigorously active Association of County Commissioners in writing this useful and interesting article.

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

TRADITIONAL ROLE AND MODERN PROBLEMS INFLUENCE FUTURE DIRECTION OF COUNTIES

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Under the leadership of their general counsel, John Alexander McMahon, the counties of North Carolina became symbols of progressive government. Just before leaving that position to assume new responsibilities elsewhere, Mr. McMahon reflected on the trend of county government today.)

The direction of county government, here and elsewhere, is being influenced by two major factors. One grows out of the traditional role of the county as a subdivision of the State. The other grows out of the different kinds of problems that counties of different sizes are facing.

Counties were originally created by the State to carry out certain activities which the legislative body believed could be handled best under local administration. From the earliest times, counties provided law enforcement through the sheriff's office; the recording of deeds and other documents through the register of deeds office; and judicial administration through the clerk of court office and through the inferior and superior courts. Counties also conducted elections for county and State offices, built roads, cared for the poor and the sick, and provided public schools.

Since counties were created for the State's purposes, it was natural for the legislative body to enact detailed statutes with respect to the administration of their activities. For example, the register of deeds was told how to register instruments; he was told how to appoint and compensate the assistants in his office, and the legislature itself made provision for his compensation.

This kind of statutory procedure can be contrasted with the way the legislature has dealt with cities and towns. They were created to provide services required by a compact community, such as water and sewer, fire protection, and sanitation. The initiative for creation usually came from the citizens of the community. The legislature granted broad powers and duties to the governing boards of these municipalities, including complete power to determine their organizational structure. This made it far simpler to centralize the administration of cities and towns.

MORE SERVICES

Faced later with demands by the people for services, the legislature granted power to counties to decide whether other activities should be carried on, and if carried on, the extent to which performed. Thus the legislature has authorized counties to establish public health programs, to establish and maintain hospitals and, more recently, to provide mental health services, libraries, agricultural extension programs, trade and vocational courses, industrial education centers, and community colleges. The legislature has authorized counties to protect property through firefighting programs, building codes, and zoning, and to build and operate airports, to establish recreation programs, to maintain civil defense programs, and to conduct other activities.

Thus counties today serve a twofold purpose. They are subdivisions of the State and they are units of local self-government.

Because of the county's role as a subdivision of the State the direction of county government is a matter of State policy. It is true that county officials often have their own suggestions with respect to activities they administer, but because of the State-county partnership they share the initiative with others.

External influences, which grow out of the traditional role of the county as a subdivision of the State, thus have a substantial bearing on the direction of county government.

URBAN COUNTY PROBLEMS

The large urban counties have a growing mobile population and an expanding urban area. These combine to create problems.

First of all, the urban counties are faced with the problem of taking over and providing on a countywide basis some of the services traditionally performed by cities. For a number of years there has been a movement toward countywide operation of library service, for example. Since World War II, county activity in hospital construction and maintenance has far outdistanced municipal interest. An interest in airports has recently become evident, and if county experience in North Carolina follows county experience elsewhere, there will soon be an increased interest in parks and recreation. None of these activities is a respecter of municipal boundaries, and counties will become more and more involved in all of them.

A second problem lies in the demands of people in unincorporated areas for services traditionally provided by cities. Many counties have recently received demands for water and sewer service in unincorporated areas, and some have come from areas into which the nearby city cannot justify expanding its service. The near future may bring demands on counties for pure water on a wholesale basis for both unincorporated areas and smaller municipalities, and the same may be true of demands for the disposal of sewage. There are already the faint stirrings of interest in housing and renewal to clear up slums in unincorporated areas.

A third problem is developing as communities spill across county lines and make regional cooperation imperative. This is making itself apparent in the physical planning area. The organization of the Piedmont Crescent 2,000 Commission recognizes the fact that land development is no respecter of county lines. Regional cooperation in hospital planning has already developed in several areas and will develop in others. We may see in the future a recognition that decentralization of industry has advantages in the overall development of an area, whereas at present each county desires maximum industrialization for itself.

A fourth problem of the large urban county lies in the necessity for developing rural-urban cooperation and communication. Urban growth patterns affect rural areas quite dramatically, not only through the effects of changing land uses on property values, but also through tax increases on rural as well as urban property to meet the cost of growth.

Finally, there is the problem of reorganization. Most large counties have already reorganized internally to meet the challenges ahead. They have county managers and county planning departments to provide centralized administration and long-range planning. Will there be a need for external reorganization, like city-county consolidation or "metro" government? In North Carolina, we do not have the overlapping and duplication of activities that have led to this kind of development elsewhere, and we may achieve the major advantages of consolidation merely through cooperation in planning between counties and municipalities.

RURAL COUNTY PROBLEMS

The small rural county has a different set of problems. More often than not, there is a decline in population, through small increases in town population will often partly offset the declining population of the rural areas. But size, more than population loss, presents the problem of providing adequate services with too few people to serve and too few taxpayers.

The schools may have too few students for a full curriculum geared to the needs and abilities of the students. The welfare department may have too few cases to justify the intensive services that some people require; child welfare service is a typical example. Many departments have too little work to justify the salaries demanded by highly trained people. And finally there is the limited tax base that must finance these services.

Some of these difficulties are being offset by multicounty operations, particularly in the health and library areas. Joint operations in other areas may follow. But the regional arrangement is easier in some cases than others, and problems arise where mountains or water add transportation difficulties. The problem of sufficient population must be solved, or the people in these smaller counties will suffer. Merger of counties is no answer, for merger itself can do little to overcome the problems presented by a scattered population.

A second problem faced by the small rural county is the need for industry and job opportunities. The competition, however, is terrific. There are some 14,000 communities in the United States engaged in the hunt for new industry, and industry continues to be attracted to the more populous areas where other business is succeeding.

A third problem may lie in reapportionment. Recent U.S. Supreme Court decisions announcing the "one man, one vote" rule, unless changed by constitutional amendment, will mean loss of representation to many of the smaller counties. Legislative representation, certainly, has been one of the biggest single factors militating against merger of counties, and loss of representation could change the picture. Whether reapportionment itself will affect the direction of county government cannot be foretold.

One important problem that faces all counties is the necessity for obtaining and retaining sufficient competent personnel. In small counties, the salary problem is coupled with the necessity for finding people who want to live in smaller communities.

An additional problem lies in money, for all counties will be faced with increased demands for services, and these demands will mean higher taxes. The one thing worse than higher taxes is the consequences of failure to meet the demands. If they are not met, people will turn to the State capitol and Washington for help. History tells us that there the call will be answered. Generally speaking, it has proved true that the demands for services are stronger than the demands for economy in government, and the greatest threat that faces county government in the years ahead is failing to provide what the people want and demand.

SIGNIFICANCE

If the problems are met, this itself will give a changing direction to county government. If the problems are not met, we can expect to see increased State and Federal activity, and this, too, will affect county government's direction.

One difficulty is that large counties are faced with different challenges from those of small counties. Large counties will need help from small counties in solving their problems, at least where legislation is needed. And small counties will need help from the large counties in financing expanding services to serve people who live in the rural areas and small towns.

As we look at the direction of county government, we can count ourselves fortunate that we do not face the problems of those States where one metropolitan area is dominant. Our more even spread of population in North Carolina is advantageous in that problems are more widely shared and understood.

But with the differences we do have, small counties and large counties can develop together. Working together, we can continue to build, and the direction of county government, like the direction of State and municipal government, will be in the tradition of good government.

A NEW CATHEDRAL FOR SITKA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement prepared by him concerning a new cathedral for Sitka.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BARTLETT

On January 2, fire, spread by 15-mile-an-hour winds, swept a section of the city of Sitka in southeast Alaska. Before the fierce flames were extinguished, 2 churches and 11 buildings housing 21 businesses and 8 apartments were razed.

According to figures I have received, the loss in real and personal property was close to $2 million. Perhaps a more important figure is the estimate of $3.5 million put on rebuilding the burned-out section of Sitka. Insurance will cover only $835,000 of the loss.

For Sitka, a small city, the loss is extensive. However, I am happy to report that residents led by Maj. John W. O'Connell, launched plans to rebuild their city almost immediately after the flames were put out. They will have the aid of the Small Business Administration, which already has declared the city eligible for disaster loans.

Robert E. Butler, SBA Alaska Director, and two aids, inspected the site of the fire the day after the tragedy. I know I speak for the people of Sitka when I say the speed with which the SBA investigated and acted was greatly appreciated.

But my principal purpose in speaking today is not to pay tribute to the courageous people of Sitka who are demonstrating the same spirit that so many Alaskans showed in rebuilding after the Good Friday earthquake of 1964.

Rather, my purpose is to call national attention to the loss of a building on which it is impossible to place a value—St. Michael's Cathedral.

Estimates have been made on the cost of reconstructing St. Michael's, but I know of no way to put a price on the historical value of the church. The cathedral is believed to be the oldest church in Alaska and was one of the few buildings remaining from the days of Russian rule.

The cathedral, called by the National Survey of Historical Sites and Buildings the finest example of Russian architecture in the United States, was dedicated in 1848. Construction began 4 years earlier.

From 1848 until 1862 and from 1905 until the present it was the cathedral for the Russian Orthodox Church in Alaska.

Some of the ornaments inside the cathedral date from an earlier church at Sitka. The icon of the Archangel St. Michael, patron saint of Sitka, was brought to the

colony in 1816 by Father Alexis Sokoloff, the first priest assigned to the town founded 17 years earlier.

Father Ivan Veniaminov, the great Russian missionary, came to Sitka, capital of Russian-America, in 1834. He returned to Russia 4 years later to appeal for an expansion of church activities in Alaska.

Father Veniaminov came back as Bishop Innocent of Alaska and launched a program which included schools and theological seminaries. It was under his leadership that the cathedral was built. Sitka became the home of the bishop.

For a time after the Alaska purchase the church continued to receive support from Russia, but since 1918 local congregations have been the sole support of orthodox clergy and churches in this country. In 1933 the ruling bishop of the Russian Orthodox Church of North America declared the church on this continent to be temporarily autonomous from the Communist-controlled organization in the Soviet Union.

As cathedrals go, St. Michael's was not imposing in size. Built in the shape of a cross, the church was 97 feet long and 66 feet wide. Despite its modest dimensions, the building had a graceful grandeur and beauty seen against its backdrop of beautiful mountains.

A four-story bell tower, constructed of massive, hand-cut logs, supported an octagonal belfry which held eight bells ranging in weight from 75 to 1,500 pounds. A carrot-shaped steeple topped by a gilt cross rose above the belfry.

A dome, like the steeple, showing the influence of oriental architecture, covered the center of the church.

The interior of the cathedral was as ornate as the wood exterior was plain. Walls were covered with painted cloth, but of most interest were the many sacred objects, paintings, and icons on display.

I won't attempt to note all that the church contained. A brief description of the iconostas, the partition in an Eastern Orthodox Church which separates the main part of the church from the sanctuary, will suffice to give an idea of the richness of the church's interior. The partition was adorned with 12 icons, splendid examples of repoussé art. In this art form, figures are painted on canvas. Then a craftsman, working with a thin sheet of silver, beats out the form of clothing worn by the figure, reproducing folds and ornaments in the original painting. The 12 icons on the St. Michael's iconostas required 50 pounds of silver.

Perhaps the cathedral's most famous icon is the Sitka Madonna, known throughout the world. The painter of the icon was Vladimir Lukich Borovikovsky, a great portrait painter who died in 1826. Employees of the Russian-American company gave the icon to the church.

Fortunately, through the efforts of firemen, priests, and residents, all of the precious items of the cathedral, with the exception of a single painting, were saved. Unfortunately, the church books, dating back to the early 1800's, were destroyed.

There are many reasons why St. Michael's should be rebuilt, but the most compelling reason is to give these beautiful ornaments, sacred objects, paintings and icons saved from the flames a proper setting. While a reconstructed church will not be of equal historical importance as the original, it seems only right that the ornaments be displayed in a church which recreates as closely as possible their original setting.

It will be possible to rebuild a replica of St. Michael's because detailed plans of the cathedral are on file in the Library of Congress.

The plans are on file because of a project of the National Park Service known as Mission '66. In 1956, Congress approved appropriations so that the Park Service could embark on a 10-year program to upgrade national parks which had been neglected during and immediately following World War II. Part of that effort was directed toward resuming the Historic American Building Survey, which had been suspended during World War II.

The six measured drawings of the cathedral were done as part of the survey. I think the tragedy at Sitka demonstrates the value of that survey. Because of that survey, it will be possible to reconstruct the cathedral.

I am happy to report that a drive to raise funds for construction of a replica already has been started by interested Alaskans. Contributions are being sent to the St. Michael's Cathedral Fund established by the Sitka Historical Sites Restoration Committee, a nonprofit, tax-exempt organization under the chairmanship of James T. Thomason.

The drive has attracted statewide support. For example, a formal campaign has been launched in Anchorage. The committee is headed by Merrill Mael, and includes among others Mayor Elmer Rasmuson, William Hopkins, an aid of the Governor, and Robert D. Arnold, my special assistant in Alaska.

It was reported that the Alaska State Chamber of Commerce has pledged $10,000 to the fund.

A radio station in Cleveland, acting on its own, reportedly made an appeal for funds.

A nationwide effort is being planned, and I am pleased to serve as the honorary chairman of this portion of the drive.

Estimates on reconstructing the church range from $500,000 to $800,000. I hope that money will be raised and that Sitka will once again be the site of historic St. Michael's Cathedral.

In closing I would like to quote from a study made for the National Park Service. Better than I could, the quotation sums the historical importance of the cathedral:

"In our opinion, St. Michael's Cathedral is of sufficient national historical and cultural significance to qualify as a national historic site.

"First, as the cathedral and spiritual center for the Russian Orthodox Church in Alaska for many years, both during the Russian and American periods of Alaskan history, it is the structure best suited to commemorate the influence of the Eastern Orthodox Church in the development of Alaska.

"Second, as the oldest known surviving religious structure in Alaska and as a splendid and typical example of Orthodox church architecture in Alaska, it is eminently qualified to illustrate for future generations one of the cultures which has contributed to the formation of our American civilization and our national scene.

"Third, as one of the very few structures of any type still remaining from the period of Russian occupation, it symbolizes and commemorates the meeting of Eastern and Western cultures on the western edge of America.

"Fourth, because of its association with Father Veniaminov it commemorates one of the great, though little known, men of the American missionary frontier.

"This site is a natural point at which to present these broad aspects of American history. No other national historic site commemorates these particular phases of our country's history. Nearby Sitka National Monument presents another, though related, phase of Alaska's story—the culture of the natives and their resistance to white settlement."

THE MANSFIELD REPORT ON VIETNAM

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, our distinguished majority leader, Senator MANSFIELD, of Montana, and his colleagues, Senators AIKEN, MUSKIE, INOUYE, and BOGGS, deserve the highest commendation for their forthright report on the grim realities of the situation confronting us in Vietnam.

If there is to be a meaningful debate in Congress on the war in southeast Asia, it must be based upon a realistic assessment of where we are, whence we came, and where we are headed. Too much mischief has already been done by the instant victory advocates who keep assuring us that the Vietcong will collapse, if we will just push the war up still another notch.

The sobering effect which the Mansfield report should inspire cannot help but add new momentum to the quest for a rational settlement of the war in Vietnam.

Mr. R. H. Shackford, staff writer for the Scripps-Howard newspapers, has given a fine appraisal of the Mansfield report in an article published in the January 10 edition of the Washington Daily News. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

VIETNAM DEBATE WARMS UP—THE MANSFIELD REPORT HAS STIRRED HAWKS AND DOVES

(By R. H. Shackford)

Senate Democratic Leader MIKE MANSFIELD's grim but extraordinarily candid report about the mess in Vietnam has set the hawks and the doves at it again.

It has created the background for a debate, already under way, that is certain to grow in intensity as Congress reconvenes and President Johnson faces new decisions.

The hawks in private denounce Senator MANSFIELD for his candor, claiming that his report aids and abets the enemy and will mislead Hanoi about U.S. intentions.

The doves praise the report, especially for its candor. They argue that it is about time some one courageously painted the real, pessimistic picture as a contrast to the ones created daily by U.S. military and diplomatic spokesmen.

The hawks, who include those who for years have argued that just a little more pressure will bring the other side to its knees, claim the situation is more hopeful than Senator MANSFIELD sees it—provided a little more escalation is ordered.

The doves suggest that the outlook in Vietnam is even bleaker than Senator MANSFIELD's public report and that the Senator's private report to President Johnson was much more ominous about the future.

NOT THAT SIMPLE

The hawk-dove formula is a gross oversimplification of official Washington. And there are no known official doves who would cut and run.

But the hawk-dove formula today does describe roughly the views of those who, given today's facts, would proceed quite differently—those who would go all out for a military solution and those who would hold only what we have and play for time.

Within the next few days and weeks, after the President's state of the Union message and the end of the jet-borne diplomatic mission (both American and Soviet), the battle lines for the debate will be much clearer.

Response to the Mansfield report, however, already has shown the broad outlines.

GOP UNITY

Republican leaders, including Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, whom the President has done so much to flatter and woo, have put their prestige behind the hawks who want total military victory before negotiations.

Democratic leaders are divided. Some of the conservative congressional committee chairmen, such as House Armed Services Chairman MENDEL RIVERS, Democrat, of South Carolina, would light the fuse, even if it leads to Peiping, if Hanoi does not back down immediately.

But other influential Democrats oppose further escalation and would, in fact, seek ways to deescalate, even unilaterally.

The value of the Mansfield report is that it states without flinching several facts that Johnson administration officials have conceded privately for some weeks but have been unwilling to spell out for the public.

These include:

The vast U.S. escalation of the war in Vietnam has failed to produce the original objectives—to reduce Communist military activity and to bring Hanoi to the conference table for a negotiated compromise settlement. Senator MANSFIELD says the Communists have matched the increased U.S. commitment.

Senator MANSFIELD estimates that the acceleration of Vietcong efforts is so great that it is doubtful the Saigon government can even hold what it has, let alone extend it, without a further augmentation of Ameriman forces on the ground.

The situation is already perilously close to where it will no longer be possible to retain the myth that it is a Vietnamese war. The mere weight of American involvement makes it an American war. Weekend reports from Saigon confirm this trend—the huge U.S. troop operation against the Vietcong's "iron triangle" was undertaken without even telling the South Vietnamese high military command anything about it.

After nearly a year of high-intensity bombing, both in the north and south, and bloody ground-fighting, the control of the country—measured by both terrain and population—is no better than it was early in 1965 when, Senator MANSFIELD discloses, the Saigon regime was about to collapse and sent an S O S to the United States for American ground troops.

Vietcong recruiting in the south continues to be successful. And the North Vietnamese—undeterred by our bombings—have doubled their infiltration rate and are expected to triple it to 4,500 per month soon. A high desertion rate in the South Vietnamese army continues and, Senator MANSFIELD warns, there is no chance of the South Vietnamese substantially increasing their regular forces much above the current 300,000 figure.

All the American military talk about the pro and con effects of the monsoon on the military operations of both sides was a miscalculation and poor judgment. Senator MANSFIELD said the consequences of the monsoon were minor, if there were any at all.

Weekend news stories from Saigon quoting Air Force pilots achieving "excellent results" from large raids on the Ho Chi Minh trail in Laos will be taken with a grain of salt by readers of Senator MANSFIELD's report. He says the trail is "not easily susceptible to aerial interdiction" because most of it is protected "by double canopies of jungle foliage."

Senator MANSFIELD's basic conclusion is the center of the debate—that there is "only a very slim prospect of a just settlement by negotiations" with the "alternative prospect of a continuance of the conflict in the direction of a general war on the Asian mainland," meaning war with Communist China.

Privately, many administration officials have agreed with that appraisal, if our military policy continues unchanged. In fact, some think it is inevitable in the long run, and a few would argue the sooner the better.

Senator MANSFIELD warns that Asians, frequently portrayed by administration officials as wholeheartedly behind us, are most fearful of a United States-Chinese war, but recognize their "relative powerlessness" to influence the big events.

THE SIGN AT TASHKENT

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, Mr. Walter Lippmann, ever the journalist of substance and insight, has given us another profound statement on the meaning of the recent events at Tashkent. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Lippmann's column, which was published in the Washington Post of January 13, 1966, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE SIGN AT TASHKENT

(By Walter Lippmann)

Death came to Shastri at a high moment in his life, and the grief which is worldwide is therefore lighted with the poetic grandeur of the circumstances. He did his best day's work and died in the evening when he had completed it. The world is the better for what was done in Tashkent. For mankind has needed badly to be shown that it is still possible to get on top of the intractable violence of human affairs.

None will suppose that peace has now been established. No doubt the way ahead will be full of trouble. Nevertheless, we have seen at Tashkent at least a part of the pattern of what might be the shape of things to come. The conflict between Pakistan and India could become a catastrophe for hundreds of millions of people. What we have been shown in Mr. Kosygin's mediation has been that the primary responsibility for making peace lies with those who are most directly concerned. The powers most directly concerned are those who are nearest to the conflict—Pakistan, India and the Soviet Union.

Mr. Kosygin was able to do what neither Mr. Wilson nor Mr. Johnson could have done. That is not because he is cleverer than they, but, in the last analysis, because he is nearer. Great Britain, in spite of the ties of the Commonwealth, has been helpless; the United States, in spite of its wealth and power, has been ineffective. The critical advantage of the Soviet Union has not been due to race, color, or culture, but to geography. The Soviet Union can talk with authority about peace in Asia because it is a power with an Asian frontier of thousands of miles.

I have come increasingly to think that the cardinal defect of our own foreign policy in this century of the wars and disappointments and frustrations has been the pursuit of idealism separated from the geography of the world. The American globalist school of thought has dominated American strategic and diplomatic policy since 1917.

In that time we have fought and won two world wars and have always been too high-minded to make peace after either of them. The globalists have always been too high-minded to make the compromises and concessions which are the essential ingredients of any peace settlement. Now we are engaged in a war which has no visible limits, and the reason given to us by our globalist leaders comes down to saying that we have appointed ourselves the guardians of the peace of the world.

Before the globalist illusion came upon us, we thought it was our business to define our vital interests and defend them. As against the gross self-delusion of globalism, there is the traditional realism which holds that a sound foreign policy is based on a careful and constant study of the geography of the world. This leads to the realization that American power cannot be equally effective all over the globe. A full understanding of this simple, self-evident, profound truth is the beginning of wisdom in foreign affairs.

Globalism is the thinking of those who have not learned the facts of life. They include the zealots of the world revolution who expect all mankind to imitate and follow them. They include also the idealists who have overreacted from their old isolationism and expect to enforce everywhere their own views of the moral law.

They cannot do that, and when they try to do it, the reality of things asserts itself and the reckoning cannot be long postponed.

POLITICAL LUXURIES

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Political Luxuries," published in the Wall Street Journal of today, January 14, 1966.

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

POLITICAL LUXURIES

"I have not come here tonight to ask for pleasant luxuries or for idle pleasures."—Lyndon B. Johnson in the state of the Union message.

In the sense that, but for Vietnam, the administration presumably would be asking for much more domestic spending, the President's claim of modest budgeting is correct. All the same, the programs he has sketched seem amply supplied with luxuries and pleasures for a time of grievous war.

Mr. Johnson argues that his civilian recommendations represent a sort of minimum that must be done for schoolchildren, the sick, and the poor. Any sacrifices required by war, he insists, must not come from cutting back on aid to those most in need.

It follows, then, that anyone who questions this huge spending on the homefront is a monster of hardheartedness. The unfortunate fact nonetheless is that the projects the Government has embarked on and now wants to expand are not necessarily in the interests of those they are supposed to help. In some cases, like the notorious business of urban renewal dispossessing the poor, they are injurious.

Consider the so-called war on poverty, which the President asks Congress not only to continue but to speed up. At present it is a costly and wasteful chaos which benefits politicians but scarcely the poor. Instead of a speedup it needs a pause for an examination of its faults and to see why it is being run so badly.

For another example of good governmental management, look at Mr. Johnson's remarkable plea for a new Department of Transportation—because, as he puts it, the existing structure of no less than 35 agencies, spending $5 billion a year, is practically incapable of serving the Nation's needs. No institution except Government could get away with failure on that grand scale.

What would benefit the people, including the poor (and the poor taxpayer) is Federal austerity to reduce the danger of a serious inflationary outbreak. Here, too, in implying that the forthcoming budget will be noninflationary, the Government appears on weak ground; the President himself suggests so when he warns we must all increase our vigilance against inflation.

The budget forecast is for fiscal 1967 spending of nearly $113 billion, a staggering drain on the economy. But with the hope that revenues will reach $111 billion the anticipated deficit is "only" $1.8 billion as compared with much higher earlier estimates.

The revenue expectation may well be unduly optimistic and will prove wildly optimistic if the economy should slow down just a bit or fail to expand between now and

the end of the period 18 months hence. Accept the revenue figure at face value and it still depends on rescinding the excise tax cuts put in effect only at the beginning of this year and on various gimmicks such as accelerating corporate tax payments.

Even if they were not excessively expensive and inflationary, the administration's plans rest on an intellectual confusion that Federal outlays are good for your soul as well as your body.

"A great nation is one which breeds a great people," says Mr. Johnson. "A great people flower not from wealth and power but from a society which spurs them to the fullness of their genius * * *. This year we must continue to improve the quality of American life."

In practice, though, that noble dream turns out to have very little to do with quality; it is, and in the nature of government must be, almost wholly quantitative and materialistic. Doling out dollars does not automatically make education better, and certainly it does not spur people to the fullness of their genius. The hand of Government pressing down everywhere is more likely to demean the quality of life, including the precious quality of individual liberty.

We agree with the President that this Nation is strong enough to fight in Vietnam and do what is necessary at home. It is difficult to agree that all the proposed domestic spending is necessary, wise or effective. And there can be no guarantee of continued strength if the Government persists in indulging in the political pleasures of handouts and the exorbitant luxury of inflation.

RENEWAL OF THE GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, today marking the 83 years since the establishment of the Civil Service Commission, the Honorable John W. Gardner, Secre- of Health, Education, and Welfare, delivered an address on "The Renewal of the Government Service."

This excellent address commemorated the 83 years of the merit system service in the U.S. Government. It preceded the awards for distinguished service of Civil Service Commission employees.

Secretary Gardner emphasized that the duty of the career service was not only to search out the gifted young people of our schools and colleges for recruitment into Government service, but to continue their growth and education and qualifications after formal education ceases.

All organizations of our society today are competing desperately to get their share of the flow of talent—

Secretary Gardner said—

but few are developing that talent properly after they get it.

I commend this excellent speech to the attention of the Congress, and ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

RENEWAL OF THE GOVERNMENT SERVICE

(By John W. Gardner, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare)

We are here to commemorate an important beginning and to honor a fine tradition. The civil service is one of our noblest social institutions and I am proud to have a part in this tribute to it.

But I have learned from long experience that it is not really necessary to congratulate institutions. They have built-in mechanisms for self-congratulation that are marvelously effective. Having participated intimately in the life of Government agencies, the military services, business firms, and universities, I feel that I can make that generalization on the basis of fairly comprehensive experience.

So I am going to honor the civil service by talking about the goals ahead rather than the laurels already won.

First, let me clear away some general questions. Is the Federal Government bureaucratic? It is indeed. But so are business firms, colleges and universities, the military services, State and local governments, and philanthropic organizations.

Is the Federal Government in danger of going to seed? It is in the gravest danger. But so are all other organizations large and small.

I think most of you know my views on the decay and renewal of organizations.

Briefly, I believe that most human organizations that fail in their missions or fall short of their goals do so not because of stupidity, not because of faulty doctrines, but because of the internal decay and rigidification to which they are all subject. They get stiff in the joints. They get in a rut. They go to seed.

I know that many of you are familiar with my diagnosis of what brings that condition about. So I am going to limit myself today to a few brief comments on what I regard as the most important single line of therapy for moribund organizations.

Organizations go to seed when the people in them go to seed. And they awaken when the people awaken. The renewal of organizations and societies starts with people. And since the first and last business of the civil service is people, this seems an appropriate occasion to examine the problem.

Specifically, I want to talk about what the Federal Government does to develop talent—after recruitment. Recruitment itself is worthy of discussion, and there is a vastly better job to be done on that front, but that is not the problem that interests me at the moment.

As a society, we are pursuing energetically, almost feverishly, the identification and nurture of gifted young people in our schools and colleges. In contrast, we are quite haphazard about the provisions for their continuing growth after formal education ceases. Almost all organizations in our society today are competing desperately to get their share of the flow of talent. But few are developing that talent properly after they get it.

The still untapped source of human vitality, the real unmined reservoir of talent is in those people already recruited and thereafter neglected.

The quickest and most effective road to renewal of the Federal service is the mining of that untapped resource. It is not only a means of tapping unused talent and opening up new stores of vitality, it is a solution to the old, old problem of developing a government service that is responsive—responsibly responsive—to changing top leadership. Vital people, using their gifts to the full, are naturally responsive. People who have stopped growing, defeated people, people who no longer have confidence in the use of their own powers, build bastions of procedure between themselves and any vital leadership.

Now, how does one go about renewing the people in the Government service—or anywhere else for that matter? There are many sources of renewal, of course. One is the uninvited crisis. Wars and depressions bring a certain amount of renewal, though the price is far higher than sensible people are willing to pay.

Another source is challenge and competition, and in this respect our Constitution has built-in provisions for the renewal of elected officials. But appointive officials, not facing the challenge of an election, are denied that stimulus.

Another source of renewal is rapid growth. Very rapid expansion of an agency is apt to have a highly stimulating effect upon the people within it.

Still another source of renewal is the sheer vitality of top leadership. I think, for example, that President Johnson has been as vigorous, if not cyclonic, a force for renewal as we have seen in this Government.

But what about the more mundane things that good government administrators can do to renew their organizations? What about the good personnel practices and procedures that will insure renewal? I'm going to give you an oversimplified answer, but an oversimplification based on having observed the personnel field with a professional eye for 30 years.

I am going to assert that the best means of inducing growth, developing talent, and insuring continued vitality in the individual is change. The change may take many forms—a change of troubles, a change of assignment, promotion, living in different parts of the country, moving in and out of Government, sampling the different worlds that make up this society, serving abroad, serving in an organization that is itself rapidly changing.

It follows, I believe, that the single condition that would contribute most to greater vitality in the Government service today is flexibility of reassignment. In his state of the Union message, President Johnson pledged bold leadership to bring this about.

The size of the Federal Establishment and the diversity of activities it encompasses offer unexampled opportunities for imaginative reassignment. With such an array of possibilities it is unforgivable that any reasonably competent Government servant should suffer in a job that does not suit his talents.

It is unforgivable that any Government servant should lack the stimulus to personal growth that comes with change. The individual should be allowed to move and the agency should be allowed to move him without damage to his status or his feelings.

Free, frequent, and fluid movement among all the agencies of Government should be the accepted rule. The ambitious or merely restless young person who wants to sample several different lines of work should not be punished or penalized. Restlessness and vitality go together. And especially promising young people should be systematically reassigned through several agencies to insure their growth.

Beyond that there should be a great increase in the planned movement of individuals between the Federal Government and the other worlds that make up American life—the world of business, the military, the universities, the labor unions, agriculture, State and local government. I have moved in several of these worlds, and I am continually shocked at their mutual ignorance of one another. That ignorance breeds both complacency and paranoia. Each of these worlds imagines that it is uniquely close to the moral center of American life, and believes that the other worlds aren't really quite to be trusted with the American future.

Of all these worlds, the Government service has the least excuse for being provincial. It should have the capacity to understand all of the other segments of society. Without that understanding it will not be able to serve them effectively.

I would also favor an oversea assignment early in the career of those young Government people who seek to rise to the top. We have gotten past the day when only those individuals who have an explicit international interest should think of going overseas. The work of Government at home and

abroad needs the breadth of perspective acquired by experience overseas. Such experience is valuable any time during one's career, but the earlier it comes the better.

All the processes of refreshment I've mentioned are particularly needed in the case of professional, scientific, technical, and scholarly people. Government needs such people more and more. But it will neither get them nor keep them if it doesn't provide the opportunities for further growth that they value so highly.

There is no excuse for Government to lose out in the competition for talent. It has a built-in advantage over every other employer. The cynics would deny this but the truth is that talented people are attracted to Government because it gives them an opportunity to render service to the entire Nation. They come with the highest motives. They leave when their purpose is thwarted or when they begin to feel trapped. Government cannot afford to be inhospitable to these people.

The administration of the affairs of this Nation is complex and dynamic. They are going to become increasingly so. The Congress has just enacted a staggering amount of legislation which must now be translated into action. It would be hard to overstate either the magnitude of the tasks ahead or their importance to the Nation.

President Johnson made this abundantly clear in his state of the Union message on Wednesday.

Now, let me ask these questions:

Is the Federal service capable of meeting this challenge? Of course, but to do so it must take some significant steps to renew its spirit and its people.

Is renewal compatible with the Federal merit system? It most certainly is. The merit system, now in its 83d year, represents a great advance in the personnel practices of government. We are not about to return to a spoils system.

But tenure was not designed to trap people, to make them inert. It was designed to free them from the capriciousness of politics. They need both the protection of a career system and opportunities for growth.

We can preserve all the great traditions of the system and still maintain the vitality that is so essential in this rapidly changing and infinitely challenging moment of history.

Recognizing that the very size and nature of the system make it particularly susceptible to stagnation, we can make special efforts to build in arrangements for renewal. Through some of the devices I have mentioned we can turn the concept of tenure into a positive asset rather than a deterrent to the full use of our talent.

The momentum generated by the President and the flood of legislation enacted by the Congress have given us unparalleled opportunities to create new patterns of work and to bring new strength and vitality to the career service.

I am optimistic that we will do so, and that optimism is based in no small measure on the fact that one of the boldest innovators in government today, John Macy, is also Chairman of this Commission.

John Macy introduced this session with some kind remarks about me and I want to end it with a tribute to him. I think he is a superb example of the best that the Federal service can produce, and I am proud to have shared this platform with him.

THE WAR ON WANT

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, while Congress was out of session, an outstanding sermon was preached at the YWCA service in Washington Cathedral by the Reverend Dr. Elfan Rees, who is secretary of the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs, for the World Council of Churches, Geneva, Switzerland.

In discussing "The War on Want," a world problem, on November 14, Dr. Rees urged public understanding, public compassion and public support for the most liberal kind of governmental and intergovernmental action to prevent widening of the gap between the hungry and the overfed in the world.

He recalled the Chinese proverb:

If you give a man a fish, you feed him for a day, but if you teach him how to fish, you feed him for a lifetime.

While we are teaching the hungry to fish, "how to plow deeper furrows, plant better seed and grow better harvests," he added, there is need to feed the hungry, just as parents feed their children while they are being educated.

I ask unanimous consent that this very pertinent sermon be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

You know my text very well. It is the sentence from the Lord's Prayer: "Give us this day our daily bread." I know you all say the Lord's Prayer, but I don't suppose any one of you here has ever thought of saying it in the first person singular. My Father which art in Heaven, as though you were the only child of God. Forgive me my trespasses as though you couldn't care less about the sins of mankind. Lead me not into temptation, as though the pitfalls of life to other people were immaterial. Now, this is not a bright idea of mine. As long ago as 1400 the great Moravian reformer, Jan Huss, preached a sermon in which he accused his congregation of doing exactly that. And I was so fascinated by the idea, as one is by a snake, I tried it myself just for the hell of it. And it sounded like a prayer out of hell. And the more I said it the more I began to feel that I was separating myself from my family, from my community, and from mankind. And the words that stuck most in my gullet was when I said "give me this day my daily bread," as though it was immaterial what was on the table for my family—as though it mattered not that my neighbor next door was short of food—as though it mattered not that millions unknown to me were half starved. And then I remembered that one of the temptations of our Lord was that He should turn stones into bread. And He refused it because at that time it was only His personal hunger that mattered. But when later in His ministry He was told that thousands were hungry, you remember what He told His disciples? "Don't send them away. You give them something to eat." You know, as one who is too old and of the wrong sex to belong to the YW, one of the things that I'm sorry about your generation is that you have forgotten one of the great things of my generation. The four freedoms that were enunciated by Franklin Roosevelt and Winston Churchill. Do you even remember them? Freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from fear, and freedom from want. Even in those dark days of 1940 the specter of hunger was stalking the world. Today it is a much more material thing than a specter. The facts of life that happen around us today is that two-thirds of the world go to bed hungry every night. The privileged one-third, those of us who live in North America and Western Europe and Australia, we have 17 percent more food than we need. And the rest of the world has 24 percent less than is required to keep it reasonably healthy. Let me put this in a more vulgar fraction. In the United States of America in a day the average person eats 4½ pounds of food and very often looks like it. In Asia they eat 1¼ pounds of food a day, and 85 percent of that is rice. And in the big cities of India at this moment the rice ration has been cut by 50 percent. One-third of the world has to diet, two-thirds starve.

And the grim factor in this situation is that the hungry are multiplying the population far faster than the wise are increasing food production. During the course of this service the population of the world will increase by 5,000. By this time tomorrow it will have increased by 120,000. We anticipate 48 million more births than deaths in the next 12 months. You know, even in North America you have a sort of population explosion. Your population has increased 30 percent in the last 20 years. But during the same time your food production has increased by 50 percent. Why should you worry? You can use that unpleasant English phrase, "I'm alright, Jack." In Asia the population increase is also 30 percent, but the food production has increased only by 25 percent. Twenty years of technocracy, of technical assistance, of charity, of science, and the food consumption of the hungry is down by 8 percent. You would think, wouldn't you, that this staggering problem of population explosion and the lag in food production would be one and indivisible. But that is not so in fact. While scientists and the United Nations are bending their energies to increase food production, far too many obstacles are being placed in the way of internationally planned family control. Let's be frank; too many of those obstacles are placed there by the Christian church or parts of it. And not until we who call ourselves Christians have greater unanimity and greater wisdom on this problem can we play our proper role in this tragic situation. Meanwhile, we can turn ourselves to what we can do for the hungry with what we have.

Five years ago the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations started a freedom-from-hunger campaign. Like anything else in the United Nations it had to begin with a resolution. Sometimes that's where things end as well. And I want to read you the preamble of this resolution. "Considering," it says, "that a large part of the world's population still doesn't have enough to eat and an even larger part doesn't get the right kind of food * * *." Now this isn't a resolution by a church synod; this is a resolution adopted by hard-bitten diplomats and specialists. The campaign has two aims. First, to create a worldwide awareness of hunger and malnutrition which apart from the human suffering and degradation that is involved pose a serious threat to peace. And second, to create a tribunal of opinion in which solutions can be organized. Much has been done. There are national freedom-from-hunger committees in so many countries. Much has been done by individual countries, none more than by the United States.

I don't know if you know of your Public Law 480, but millions of hungry people do. If I may give you just one example, the food provided under that law at this moment is feeding one-fifth of the total population of Bechuanaland, where they have had no rain for 3 years. Some of us are worried that the Public Law expires next year. Worried because far too many of you don't know it. And we hope and pray and believe that the U.S. people and Government will continue to look at world hunger compassionately and creatively. What was planned as a 5-year campaign has become a permanent campaign. It's a long-term job, but it is a long-term job charged with urgency. The gap between the hungry and the overfed has widened in those 5 years, not narrowed. It's urgent because

the hungry can't afford to wait. And it is urgent because the world can't afford to wait.

Lord Boyd-Orr once said "hunger is the worst politician." And how right he is. If I wanted to preach communism it wouldn't be to you, it would be to the hungry. You can't digest Karl Marx on a full stomach. If I wanted to cause trouble in the world it would not be to you I would turn, but to the hungry. Hunger is the worst politician. There are two other things that most disturb me as a Christian. The one is that the mass of the hungry are, by and large, the so-called colored people. And the mass of the well-fed are, by and large, the white. And race relations, God knows, are bad enough without their being exacerbated by hunger. What's even more disturbing is that, by and large, the well-fed call themselves Christians. And, by and large, the hungry don't. And I find nothing in Holy Writ that links obesity with sanctity.

It has been said that every war is either a crime or a crusade. I'm talking to you about a crusade. The war on want. It is a world problem. It is a governmental and intergovernmental problem. We can't do it by private societies, collecting subscriptions. The effort of every one of the rich nations must be harnessed if we are to achieve victory. Only governments can do that and only they in concert. Aren't you relieved to hear that? So what? I'm not a government. But this, I say, neither precludes nor excuses the churches. God's purpose as revealed in Jesus Christ is to redeem the whole of human life. And if the church is to carry conviction that His Gospel is the only Gospel it must do so by showing that redemption is for the whole of human life and is offered by One who came not only that man might have life but have it more abundantly. And I am proud that there is so great a Christian response to this tragic need. In Germany, in Austria, in Switzerland, there are bread for my brother campaigns. Here in America, Church World Service and National Catholic Relief have been sending millions of tons of food to the hungry. And with your continuing compassionate help could send more. Again I say, it's clear that only massive international action can begin to solve the problem. But this depends for success on public understanding, public compassion, and public support. And if we can get understanding in the churches and in the Y's, we'll get compassion. I know it. And where there is compassion there will be a wave of public support for the most liberal kind of governmental and intergovernmental action. If this campaign has a philosophy it might be the old Chinese proverb "If you give a man a fish you feed him for a day, but if you teach him how to fish you feed him for a lifetime." And the main theme of this campaign is to teach the hungry how to fish if you like, how to plow deeper furrows, plant better seed and grow better harvests. It's education. But I need not remind you that while you are being educated your parents have to feed you. And every kind of emergency aid, the work of UNICEF, the work of the church agencies, the work of anybody who sends food to the hungry, helps to feed them while they're learning how to fish. And I am glad that not only member churches of the World Council of Churches, but the great Roman Catholic Church also, are committed to this campaign. Pope John the XXIII said of it, rightly and holily, "Beloved children, must we repeat and exalt the principle of human solidarity and remember and preach loudly the duty of those communities and individuals who live in plenty to reach out to those who live in want." I treasure all those phrases, but one I love most of all was when he says, "Preach loudly." I remember when I was an undergraduate I used to buy the gramophone records of some music-hall type who called himself Jack Smith, the Whispering Baritone. I have an uneasy feeling that our pulpits are filled with the Reverend John Smith, the whispering preacher. Preach and preach loudly so that we may be heard outside. Now one of the great privileges I have had in America is meeting many of my brother clergy who tell me that the pace of life in your country is so fast that apparently you all have tranquilizers for breakfast, and that their ministry consists almost entirely of comforting the disturbed. And I thank God it isn't mine. If I were to define my ministry just now, it's disturbing the comfortable, and nobody looks more comfortable than you do. Nicolas Berdaiev once said that "bread for oneself is a material preoccupation; that bread for others is a spiritual preoccupation." Give us this day our daily bread, not every other day as happens in some countries. And so I remind you again of our Lord's command. You give them something to eat. You remember the disciples replied, "We only have five loaves and two small fishes." You daren't give that answer. It wouldn't be true. But you do have an answer. It's the theme of your week. You give them something to eat. Yes, Lord.

SENATOR HARRIS HONORED

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to a signal honor which has been awarded to one of our colleagues, Senator FRED R. HARRIS, the junior Senator from my home State of Oklahoma. He has been named by the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce as one of the Nation's 10 outstanding young men in 1965, and has gone to St. Paul, Minn., for an awards congress scheduled Friday and Saturday.

I believe my colleagues on both sides of the aisle join me in congratulating the honored Senator from Oklahoma. Despite his youth—he is 35—he has made an excellent record since he won election in 1964 to serve out the last 2 years of the late Senator Robert S. Kerr's term. He not only has been a faithful Member, with an excellent attendance record, he has presided hour after hour with the patience we ask of new Members. He also has made an extensive study of Senate rules and procedure in carrying out what could have been a routine chore.

Those of you who have served on the Public Works or Government Operations Committees with him have learned what a hard and effective worker he is. The senior Senator from Arkansas, chairman of the latter group, has appointed him to the chairmanship of a new Special Subcommittee on Government Research. Under his vigorous leadership, I am sure we are going to learn a great deal about our national research effort with answers to such questions as where it is done, by whom, whether or not there is duplication, and whether or not its results are readily available.

FRED HARRIS's excellent first year record in the Senate undoubtedly had to do with his selection by the Jaycees. They probably also considered important the fact that a man, barely old enough to serve and making his first statewide race, won a runoff primary as well as a general election against impressive contenders.

Elevation to high office at a minimum age has happened before to the junior Senator from Oklahoma. He was elected to the State senate at the age of 25, a year and a half after his graduation from the University of Oklahoma Law School. He also has practiced law in Lawton, Okla., not far from his hometown of Walters, Okla.

I congratulate both Senator HARRIS and the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce for a wise selection.

U.S. POLICY AND ACTIONS IN VIETNAM

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, there are very few Members of Congress who have as clear an understanding of the history and the conflicting forces involved in the Vietnam war as has our colleague the distinguished junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. I am glad to say "junior." It happens that, according to the calendar, he is one of the older Senators, but in accord with his activity and with his thinking, he is one of the youngest and most vigorous.

He was one of the very first of our statesmen to speak out repeatedly in opposition to the policy being pursued in Vietnam by the United States. Whether or not citizens agreed with his point of view, he has demonstrated outstanding leadership in helping to initiate a public debate on Vietnam, and our present policies in southeast Asia.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to continue for 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, on December 9, 1965, Senator GRUENING in a speech entitled "U.S. Policy and Actions in Vietnam," delivered at Harvard and Boston Universities, made a masterful and scholarly argument opposing our Nation's present policy in Vietnam. I commend this to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

U.S. POLICY AND ACTIONS IN VIETNAM

(Remarks of Senator ERNEST GRUENING delivered at Harvard and Boston Universities December 9, 1965)

I have been asked to address you on the subject of the U.S. policies and actions in Vietnam. As you know, for reasons which I will discuss in detail, I am not in agreement with those policies and actions.

Recently those who have publicly criticized those policies have come under increasing attack. This is a surprising development. I would assume that in this land of freedom, the right to speak out openly on behalf of peace would be taken for granted. I would consider it not only a right but a duty—an imperative duty.

As the St. Louis Post Dispatch—one of the Nation's finest newspapers—stated editorially on December 2:

"One of the striking things about the criticism of Vietnam policy is its persistent refusal to be silenced. We hope that continues to be the case. Every citizen shares the moral responsibility for his country's conduct. If he believes his country's conduct to be wrong, but fails to speak out, he is betraying his own obligations as a citizen. Just as public criticism of a no-negotiation policy brought about a policy of pro-negotiation, so

criticism of mistaken objectives in Asia can bring about adoption of the right objectives. It is vital that discussion of the Nation's Asian objectives be free and vigorous."

Since the Bill of Rights, the first of the 10 amendments to the Constitution, prohibits the Congress, and by implication all other legislative and executive authorities in the Nation and State, from abridging freedom of speech, the burden of proof should rest heavily on any who would deny or seek to impair such freedom. I know of no right more precious or more inherent in our Nation's philosophy and its often reiterated professions.

But our Nation is now at war—an undeclared war, to be sure—and many of our fellow citizens hold the view that it is our duty as patriotic Americans to support the administration, which has assumed the responsibility for our course of action in southeast Asia, and is conducting the war. When our men are dying in combat deep passions are naturally aroused, the martial spirit becomes rampant, and dissent and protest become increasingly perilous.

Yet it is just at such a time that speaking out is more than ever essential.

Earlier this week I received a letter from a professor in a large western State university, asking me to come there and address the student body and faculty on Vietnam and related matters. I quote from his letter:

"We have had a small protest demonstration * * * and this has produced a most violent reaction which has assumed chilling proportions, creating a climate extremely unfavorable to rational discussion of these problems."

There in a brief sentence you have what is going on all over the country, and it emphasizes the need for presentation on both sides of the case for and aaginst the U.S. policies in southeast Asia, and our armed intervention there.

So, whatever the consequences, I agree with the Post-Dispatch editorial that he who dissents from his country's policy but fails to speak out, is indeed betraying his obligations as a citizen.

Clearly it is not easy to oppose the publicly expressed and reiterated declaration of policy and related action by the President of the United States, policies largely supported by the press—with some honorable and courageous exceptions—and in behalf of which the powerful machinery of Government is militantly mobilized.

Yet those who disagee with our national policy in this area can support President Johnson's statement in his April 27 news conference, which is pertinent to recall.

Asked: "Mr. President, do you think any of the participants in the national discussion on Vietnam could appropriately be likened to the appeasers of 25 or 30 years ago?"

He replied: "I don't believe in characterizing people with labels. I think you do a great disservice when you engage in name calling. We want honest, forthright discussion in this country, and that will be discussion with differences of views, and we welcome what our friends have to say, whether they agree with us or not. I would not want to label people who agree with me or disagree with me."

It is not a secret that I have been one of those who have disagreed. I began voicing my disagreement in a full-length speech on the floor of the Senate on March 10, 1964, just 21 months ago. It was entitled: "The United States Should Get Out of Vietnam." That was before our country had committed a single soldier to combat, or dropped a bomb. It would have been far easier to negotiate an honorable settlement at that time and to obviate much of the slaughter and all else that has happened since and the grim prospect that now lies before us.

Among the imperative reasons for full public discussion and disclosure is because, in my view, the justification for the course which has now so deeply and tragically involved our country in Vietnam and in southeast Asia, with apparently only a prospect for further and deeper involvement, is that the basis—the alleged basis—as I have studied it differs very materially from the actual historic record. And it is not possible realistically to appraise what should have been our course of action and what it should be now and in the future without a presentation of that other side of how we got into this mess.

During World War II the French colony of Indochina was overrun by the Japanese. Fighting to liberate this area were Vietnamese and the Allied Forces at war with Japan. The native aspirations—part of the worldwide revolt against foreign domination, against colonialism—were for independence. But the French wanted to regain their colonial possessions. Because of the fear that Communist China would take over this area, the Eisenhower administration was urged to assist the French in reconquering their former colony. Certain voices in the United States urged all-out military assistance. Others advised against it. President Eisenhower declined to send our troops into combat to aid the French although we did give the French substantial financial assistance and some cooperation in military training through a military mission established in Saigon. But lacking this all-out support, the French were defeated by the local forces, the Vietminh, suffering staggering losses and surrender at Dienbienphu.

In consequence, there was a meeting at Geneva of representatives of 14 nations, where accords were drawn up which provided that 3 new nations should be born out of the former French colony—namely Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam. The accords provided that Vietnam was to be temporarily—but only temporarily—divided into North and South Vietnam for reasons of demobilization, but that within 2 years an election would be held to choose the officials who would govern the reunited Vietnamese.

The United States was in South Vietnam with its military mission at Saigon, and with the political demise of the French, was in charge. It was the United States that brought Ngo Dien Diem back from monastic life in the United States, was installed by us as President of the Cabinet and in a subsequent plebiscite backed him against the playboy Emperor Bao Dai.

Now we come to what I consider the pertinent part of the history of U.S. involvement.

The United States did not sign the Geneva Accords but it expressed support of them in a unilateral statement.

This statement by Under Secretary of State Walter Bedell Smith, dated July 21, 1954, was declared by him to be a unilateral declaration of U.S. position in these matters, and it stated:

"The Government of the United States being resolved to devote its efforts to the strengthening of peace in accordance with the principles and purposes of the United Nations takes note of the agreements concluded at Geneva on July 20 and 21, 1954."

The statement declared its support of paragraphs 1–12 inclusive of the Geneva agreements and that "it will refrain from the threat or the use of force to disturb them in accordance with article 2(4) of the Charter of the United Nations dealing with the obligation of members to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force," and second it "would view any renewal of the aggression in violation with grave concern and as seriously threatening international peace and security.

"In connection with the statement in the declaration concerning free elections in Vietnam my Government wishes to make clear its position which it has expressed in a declaration made in Washington on June 29, 1954, as follows: 'In the case of nations now divided against their will, we shall continue to seek to achieve unity through free elections supervised by the United Nations to insure that they are conducted fairly.'

"With respect to the statement made by the representative of the State of Vietnam, the United States reiterates its traditional position that peoples are entitled to determine their own future and that it will not join in an arrangement which would hinder this. Nothing in its declaration just made is intended to or does indicate any departure from this traditional position.

"We share the hope that the agreements will permit Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam to play their part, in full independence and sovereignty, in the peaceful community of nations, and will enable the peoples of that area to determine their own future."

You will note that in this declaration by the United States, we speak only of Vietnam, not of South Vietnam or North Vietnam, but Vietnam, and we reiterate our traditional position that its people are entitled to determine their own future.

On the same day, July 21, 1954, President Eisenhower issued a statement confirming Under Secretary Bedell Smith's declarations.

Now the official justification for our subsequent and present military involvement there and our steadily increasing involvement in South Vietnam was stated as follows:

In the state of the Union message in January 1965, President Johnson said: "We are there, first, because a friendly nation has asked us for help against Communist aggression. Ten years ago we pledged our help. Three Presidents have supported that pledge. We will not break it.

He elaborated on this statement in his Johns Hopkins speech on April 7, 1965, saying:

"Why are we in South Vietnam?

"We are there because we have a promise to keep. Since 1954 every American President has offered support to the people of South Vietnam. We have helped to build, and we have helped to defend. Thus, over many years, we have made a national pledge to help South Vietnam defend its independence.

"I intend to keep that promise. To dishonor that pledge * * * would be an unforgivable wrong."

Now let us go back and see what that first pledge was—the pledge by the first of the three Presidents President Johnson refers to, namely President Eisenhower.

It was contained in a letter to President Diem as President of the Council of Ministers of Vietnam on October 23, 1954. I will read it.

"DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have been following with great interest the course of developments in Vietnam, particularly since the conclusion of the conference at Geneva. The implications of the agreement concerning Vietnam have caused grave concern regarding the future of a country temporarily divided by an artificial military grouping weakened by a long and exhausting war and faced with enemies without and by their subversive collaborators within.

"Your recent requests for aid to assist in the formidable project of the movement of several hundred thousand loyal Vietnamese citizens away from areas which are passing under a de facto rule and political ideology which they abhor, are being fulfilled. I am glad that the United States is able to assist in this humanitarian effort."

You will note that what I shall read now, which follows those first two paragraphs of President Eisenhower's letter to Diem, says nothing about a further request by President Diem for assistance. The only request of record was limited to assistance in moving several hundred thousand Vietnamese from the north to the south. There is nothing to

indicate that Diem was asking and that President Eisenhower was responding to a request "for help against Communist aggression."

I now resume the quoting of Eisenhower's letter:

"We have been exploring ways and means to permit our aid to Vietnam to be more effective and to make a greater contribution to the welfare and stability of the Government of Vietnam. I am, accordingly, instructing the American Ambassador to Vietnam to examine with you, in your capacity as Chief of Government, how an intelligent program of American aid given directly to your Government can serve to assist Vietnam in its present hour of trial, provided that your Government is prepared to give assurances as to the standards of performance it would be able to maintain in the event such aid were supplied."

Consider now this language. "We", namely, the Government of the United States, "have been exploring ways and means" of aiding Vietnam. But that aid is to be given only "provided that your Government is prepared to give assurances as to standards of performance it would be able to maintain in the event such aid were supplied."

Now to continue President Eisenhower's letter:

"The purpose of this offer is to assist the Government of Vietnam in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state, capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means. The Government of the United States expects that this aid will be met by performance on the part of the Government of Vietnam in undertaking needed reforms."

I continue to quote from President Eisenhower's letter:

"It (namely the Government of the United States) hopes that such aid, combined with your own continuing efforts, will contribute effectively toward an independent Vietnam endowed with a strong government. Such a government would, I hope, be so responsive to the nationalist aspirations of its people, so enlightened in purpose and effective in performance, that it will be respected both at home and abroad and discourage any who might wish to impose a foreign ideology on your free people."

So here we have a third precondition for U.S. aid. The Viet Government was to be a government respected both at home and abroad. We know how responsive it was to the aspirations of its people, how enlightened its purpose, how much respected at home—since a civil war broke out against it. And it was not respected abroad, as evidenced by the fact that Ambassador Lodge supported the removal of Diem and the Nhus. Of course, those conditions prescribed by President Eisenhower were not fulfilled by the Diem regime. But in any event nothing was said about sending in our troops. There was no promise or pledge of military aid.

This is further confirmed by a White House statement of November 3, 1954, which states that President Eisenhower had instructed Gen. J. Lawton Collins as his special representative "to explore" with President Diem and his government how "to help them with their critical problems and to supplement measures adopted by the Vietnamese themselves." Again, no mention of any request by Diem for that aid. Had there been, it is hardly likely that such a request would not have been mentioned. That is why I believe that we asked ourselves in. The most that was implied was economic aid which was given, and President Eisenhower himself declared a few months ago that he had only offered economic aid. During the remaining 6 years of the Eisenhower administration, we had a military mission which did not exceed some 600 officers and men; not one of these were engaging in combat, no American lives were risked or lost during that period. So much for the first of the three Presidents.

Now we come to the second President, John F. Kennedy, who was persuaded by his Secretary of Defense, Robert McNamara, to escalate our commitment to the extent of sending military advisers whose number rose before the end of his Presidency to some 15,000. But as late as September 2, 1963, less than 3 months before his death, in an interview with CBS newscaster, Walter Cronkite, President Kennedy said: "I don't think that unless a greater effort is made by the Government to win popular support that the war can be won out there."

So, President Kennedy had reached the conclusion that Diem had not fulfilled Eisenhower's conditions although he had had 9 years to do so from 1954 to 1963. And then President Kennedy goes on to say: "In the final analysis, it is their war. They are the ones who have to win it or lose it. We can give them equipment, we can send our men out there as advisers, but they have to win it—the people of Vietnam—against the Communists. We are prepared to continue to assist them, but I don't think that the war can be won unless the people support the effort, and, in my opinion, in the last 2 months the Government has gotten out of touch with the people."

I believe this record shows that we did not make a solemn pledge to support that Government. And in any event that Government ceased to exist after its failure was manifest. One of the reasons why civil war broke out against Diem in addition to his own oppressive tactics of jailing hundreds of people without trial, some of them being tortured in prison, was the repudiation of the provision to hold general elections in July 1956. This was the most basic item in the Geneva Accord and you will recall our unilateral commitment to it by Walter Bedell Smith, Under Secretary of State, when he stated:

"In the case of nations now divided against their will, we shall continue to seek to achieve unity through free elections."

Yet, the United States, which dominated the situation of South Vietnam, approved and ratified that Government's refusal to hold the elections. We and they refused to hold them for the reason, frankly stated, that it was felt that Ho Chi Minh would be elected President. But what principles are we espousing when we agree to go to an election and then call it off because we feel we are going to lose it? That is the unquestionable record on this issue. How do we square that with our national conscience and a tradition that would be inviolate under our standards?

Now, some deny that this is a civil war and one of the partial myths on which we base our actions is that the whole trouble stems from aggression from Hanoi. Well, no one could have been better informed on this issue than John F. Kennedy who was in the Senate since 1953 and who, in his news conference of July 18, 1963, referred to "the civil war which has gone on for 10 years."

Chapter 3, article 16, of the agreement on the cessation of hostilities provides: "With effect from the date of entry into force of the present agreement, the introduction into Vietnam of any troop reinforcements and additional military personnel is prohibited."

And further: "With effect from the date of entry into force of the present agreement, the introduction into Vietnam of any reinforcements in the form of all types of arms, munitions and other war materiel, such as combat aircraft, naval craft, pieces of ordnance, jet engines and jet weapons and armoured vehicles, is prohibited."

The Geneva agreement provided for an International Commission to supervise the carrying out of the Geneva Accord and to see that its provisions were carried out in Vietnam. The Commission consisted of three representatives, one from Canada, one from India, and one from Poland. They made various reports which indicated increasing violations of the agreements by both parties. When one reads them objectively one gains the impression that the violations by the South Vietnamese under U.S. tutelage were far more serious and far more extensive. A special report by the Commission in paragraph 12 states:

"Since December 1961 the Commission's teams in South Vietnam have been persistently denied the right to control and inspect, which are part of their mandatory tasks. Thus, these teams, though they were able to observe the steady and continuous arrival of war materiel, including aircraft carriers with helicopters onboard, were unable, in view of the denial of controls, to determine precisely the quantum and nature of war materiel unloaded and introduced into South Vietnam."

And it continues in paragraph 17:

"As the Commission has been denied mandatory controls, as pointed out earlier in paragraph 12 above, it has not been able to make a precise assessment of the number of military personnel and the quantum of war materiel brought in. However, from December 3, 1961, up to May 5, 1962, the Commission's teams have controlled the entry of 72 military personnel, and observed but not controlled 173 military personnel, 62 helicopters, 6 reconnaissance aircraft, 5 jet aircraft, 57 fighters/fighter bombers, 25 transport aircraft, 26 unspecified types of aircraft, 102 jeeps, 8 tractors, 8 105-mm. howitzers, 3 armoured carriers (tracked), 29 armoured fighting vehicle trailers, 404 other trailers, and radar equipment and crates, 5 warships, 9 LST's (including 4 visiting LST's), 3 LCT's, 5 visiting aircraft carriers and spares of various kinds."

In the case of North Vietnam, the Commission (the Polish delegate dissenting, which is not surprising since he represented a country behind the Iron Curtain) concluded that "in specific instances there was evidence to show that armed and unarmed personnel, arms and other supplies had been sent from the North to the South with the purpose of supporting, organizing and carrying out hostile activities including armed attacks, directed against the armed forces and administration of the zone in the south. These activities are in violation of articles 10, 19, 24, and 27 of the agreement of cessation of hostilities in Vietnam."

Obviously, both sides, North and South, were violating the Geneva agreement. It would appear that those of the South were far larger and they had the support and approval of the United States. The violations on both sides were charged by the Canadian and Indian representatives who may well be credited with impartiality. The Polish delegate, whose report may not be accepted as unbiased, refused to join in the indictment of the charges against North Vietnam but joined with his colleagues against those of the South.

We now come to further U.S. violations. The United States is a signatory to the United Nations Charter. In fact, the United States was largely instrumental in creating the United Nations.

Article 2, of chapter 1, paragraph 4, provides:

"1. All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations."

Article 33 of chapter 6, provides:

"1. The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, shall first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice."

Now you notice that this article does not say that they may do this but that they shall do it, and lists eight alternative methods which should be used "first of all." Now we may well ask, did we, the United States, when there were violations of the Geneva agreements, seek a solution by negotiations? We did not. Did we seek a solution by inquiry? We did not. Did we seek a solution by mediation? We did not. Did we seek a solution by conciliation? We did not. Did we seek a solution by arbitration? We did not. Did we seek a solution by judicial settlement? We did not. Did we seek a solution by resorting to regional agencies or arrangements? We did not. Or did we seek a solution by "other peaceful means of our (their) own choice?" We did not.

One of the "regional agencies or arrangements" whose aid we might have invoked for a peaceful solution was the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization which was created at the instance and by the leadership of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and whose signatories were the United States, Australia, France, New Zealand, Pakistan, The Philippines, Thailand and the United Kingdom. It reaffirms in article I the agreement to settle international disputes by peaceful means and, to quote it exactly:

"The parties undertake, as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, to settle any international disputes in which they may be involved by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered, and to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations."

Thus having used force the United States was also violating the SEATO treaty. I have spoken of the violation of article 2, paragraph 4, chapter 1 (which was specifically mentioned by Under Secretary Walter Bedell Smith's declaration of U.S. policy which we would adhere to), and the violation of article 33, chapter 6, of the United Nations Charter that provides for the settlement of disputes by peaceful means. Another violation was that of article 37 which provides that if parties to a dispute of the matter referred to in article 33, fail to settle it by the means indicated in that article they shall refer it to the Security Council. Again not "may" but "shall." The United States has not done that.

So when those in authority in Washington speak of "a national pledge" as a justification for our course of action in Vietnam, I find it difficult not to contrast that dubious conditional, qualified, tentative offer of help to a vanished South Vietnamese Chief of State—who did not fulfill the conditions—with our violation of the unqualified treaty commitments, of which there could be no more solemn category—the United Nations Charter, the Southeast Asia Treaty, and the violations of the unilateral statement by Under Secretary Walter Bedell Smith, reiterated on the same day by President Eisenhower, that we would support Vietnam supervised elections in 1956.

To review briefly what has happened in the Congress: In August of 1964 it was reported that two, or possibly three, PT boats had attacked our 7th Fleet in the Tonkin Gulf. But if, as reported (although it is questionable whether the full facts have been revealed to the American people), this was an act of aggression—although perhaps as unimportant as an attack by a 14-year-old boy with a beanshooter against Cassius Clay—the President was wholly within his rights to order a retaliatory attack by airplanes from the fleet on the base from which these PT boats emerged. However, the next day a resolution drafted in the White House was submitted to the Congress not merely approving everything that had been done before in southeast Asia, but giving the President unlimited power in his own discretion to use the Armed Forces of the United States anywhere in southeast Asia. It passed the House unanimously and in the Senate there were two opposing votes—those of Senator WAYNE MORSE and mine. I could not justify giving the President this unlimited, unrestricted power out of which our steadily escalating military commitment stems. For one thing the Constitution of the United States is specific that only Congress can declare war. We are now at war, and in my judgment, and that of WAYNE MORSE, who is a constitutional lawyer, we are thereby in violation of the Constitution.

In February last we started bombing North Vietnam. The justification for this drastic change of policy was that there had been an attack on one of our outposts at Pleiku. Pleiku is about 200 miles south of the 17th parallel, the boundary between North and South Vietnam. At night a group of Vietcong passed through the lines of the South Vietnamese troops who were either too inert or uninterested to alert our men in the barracks. The Vietcong opened fire with a mortar of American make, which they had apparently secured from the South Vietnamese forces, and killed 8 American soldiers. There was no direct relation between this incident and North Vietnamese infiltration, but it was made the justification for the bombing which has now continued for 10 months with no appreciable result. It appears rather to have hardened the determination of the North Vietnamese to continue what they have been doing and rather to increase their aid to the South Vietnamese National Army of Liberation.

Last May the President sent to the Congress an appropriation request of $700 million to conduct this undeclared war in Vietnam. President Johnson frankly stated that this request was being made not because moneys were needed to supply our Armed Forces in Vietnam, for he could transfer money needed from other sources, but rather as a vehicle to secure additional congressional approval of his carrying on the undeclared war in Vietnam and anywhere else in southeast Asia that he saw fit. This the President made clear at the outset of his message, when he stated: "This is not a routine appropriation. For each Member of Congress who supports this request is also voting to persist in our effort to halt Communist aggression in South Vietnam. Each is saying that the Congress and the President stand united before the world in joint determination that the independence of South Vietnam shall be preserved and Communist attack will not succeed."

Since this money was not needed and was to be used merely as a symbol of support for our policy, I found myself unable to vote for it, as likewise did WAYNE MORSE, and we were joined by another Senator, GAYLORD NELSON, of Wisconsin. In the House, seven Members voted against it.

Going from these factual presentations to the realm of personal opinion, it is my deep-seated belief that we made a very serious mistake in getting involved militarily because first, in my view, nothing that happens in South Vietnam jeopardizes the security of the United States. And even if it did so there is a question of whether that would justify our invading Vietnam and bombing it any more than we can justify the seizure by Stalin of the formerly independent countries surrounding Russia—Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary—on the grounds that their control was essential to the security of Soviet Russia. Nor do I subscribe to the domino theory which is that had we not gone in, these nations of southeast Asia would have fallen into the hands of the Communist Chinese. And then we are told in sequent flights of fancy that after southeast Asia the Philippines, Australia, New Zealand would fall and we would have to be fighting the Communists on the beaches of California. That to me is errant nonsense. Certainly our control of the Pacific by sea and air renders that absurd. Moreover I am not a pacifist and I do not like and am utterly opposed to the advance of totalitarianism anywhere. If a situation should arise whereby a free government such as that of Australia or New Zealand were threatened by attack and invasion by the forces of imperial communism and there was a request from those governments for our aid, I would be for giving that aid without stint or limit. The situation in South Vietnam is quite different. I am confident, and this is further in the realm of opinion, that had we stayed out entirely we would have three independent countries formed out of French Indochina, that they would have installed their own social and political ideology, which they would have had every right to do, and that a united Vietnam would have adopted communism as its social and economic system. But it would have been a Communist regime independent of Peiping and there is evidence that many non-Communists are enlisted in the civil war against the South Vietnam Government. The history of Vietnam shows conclusively their people's dislike and fear of the Chinese, and their war is largely motivated by a desire to get rid of all foreign rule. They want independence, and that should be a cause that ought to appeal to Americans. They did not want the French in. They did not want the Chinese, and I doubt whether a majority want us in. In Europe, to achieve a corresponding situation, namely in Yugoslavia, a Communist state independent of Moscow, the United States invested $2 billion in aid for Tito, and our policy makers considered that, and now consider it, a sound and profitable investment.

I need not detain you longer to point out what has happened and what is happening. I consider our bombing of North Vietnam totally without justification morally, legally, or otherwise. It is the sort of thing we condemned scathingly when done by totalitarian powers in past years; and as we have seen now after 10 months of such bombing, it has merely stiffened the resistance of those whom we are fighting. We are getting in deeper and deeper; not only are our casualty lists growing, but the toll of not merely those fighting but of civilian noncombatants mounts daily. It is my reasoned view that in our effort to stop the advance of imperialist communism, we are actually aiding it. So far, at least, the situation must be to the liking of the Communist rulers of China, for to date they have not committed a single soldier to this war. And yet there we are—a great Western Power, the greatest in the world—engaging in a desperate, bitter, and horrible struggle on the continent of Asia with a small Asiatic nation, sacrificing the lives of our youth and spending billions of dollars.

The situation is different even from that of Korea. First, there was overt aggression from the North there. Second, we were there under a United Nations mandate. Third, the South Koreans wanted to fight. These factors are not present, at least not in the same degree, in Vietnam. There was no overt initial aggression from the North at the start. There has been infiltration, subsequent infiltration, but paralleling the U.S. support of South Vietnam, and at least not appreciably until our and Diem's refusal to hold elections. The United States went in unilaterally and until very recently, and only in response to great pressure from us, we had little support from our SEATO allies—none from Pakistan, none (to speak of) from Britain, none from France, and when administration spokesmen cite the total number of nations that are allegedly with us—in a kind of numbers game—we find that they have come in late and largely

with only token assistance. In the November 29 issue of Newsweek there was a little item in its Periscope column entitled "Spain Lends a Hand" which reads: "Spain is the latest country to lend a hand in Vietnam. After much prodding from L.B.J., the Franco government hopes to ship in four ambulances with medical crews. Actually the ambulances will have little significance (the helicopters do their work now) but the medics are wanted and the Spanish contingent will be welcomed as evidence of support for the United States and Saigon."

When I was in South America last January I found that every American Ambassador had received orders to go to the President of the country to which he was accredited to request support for our efforts in Vietnam. Many of them were reluctant to do this and in many cases their pleas were unheeded, while in others there was the same kind of token compliance which we now see we have coming from Spain. These countries are all recipients of lavish American aid and the United States is, in effect, paying for these tokens and is in a position to apply pressure.

I could only wish there could be a ready and quick answer to and a way out of the tragic dilemma that the President, his advisers, and the people of the United States find themselves in. We are now so deeply committed that a way out is extremely difficult to find. There have been numerous suggestions made and we should explore them all actively. Our so-called unconditional discussions are not unconditional as long as we do not firmly pledge willingness to negotiate also with the people who are doing the fighting, the National Liberation Front, or Vietcong; guarantee the carrying out of the general agreements to which we once pledged support, namely supervised elections in all Vietnam, but whose violation we approved, and make every effort for a cease fire and simultaneous phasing out of the combatants of both sides. Unless we make such modifications in our attempts at negotiation and stop the bombing of North Vietnam—because no people will yield under those circumstances—this senseless war will go on and get steadily more disastrous.

What the United States should do—in sum—is to return to the rule of law. We should have invoked the United Nations at the very beginning when we felt that treaty commitments were violated and we have not used the United Nations as we should have.

In this connection, the disclosures by Adlai Stevenson to Eric Sevareid, which appeared in the November 30 issue of Look magazine, that both McNamara and Rusk turned a deaf ear to the efforts of U Thant to secure negotiations which were then possible, are very disturbing.

Because I strongly value adherence to law, I cannot approve the action of a few of our draftees in burning up their draft cards. They are in violation of the law and must take the consequences, however one may sympathize with their feelings that we should never have been in Vietnam and that what we are doing there is morally wrong and self-defeating. But peaceful protests and freedom of speech should remain inviolate and we should continue to urge almost any sensible solution that would put an end to the killing. It would be much better than the dark prospect of more and more slaughter which lies ahead and which ultimately, in my judgment, will result in a solution which could have been achieved bloodlessly a few years ago. The sad fact is that we cannot win this war. When I say "win" I do not necessarily mean that in a strict military sense. If we continue to pour troops into southeast Asia, blast its villages from the air with bombs and napalm, kill more tens of thousands, we may in time impose a military domination, although even that is by no means certain. But even if we did, what then? Sooner or later the problems of Asia will be settled by Asians, as they should be. We should have learned that the white man cannot settle them for the Asians. We will be told that there are some Asians fighting on our side, as in the case of the Koreans, but they are beholden to us, and in general, it appears to me that we have very little spontaneous enthusiastic support from almost any source.

I cannot conceive that it is desirable or wise for us to throw our young men into every cockpit in the world where Communist totalitarianism rears its ugly head. And why should we assume the role of self-appointed "citizen fixit," of world policemen, all over the globe? If the cause is sufficiently good and urgent, an approach should always be made under the United Nations on a basis of international legality and with the support, from the very beginning, of others who believe that freedom is truly at stake and that those for whom we fight also know and value freedom and are prepared to do their share. This is far from the reality in Vietnam.

There are still other impending grave casualties of our military plunge into the quagmire of southeast Asia. To date over 1,500 fine young Americans have been killed in action. Several hundred more have died in noncombat fatalities. Ten thousand have been wounded, many crippled for life, and that ghastly toll is just beginning. Meanwhile, the great achievements on the domestic front of President Johnson and the 89th Congress in its 1st session—and they were great—will be largely nullified. They will be nullified just as their implementation was to begin. The inspiring vision of the "Great Society" will be blurred if not blacked out. There will not be the means both for the construction of that society at home and the destruction of war abroad. Most tragic of all, apart from the human sacrifices and the blighting of countless homes, is the fading of the national image of our beloved country, of which, despite some of its failings, we have had every right to be proud, to cherish, and to wish to maintain.

I can only express the fervent hope that we can, somehow, soon, call a halt before that image and that vision of this great land become a memory. Let us all do our utmost to bring that about.

PROXMIRE POSTMASTER BILL SUPPORTED BY ARTHUR D. LITTLE, EFFICIENCY EXPERT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, last year I introduced legislation which would place postmasters' appointments under the civil service system. At that time I pointed out that the present system of political patronage injured post office employee morale. Postal employees are forbidden by Federal law to participate in the very political activities that are essential under the patronage system if they are to get a postmastership. I also indicated that patronage matters of this kind tie up valuable staff personnel. They create dissension in State and local parties. For every party worker who is a successful postmaster appointee, there are 5 or 10 who are disappointed and resentful.

The distinguished management consultant firm of Arthur D. Little has recently cited the present postmaster appointment system as an example of time wasted "on nonpolicy business by Congress that could be saved without significant political cost or effect." This conclusion was included within a management study of the Congress commissioned by NBC News in connection with its special report "Congress Needs Help."

The specific language of the Arthur D. Little report states:

> The time spent on postmaster and service academy appointments serves little useful purpose. Some 21,000 postmaster appointments and all appointments to the military academies clear through congressional offices. These appointments * * * are an avoidable distraction. In the judgment of many Congressmen, the political values of this time-honored custom are not commensurate with the amount of time it takes.

I agree with the report's comments. I hope that the Post Office and Civil Service Committee will schedule early hearings on my proposal, S. 252, in the coming year.

CHURCH CONCERN FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on November 12, 1965, the board of directors of the Council of Churches of Greater Washington passed two resolutions which I deeply hope the Senate heeds in carrying out its duties and responsibilities to the citizens of the District of Columbia and the Nation at large during the 2d session of the 89th Congress.

The first resolution expresses the council's support for appropriations to implement the rent supplement program authorized by Congress last year as part of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965. As a member of the Housing Subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, I am particularly aware of the long hours spent in committee and in conference on this legislation. All of my colleagues in the Senate remember the thorough floor debate conducted on the measure. Yet the rent supplement program will simply be a frustrating monument to legislative inefficiency if, after these many hours and days of work, we do not appropriate the money to initiate the program.

The second resolution expresses the hope that the site of the National Training School for Boys will be used for low- and middle-income housing. As many of my colleagues know, this site has been prominently mentioned for a proposed new Government Printing Office. In fact it was put forward by the Government Printing Office a matter of weeks after Bolling Field was ruled off limits for a new printing plant.

Mr. President, as a member of the Legislative Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee I had an opportunity to explore the GPO's justification for its new $49 million white elephant. Even were the proposed location for this building submarginal land, I would question the wisdom of approving such an undertaking. But when the land could and should be used to house the victims of slum dwellings in our Nation's Capital I believe it would be criminal to build a sprawling printing office there.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have these resolutions printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

RENT SUPPLEMENT

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has adopted rent supplements as part of the Nation's total attack on the housing problem; and

Whereas the Congress has not approved the necessary financial appropriations to fund the rent supplement program; and

Whereas leaders of private enterprise, social welfare, and labor support the rent supplement program: Now, be it therefore

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Council of Churches of Greater Washington urges upon the Congress that it approve the appropriations requested by the President of the United States for this program; and be it further

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Council of Churches of Greater Washington calls upon the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States of America, and its pertinent commissions and divisions, to lead the churches of the Nation in a program of action in support of the rent supplement program.

NATIONAL TRAINING SCHOOL SITE AND HOUSING

Whereas housing for low- and middle-income families is one of the greatest needs in the District of Columbia and Metropolitan Washington; and

Whereas approximately 110,000 persons in the District of Columbia live in overcrowded housing, and more than 5,000 families are on the waiting list of the National Capital Housing Authority for public housing; and

Whereas land for low- and middle-income housing is not readily available in the District of Columbia; and

Whereas the site of the National Training School for Boys is soon to be vacated; and

Whereas the National Capital Planning Commission is faced with the opportunity of making a crucial decision on the future use of the site of the National Training School for Boys; and

Whereas a compromise proposal has been advanced to secure a large section of the National Training School site for use by the U.S. Government Printing Office; and

Whereas the U.S. Government Printing Office can be continued, with expanded facilities, where it is now located, or can be located elsewhere than on the site of the National Training School for Boys: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Council of Churches of Greater Washington (a) reaffirm its previous recommendation to the National Capital Planning Commission that the site of the National Training School for Boys be used "for a planned residential community emphasizing housing for low- and middle-income families"; (b) develop a campaign of public education and action, in cooperation with other groups, on this matter; and (c) urge the churches of Metropolitan Washington to support this position.

VAST IMPROVEMENT IN ECONOMIC STATISTICS WELL WORTH PRICE TO TAXPAYERS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Dr. Otto Eckstein is recognized as one of the most brilliant economists in the country. A distinguished Harvard professor, Dr. Eckstein has just completed a tour of service on the President's Council of Economic Advisers as one of the three top economic advisers to President Johnson.

On October 28, 1965, Dr. Eckstein addressed the annual meeting of the Federal Statistics Users' Conference. In this address, Dr. Eckstein spells out the immense contribution, the remarkable improvement in economic statistics in recent years makes to our present economic policymaking.

At a time when Government economic policy is being honored and praised as never before—thanks to our remarkably prolonged prosperity—the part played by this vast improvement in statistics—the economic intelligence on which all policy is based—should not be forgotten.

Mr. President, in view of the necessity that the Congress and the country appreciate the importance of paying the price to improve these statistics, I ask unanimous consent to have Dr. Eckstein's remarks printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

INFORMATION BASE FOR PROSPERITY

(Remarks by Otto Eckstein, member, Council of Economic Advisers, at the annual meeting, Federal Statistics Users' Conference, Washington, D.C., October 28, 1965)

Fellow users of Federal statistics, people poke fun at statistics. You do need to keep your sense of humor about them. And that is a lot easier to do when the figures are going well. But I am going to try to be serious about our statistics tonight, to tell you why I think they are essential to our economic progress.

The Council of Economic Advisers is not one of the official members of the Federal Statistics Users' Conference. But let me assure you that we share your concerns. Without the steady flow of information that comes to us every day, our job of advising the President on economic policy would be quite impossible. Indeed, we take our information system so for granted that we tend to forget just how far we have come in such a short time and how completely we have become dependent on that system for private and public decisionmaking in this economy.

ADVANCES IN STATISTICS

Let's go back 65 years, to the turn of the century. What was in the Statistical Abstract back then, when it was published by the Statistics Bureau of the Treasury Department? In 1900, the Statistical Abstract included series on Federal Government receipts and expenditures; money supply and banking system balance sheet data; imports and exports by country and commodity; rail and water transportation; commercial failures; wire and postal communications; and production and prices of major agricultural, mineral, and industrial commodities. There were as yet no summary price indexes, although preliminary work on wholesale price indexes had been going on for a few years and the index commenced in 1902. We did have some good population censuses and census of manufacturing every 10 years and there were private figures on stocks, interest rates, and particular industries. And BLS was already doing some special surveys of wages and employment.

I would not have wished to prepare the annual CEA forecast of the economy back in 1900.

Now let's move up 25 years to 1925. We had made progress by then. The Department of Labor was publishing wholesale and cost-of-living price indexes, as well as monthly estimates of employment and data on wages and hours in selected industries. The Department of Commerce was publishing seasonally corrected monthly statistics on production, stocks, and unfilled orders in various "basic" industries, and the Census of Manufactures was taken every 2 years. Many of the familiar monthly publications had been started by then including the Survey of Current Business, the Monthly Labor Review, and the Federal Reserve Bulletin.

Now let's go to 1945. That certainly is part of the modern era, and there were quite a few significant additions to the Federal statistical program. Perhaps the two most important were the monthly Report of the Labor Force, begun in 1940 as the first direct measure of unemployment, and the national income and product statistics, started in the thirties. There were no direct measures of unemployment all through the great depression, and even today the estimates for that period are based on the necessary hazardous system of taking the difference between estimates of employment and total labor force.

But we were still far short of what we have now. Today we have an input-output matrix, quarterly deflated GNP and its components, and many other elaborate statistics. Anticipations surveys of business and consumer intentions have become regular and carefully watched series.

The quality of these statistics has also improved greatly. The samples of the surveys are bigger and better. Seasonal correction is applied to most figures and the unadjusted figure is becoming almost a rarity in use. Concepts have been sharpened. Improved data processing is making the results available much more rapidly.

ADVANCES IN ECONOMIC POLICY

We have also come a long way in the goals we have set for ourselves and in the use of economic policy. We are now in the 56th month of expansion.

Our rate of growth of real output since the shallow trough of the last recession has been 5.3 percent a year; the gap between potential production and actual production has narrowed from $50 billion to less than $20 billion; unemployment is down to 4.4 percent; disposable personal income is up by $116 billion and consumption by $104 billion; profits after taxes are up by $20 billion and investment for plant and equipment by $22 billion.

Some people speak of this expansion as if it were a miracle. Others as if it were an ever-expanding bubble that is heading for its inevitable bursting. But to the technical analyst there is no miracle and no bubble, but rather a readily explained period of progress in which our economy was permitted to show the growth of which it was really capable.

The major difference between this expansion and those before it lies in the realm of policy, both public and private. The Federal Government fully appreciated the enormous influence which it exercises through its budget which absorbs over a fifth of all the purchasing power in the economy and returns a roughly similar amount through spending. In this expression the Federal budget did not withdraw an undue share of the growth of incomes, but rather acted as a mild stimulant to compensate for a demographic situation which somewhat dampened the buoyancy of private demands.

It was the tax cut of 1964 which really marked the arrival of the new era in economic policy. With the economy not in recession, but making little progress in closing the gap between actual and potential production, with the budget expected to be in deficit, the Government deliberately reduced tax rates to stimulate private purchasing power. The results are now well known. In the year and a half since the tax cut GNP in current dollars has risen by $73 billion (equivalent in constant dollars to a

rate of 4.9 percent a year); disposable personal income is up by $57 billion; and consumption expenditures rose by $53 billion, maintaining the traditional relation between consumption and income; unemployment has fallen from 5.9 to 4.4 percent.

Since the tax cut, the growth of the economy has accelerated substantially. Equally important, the great gains of the last 2 years have accrued not only to those with the incomes to benefit directly from tax reduction, but to all segments of our society. The employment gains have come in a particularly favorable pattern from a social point of view.

In the last 24 months, employment of unskilled nonfarm workers rose by 7.6 percent, compared to a gain of 5.2 percent for the highly skilled (craftsmen and foremen). The incidence of poverty, defined as standard family income below $3,000, was reduced from 20 to 17½ percent from 1962 to 1964, and has clearly fallen again this year. Unemployment in the designated major depressed areas has fallen proportionately more than total unemployment, from 8 percent in July of 1963 to 5.2 percent this last July. And even the Federal budget itself has turned out to benefit from tax reduction. In the year after the tax reduction, in fiscal 1965, administrative budget revenues were higher by $3.5 billion than the year before, and the Federal deficit shrank from $8.2 to $3.5 billion.

THE INFORMATION BASE FOR THE EXPANSION

Economic policy in this expansion was predicated on an analysis and projection of the national income accounts. Other information was used as well, but the focal point, the organizing scheme, was the gross national product and its major components. Each year's projection of the gross national product accounts could be carried out by direct estimates of Government spending. Investment was projected by use of the several surveys of business investment intentions together with econometric approaches. Consumption could be estimated by the traditional consumption-income relationship, by separate analysis of auto sales, and by the analysis of the intentions surveys for consumer purchases. State and local government expenditures could be projected fairly accurately by extrapolating their growth at an annual rate of 8 to 9 percent which they followed since 1950. I think it is safe to say that we never did fully master the art of projecting inventory investment or net exports with any reasonable degree of precision. But with the solid evidence that we had, it was possible to chart the general progress of the economy a year ahead.

As each year went by, the quarterly figures for the gross national product accounts gave us good evidence on the economy's progress and permitted comparison of the projection with performance. To be sure, the initial gross national product figures sometimes are revised more drastically than we would wish. But all in all, these quarterly figures together with data on employment, industrial production, sales, orders, and inventories, hours and earnings, prices, money and credit, construction contracts, and other major indicators, have provided sufficient information to permit policy to be formulated in a reasonable, quantitative way. If our forecasts have not always been accurate, the fault has been as much ours as the data's.

THE OUTLOOK FOR THE ECONOMY

So much for the past. What about the future? How long can this expansion last? Everyone has a nagging suspicion that the inexorable workings of the business cycle will catch up with us sooner or later, that contraction must follow expansion. But that's not a really interesting proposition. The key question is when? Is the end of this expansion in sight? Or will you meet a year from now, still asking how long can it last?

I have no firm answer to that question, but I do know this. The hard statistical evidence that we have now at hand, and as you know there is a lot of it, suggests continued good progress. The early evidence on the outlook for fixed business investment next year is very good. Consumers appear to be as willing as ever to spend the traditional fraction of their rising incomes. And the Government budget can be expected to continue to be designed to sustain prosperity within the limits of our productive potential. The Council has not yet completed its first full-scale formal exercise of projection for 1966. We do not yet have the magic number for GNP for next year, and indeed we won't climb out on that limb until we have to do it in our annual report, which appears, by law, on January 20. But we do feel confident on present evidence that it is much the most reasonable expectation now that expansion will continue through all of 1966. And there is no reason now obvious why next year's expansion should not match this year's gain.

Nor does this expansion show any of the signs of tiredness which have characterized periods just prior to the peaks in previous expansions. The expansion of the last 5 years has not been accompanied by imbalances that might herald an early departure from sustained further expansion.

Our excellent price record of the past 5 years is not hard to understand. Output per manhour rose on the average by 3.2 percent a year in the period 1959–64, while compensation per manhour rose 3.5 percent a year. As a result, labor costs per unit of output were no higher in 1964 than in 1960; and the evidence suggests that average labor costs in 1965 will be no higher than in 1964. In the preceding 12 years, a period of substantially rising costs and prices, productivity rose by an average of 2.4 percent a year, and compensation per man-hour by 6 percent. We have not had cost pressure on prices this time.

On the demand side of the price equation, there is now little evidence of demand exceeding productive potential. Planned increases in Government spending for Vietnam buildup will add to demand in 1966, but sharply higher payroll taxes starting in January will work in the opposite direction. Overall fiscal policy will make full allowance for these factors.

INFORMATION BASE FOR BALANCED AND SUSTAINED EXPANSION IN PROSPERITY

With unemployment down to 4.4 percent and the operating rates of industry continuing to be close to 90 percent, the task and challenge of policy takes on some new perspectives. As long as the central problem of policy was to stimulate demand to close the gap between actual and potential production, global measures and projections were generally sufficient to chart our course. Some gap between production and capacity remains. Unemployment at 4.4 percent is not full employment. But the margins have narrowed. We are entering a new environment, and we must reshape our thinking accordingly.

We will need new information if we are to thread our way successfully. Let me indicate to you some of the challenges of this new environment and some of the new needs for information.

First, we must learn to live with balanced, high-level expansion. We must become accustomed to sustained periods in which our industry operates at 90 percent or even a bit higher. We must become accustomed to high rates of investment, investment which introduces new technology and advances workers' productivity, and which expands industry's capacity to produce. At this time, industrial capacity is rising at 5 to 6 percent a year and there is every reason to think that next year's capacity growth will be as great. We must strive to keep operating rates of industry at high but not excessive levels, to have demand for industrial products grow with capacity. It has been over 5 years since we last experienced an actual downturn in production. In the coming years our goal must not be just to avoid declines, but to assure, year after year, that actual production grows in line with productive potential.

Second, with the gains achieved by closing the gap more fully realized, we have to turn again to the classical question of achieving a high rate of growth of potential. Economic research has made great progress in identifying the sources of real growth. The new findings emphasize the role of education, training, and skill of the labor force as sources of productivity growth. Physical capital is essential, but it is not enough by itself. To accelerate or even to sustain our long-term rate of growth, this country must continue both to upgrade the quality of her labor force and to upgrade and expand the physical capital stock.

Third, at high employment, the dangers from sector imbalances become greater. We must be watchful not only that the overall level of demand remain within our productive potential, but also that bottlenecks are avoided, and that where they exist we do what we can to expand production.

Fourth, wage-price-cost balance must be preserved. Wage increases have to remain within the productivity trend if labor cost per unit of output is to remain stable. This is a necessary condition for stable prices. But in addition, price increases designed to widen profit margins or failure to share productivity gains with consumers through lower prices can upset stability both by directly raising the price level and by accelerating wage trends.

Fortunately, when it comes to stability there is nothing that succeeds like success. With a long period of balance behind us, our expectations have moved toward stability. Business is not investing today on the basis of inflationary expectations. The good productivity gain which has characterized this expansion and kept labor costs stable is itself the product of the stable growth, and should continue as long as the expansion itself retains its steadiness and continuity.

In this new phase of the expansion, we will no longer be able to rely as heavily on global measures alone. In the coming months and years, we will need to strengthen our knowledge substantially on many points. For example:

We need fuller, more comprehensive, and more detailed measures of productivity so that we will be able to estimate coming cost trends, as well as to search scientifically for the causes of productivity growth.

We need better estimates of the Nation's wealth. If we are to aim economic policy so that demand grows in line with potential supply, we need better estimates of the growth of that supply. And we will need to know how much capital is needed to augment capacity in different lines. The Joint Economic Committee, which has done so much to promote better statistics for this country through its Subcommittee on Economic Statistics, published an important report last year on this problem. We need to improve our price information. The United States has much the most comprehensive set of price measures of any country in the world. But our measures are not sufficiently sensitive, probably overstate price increases by inadequate allowance for quality improvement, and do not adequately reflect actual transaction prices or other aspects of total cost such as the period of delivery, freight absorption, etc. The report of the Stigler committee provides some important insights and suggestions.

We must continue to strengthen our unemployment statistics, and supplement them with figures on job vacancies. We need better information on compensation per manhour. With fringe benefits becoming an ever-larger share of total worker compensation, we should have regular, periodic information on fringes along with straight wages. Further, a larger part of the labor force consists of nonproduction workers, and is engaged in the tertiary industries. We need more thorough coverage for these types of workers and these sectors.

Finally, our statistical efforts must more fully serve this country's increased concern with its balance of payments.

We need to do a lot more work on indexes of export prices, both for ourselves and for our major competitors.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

The Federal Statistics Users' Conference has been a source of great strength to the Federal statistical program. I have outlined to you tonight some of the changing needs for our information base for continued prosperity. We shall look to you in the future as we have in the past for advice and guidance and for support in keeping our programs up to the needs of the times. We are blessed that the challenges before us are the challenges of prosperity and not of depression. Speaking for those of us in the Government, let me express our gratitude for the support you have given us in the past and for the continued support I know you will give us in the future.

Thank you.

WISCONSIN'S DICK CUDAHY SHOWS HOW INITIATIVE STILL PAYS OFF

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I think we all would agree that loyalty, hard work, and initiative should be recognized. That is what I want to do today in a brief comment on a young man who restored to fiscal soundness an old and famous family firm.

The man is Richard D. Cudahy, a grandson of the founder of Patrick Cudahy, Inc., of Milwaukee.

Richard Cudahy chose a career outside the family business after World War II when he entered Yale University Law School, graduated, and began the practice of law in Chicago.

But by 1961, his grandfather was deceased and his father, Michael Cudahy, was ill.

Without hesitation, Richard Cudahy picked up the reins of leadership. With the cooperation of the United Packinghouse Workers, he initiated modern, efficient, and productive meatpacking practices. The success of his policies became evident by the next year.

His continued success is truly a tribute to those virtues of enterprise, imagination, and thrift which we hear too little of today.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article of this high example from Meat Processing magazine.

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

RICHARD D. CUDAHY, YOUTHFUL LEADER OF PATRICK CUDAHY, INC., SWITCHES PROFESSIONS TO GUIDE 77-YEAR-OLD WISCONSIN PACKING FIRM

Five years ago Patrick Cudahy, Inc., was faced with a situation that has confronted many packers at one time or another. Rising labor costs, outdated production methods, and unprofitable operations posed serious financial problems for the Wisconsin firm. Since Patrick Cudahy founded the firm in the Milwaukee suburb that bears his name, things had never been quite so desperate.

Today, however, the 77-year-old firm is experiencing a relative prosperity that is surprising the industry.

Much of the credit for this turnabout can be traced to a new management team headed by the company's president, Richard D. Cudahy.

WEST POINT GRAD

Although a grandson of the founder, Richard Cudahy had severed direct relations with company operations early in life to pursue other career interests. In 1944 Cudahy joined the U.S. Army Air Force but shortly thereafter received an appointment to the U.S. Military Academy. After graduation from West Point, he served 4 years with the Air Force. Upon leaving the service in 1952, he attended the Yale University Law School where he received his LL.B. degree in 1955.

With this background, Cudahy spent several years in Government legal posts but in 1957 the Midwest beckoned and Cudahy joined a prominent Chicago law firm.

In 1961, Patrick Cudahy's plight came to a head. Michael Cudahy, president of the firm since the death of his father, was ill and unable to maintain effective company leadership. He summoned his son to take the helm—and that Richard Cudahy did.

UNION HARMONY

Cudahy explains that he rejoined the firm partly to carry on the family tradition as well as for the opportunity the new post presented. "Meat packing is a fascinating business," he says. "Certain managerial policies were not working out in the late fifties, but I felt that a new approach could help resolve the problems." Cudahy thus had the chance to exercise his own ideas in regard to labor relations, personnel, and marketing. "This approach," says Cudahy, "is by no means original—but our plans call for continued development and emphasis of our more distinctive and distinguishable products as opposed to our commodity products."

Cudahy became president in January of 1961. Through his efforts and with the cooperation of Local 40 of the United Packinghouse Workers, wage scales were realined and a long-range modernization of production practices was initiated. The first beneficial effects of these policies were evident by the end of 1962—and from then on the benefits have been snowballing.

Cudahy retains an active interest in the legal aspects of business. Associates reveal that when legal problems arise, it is altogether too easy to take them to Cudahy for solution—and if an answer is not readily apparent, he will research the problem until one can be found. In fact, Cudahy spends some of his leisure time as a lecturer in law at Marquette University Law School.

ACTIVE DEMOCRAT

In line with this legal background, he has been admitted to practice in three States and the District of Columbia and is a member of the American, Wisconsin, Chicago, and Milwaukee Bar Associations.

Cudahy is also on the Milwaukee Board of Harbor Commissioners and active in affairs of the Cudahy Marine Bank, the Wisconsin Regional Export Expansion Council, and a State subcommittee on education. He is president of the Milwaukee Urban League and has been active in Democratic political circles including membership in the Wisconsin delegation to the last Democratic National Convention.

Still a young man at 39, Cudahy's prospects for the future are bright. Meanwhile, he is gaining valuable experience guiding Patrick Cudahy, Inc., on a new course.

HARVARD VERSUS OXFORD DEBATE ON VIETNAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the finest examples in recent years of debate in a free society took place less than a month ago. It was, in fact, an international debate between a trio at Harvard University and their opposite numbers in London. It was televised by CBS via satellite.

Laurence Tribe, one of the Harvard students, states the U.S. goal most eloquently when he said:

The United States has no ambitions in South Vietnam. We have no interest in creating an outpost of American democracy there. Our purpose is not to impose a particular government on South Vietnam. Our purpose is only to give them a chance to choose.

The distinguished professor, Henry Kissinger, also contributed an eloquent summation when he said:

I would like to emphasize that our goal is and should be freedom for the people of all of Vietnam to determine the future of their country. As Americans, we would far prefer to engage in tasks of construction. We would far prefer to do what President Kennedy said in his inaugural address, that to those people in the huts and villages of half the globe, we pledge our best efforts to help themselves. But we do not have the choice between defense and construction. Unless we can do both, we will not be able to do either.

I would like to emphasize that our continued efforts should be devoted to the goals so well stated by these two articulate and outstanding Americans.

Because television debates, despite their immense immediate impact, are perishable, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of that debate printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From "CBS Reports," as broadcast over the CBS television network, Dec. 21, 1965]

TOWN MEETING OF THE WORLD

(With CBS News Correspondent Charles Collingwood. Executive producer, Don Hewitt)

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. Good evening. As part of our continuing special coverage of the war in Vietnam, this CBS News broadcast, "Town Meeting of the World," has arranged a transatlantic debate on the subject: "Resolved that the United States should carry out its commitment in Vietnam." The two debating teams, one in England and the other in the United States, are linked together via Early Bird satellite. They see each other. On this side of the Atlantic, two Harvard students and a distinguished Harvard professor; on the other side, two Oxford students and a famous Oxford graduate. At this time, I think I ought to introduce them to each other. First, on the subject, the debating side taking the affirmative side of this resolution, the team arguing that the United States should carry out its commitment, this is Robert Shrum, a student at Harvard Law School. Mr. Shrum was picked this year as the top debater at the National Intercollegiate Debate Tournament.

Next, Prof. Henry A. Kissinger, of Harvard. Professor Kissinger is a leading scholar and theoretician on defense and foreign policy in the nuclear age. He's been an adviser to the U.S. Government under four Presidents and has recently returned from Vietnam.

Mr. Laurence Tribe is, like Mr. Shrum, at Harvard Law School. He's also a notable college debater, his team having won the national championship in 1961.

Now, Messrs. Shrum, Kissinger, and Tribe, I'd like you to meet your opponents in England. Mr. Tariq Ali, of Lahore, Pakistan. A former president of the Union at Oxford, he's been quoted as predicting that he'll be president of Pakistan in 10 years. In the meantime, he's standing as candidate for Parliament in the radical alliance interest against British Foreign Secretary Michael Stewart. Mr. Michael Foot, who is presently a Member of Parliament and is generally regarded as the ablest and most articulate spokesman for the Labor Party's left. Mr. Foot has also had a brilliant career outside of Parliament as an author and journalist. Mr. Stephen Marks, a former chairman of the Oxford Labor Club, has been called the most formidable debater at Oxford.

Now, gentlemen, let me give you the ground rules of this debate of ours. We're going to start with 1½-minute arguments from the students on each team. You may find that a little constricting, but there'll be time later. They'll be followed by 2½ minutes by senior members, Professor Kissinger and Mr. Foot; and when your time is up, I'll ring a bell, like that, carried across the Atlantic via Early Bird. Now, after the opening statements, we'll open things up for a give-and-take discussion among the two teams and later we'll invite the audiences in London and New York to give questions to you, and incidentally, I think I'd better introduce the audiences. In London, students from Oxford, members of the Oxford Union. We're making no pretense, of course, that everyone at Oxford agrees with the view taken by the Oxford debaters; nor for that matter, that the American college students from the various schools in the New York area here all agree with the views taken by the Harvard debaters.

Now, after all that ado, but with no further, let's begin with the first American spokesman for the affirmative, Mr. Larry Tribe. One and a half minutes, Mr. Tribe.

Mr. TRIBE. Ladies and gentlemen, Asians and Americans are dying tonight in order to preserve a world in which each nation can shape its own future. Peace was preserved in Cuba and Berlin because no one doubted that we would carry out our pledge not to back down. We have made that pledge in Vietnam. Nowhere have we said more clearly, "We will stand." If we abandon that commitment, imagine a future confrontation and ask yourself, who would believe us then?

Vietnam was one country before it was divided; so was Korea, so was Germany. The issues are the same in Vietnam. There can be no peace when international lines of demarcation are challenged by military force, when the pen that draws those lines is challenged by the sword. Nor can there be peace so long as unrest and social revolution remains the prey of hostile powers, the focal point of global confrontation. We seek no military victory in Vietnam. We will withdraw when North Vietnam ceases its support and guidance of the South, ceases its support of the war. That will come about when Hanoi is convinced of our resolve. To retreat before she is convinced would tempt aggressors everywhere.

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. Thank you, Mr. Tribe. Now, for the negative. Mr. Tariq Ali, of Oxford.

Mr. ALI. I would like to pick up where Mr. Tribe left off on the subject of negotiations. The Hanoi regime, before the United States started bombing North Vietnam and increasing its buildup of troops, told the Secretary General of the United Nations that it was prepared to negotiate. This offer was not made clear to the American people, with the results that we have the situation—we have the situation as it is today. And this is basically the point, that you can't expect people to negotiate when you are bombing their cities, when you are destroying their villages. I think it is unfortunate, and I hope members—I hope members across the Atlantic forgive this callous remark that the United States and member citizens of the United States don't really know what bombing is. If they did, no decent U.S. citizen could support it. An American pilot told (a reporter) of the New York Times, "I don't like to hit a village. You know you're hitting women and children too, but you've got to decide that your cause is noble and that the work has to be done." This situation, as this statement, saddens me, as it should sadden every human being, as it should sadden Professor Kissinger, who just returned from South Vietnam and said that he was very worried that the South Vietnamese Government did not enjoy the support of the people; and that is why you cannot equate Germany and South Korea with Vietnam, because the majority of the people in South Vietnam support the Vietcong.

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. Thank you, Mr. Ali. And now, on the affirmative side of the argument, another student at Harvard, Mr. Robert Shrum.

Mr. SHRUM. Perhaps no nation in the history of warfare has ever known the horrors of bombing better than the United Kingdom, and yet the United Kingdom knew that in World War II, bombing was necessary to meet the Nazi threat, and if bombing is necessary in Vietnam to meet the Communist threat, then unpleasant as that course may be, it is the only real one that the United States can pursue. Why are we pursuing that course? Not because we seek a military victory, not because we seek an economic advantage, but because we seek to see to it that the people of South Vietnam are not forced to choose their way of life at the point of a gun. Rather we seek for them a free election under international auspices in which they can decide under what form of government they want to live. The form of negotiations proposed last year by Hanoi excluded the South Vietnamese Government. It's totally antithetical to the American commitment in Vietnam for we aren't fighting for ourselves. We're fighting for the principle that people shall not have to submit their wills to aggression. We're there, fighting for the South Vietnamese. We surely could not abandon them at a time when negotiations came about. Our principal purpose in South Vietnam is to repel aggression. When aggression is repelled, when the North Vietnamese cease their aggression against South Vietnam, then the bombing will no longer be necessary; then negotiations can take place, then the people of South Vietnam can decide their own future.

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. Thank you. And now, on the other side of the issue, once again from Oxford, Mr. Marks.

Mr. MARKS. Ladies and gentlemen, I'm very frightened by those last two speeches, very frightened indeed, and I'd like to try, in the short time I've got, to deal with some of the frightening misconceptions that lie behind them. First of all, Mr. Shrum's statements—no, I'll start first with Mr. Tribe. He talked about America's pledge. Who was that pledge made to? The pledge the United States is defending in Vietnam was made to a government the United States deliberately installed there in the first place with the intention of frustrating free elections as provided for in the Geneva agreement. That's how their government got there. It represents no one except American dollars. That is all that government is there for, and the commitment to that sort of government isn't worth the paper it's written on.

What other points did he make? Korea and Germany. Neither Korea nor Germany have specified for them in international treaties that they have to be reunited within a specified time under free elections. America agreed to that pledge in 1954 in Geneva. She's broken her word. That's why the comparison with Korea and Germany doesn't apply.

What other points were made? Support and guidance from the North. We're told when that stops, America has no quarrel with the South Vietnamese. Then why was America intervening, giving military help in contravention of the Geneva agreement to South Vietnam before they started getting help from the North. From—sorry—from the day the Geneva agreements were signed, America was helping the South Vietnamese Government and there's no reason to think they will stop because if they did stop that Government would fall. That's just the beginning.

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. Thank you, Mr. Marks. We'll hear from you later, but now we're going to hear from the two senior members of each team beginning with Prof. Henry Kissinger from Harvard. Two and a half minutes, Mr. Kissinger.

Mr. KISSINGER. Ladies and gentlemen, the subject we are discussing this evening is whether the United States should honor its commitment to Vietnam. Let me first answer the point about to whom this commitment was made. I take it that the commitment is made to the people of South Vietnam to give them an opportunity to choose their own future, free of outside interference. We have an obligation as well to the peoples of other new nations that the dislocations that are inseparable from the process of their development not be used by more powerful or better organized neighbors. We have a responsibility toward our friends all over the world that they can rely on our pledges. And finally we have an obligation to the peoples of the world to be in the pursuit of these obligations—will explore every avenue toward peace. If we withdraw from our commitment in Vietnam today, we will leave countless thousands to a brutal fate. We will strengthen all those in the Communist world who argue that war is a means for settling disputes. In the pursuit of our responsibilities, we have, of course, always to be careful that our measures reflect a political and moral purpose and not simply the momentum of past decisions. We are—we have a responsibility to see to it that political and military means reflect the proper priorities. Of course, the war in Vietnam is a grim and desperate struggle, but those who defend the principle of peaceful change will always be challenged in difficult situations. Of course, everyone watching the sacrifice and the suffering must suffer great anguish, most of all Americans whose sons are running—are risking their lives daily. But we are not in Vietnam because we want to stay. We are in Vietnam because we want to withdraw, and we will do so as soon as free choice is guaranteed to the people of South Vietnam.

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. Thank you, Mr. Kissinger. And now, from England, Mr. Michael Foot.

Mr. FOOT. Ladies and gentlemen, I'm still not clear, despite the statements made by the three movers of this motion, exactly what is the commitment which the United States claims to be defending in Vietnam. We are told by Professor Kissinger that the commitment is made to the Government of South Vietnam, and, of course, it is true that the only possible excuse for the Americans having 170,000 troops or 180,000 troops on the other side of the world from the United States itself is that they should be there on the invitation of a foreign government. Now, of course, there will be many arguments, no doubt, in this debate as to who installed the government in South Vietnam and whether, in fact, the United States did not help to in-

stall the Government that has issued the invitation. There would be arguments about that. There may be arguments, also, as to whether in fact they are repelling aggression; but even if Americans sent troops—think they have the right to send troops to South Vietnam in response to an invitation from the South Vietnam Government, and even if we were to concede that, and even if we were to concede that the South had suffered aggression from the North—I concede none of these things; but even if we were to accept all those parts of the arguments put forward by those who sponsor this motion, it still remains the fact that the United States of America would not have the slightest right whatsoever, under the charter of the United Nations, in order to repel alleged aggression, to bomb indiscriminately a neighboring country; and if South Vietnam were subject to aggression, why did not the United States of America take this issue to the Security Council of the United Nations? Why did they not attempt to secure—why did they not attempt to secure the backing of other countries there? Why did they not go and put their case? Why did they not go and present their evidence to the other nations, or does the United States of America think that it has the right to decide these things for themselves on the other side of the world? Well, we contest that right. We contest that right partly because we don't think the American claims conform with the facts, but also because we do not believe that any single nation has the right to decide how it is going to respond to aggression, particularly when they're doing it on the other side of the planet.

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. Thank you, Mr. Foot. Now we have the outlines of the arguments between the two teams on each side of the Atlantic. Let's carry on from there. Who on the American side wishes to answer Mr. Foot and the British side? Mr. Shrum.

Mr. SHRUM. Mr. Tribe.

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. Sorry, Mr. Tribe.

Mr. TRIBE. Mr. Foot asks why did the United States not take the issue to the United Nations? In August of 1964, it was the United States that invited Hanoi to take part in Security Council discussions on the Gulf of Tonkin incident. Hanoi refused. It was in September of this year that the Government of North Vietnam said bluntly any United Nations resolutions in this area would be null and void. Under those circumstances, what sense would it make to go to the Security Council and simply make the motion of having been there? Secretary Goldberg—Ambassador Goldberg, in September of this year, pointed out the majority of the members of the Security Council are agreed that while the United Nations can be used in a conciliatory capacity in this area and that America has done on a number of occasions, it cannot effectively be used for anything other than quiet diplomacy.

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. How about that, Oxford? Who wants to reply to that?

Mr. FOOT. Well, I don't know what right Mr. Goldberg has got to decide which matters should go to the United Nations. This is the charter that we all signed, that the U.S. Government signed as well. Their obligation under that charter is that if they think they or their allies are subject to aggression, we should take this matter to the United Nations to be judged. My answer to the reason why the United States didn't take this major matter to be decided at the United Nations is because they had no clear case. They had no clear case that in fact the cause of the war in Vietnam was an aggression by the North against the South. I haven't any doubt that the North has given assistance to the South during the course of the war, but that's not the origin of the war. If you're going to go to the origin of the war, you have to go back at least to 1954, when an agreement was signed as to how a settlement should be made in Vietnam, an agreement which, among other things, specified that there should be elections in the whole of Vietnam within a period of 2 years; and the U.S. forces in Vietnam and the U.S. policy in Vietnam has upset the demand and insistence of the Geneva Conference that there should be general elections in the whole of Vietnam, so I would like to ask the question: Do the sponsors of this motion, does the Government of the United States now accept the terms of the Geneva settlement of 1954?

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. Mr. Kissinger.

Mr. KISSINGER. With respect to the United Nations Charter, article 51 specifically provides for the right of individual and collective self-defense.

Secondly, the view that Mr. Foot has just expressed does not seem to be shared by the Government of North Vietnam, which on September 23, 1965, stated as follows: "The U.S. authorities are feverishly trying by every means to secure a United Nations intervention in Vietnam. They have, quote, 'requested help from the United Nations membership at large in getting peace talks started.' This is a maneuver to use the United Nations to impose on the Vietnamese people negotiations under U.S. terms." There have been at least five other instances this year in which the North Vietnamese Government has asserted that the United Nations is not competent to enter the Vietnamese dispute. This is the primary reason why the United Nations has not been apprised of this problem.

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. Mr. Marks, you said at the end of your speech that that was "only the beginning." Do you have something that you'd like to address to the proposers of the resolution?

Mr. MARKS. Yes, there are a number of points I'd like to add. I'm glad to get off the United Nations. The North Vietnamese don't think that it has much to offer and quite frankly, I agree with them.

I'd like to take up this point which I think Mr.—where are we?—I think Mr. Shrum made. He said—and the others. He said that America was in favor of the people of South Vietnam choosing their own government. Now, I remember reading a newspaper report on this. I'm afraid I don't have the detailed reference here, but I hope you'll take my word for it—of an interview recently with Vice President HUMPHREY, who said that the United States would not permit the Vietcong to take part in free elections in Vietnam. Now, I'd like to know if Mr. Shrum means the same thing by free elections as Vice President HUMPHREY, or whether he means the same thing as most Democrats mean by free elections. I'd also like to ask, since our own Foreign Secretary, Michael Stewart, who's usually an authoritative spokesman for the Washington line, tells us that there can be no free elections in Vietnam until there's been a period of classification—of pacification. I would like to know whether this pacification is a polite word for killing all the Communists, because I have a rather great suspicion that it is.

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. Mr. Shrum.

Mr. SHRUM. Well, I—before answering this question about elections, I do want to say that the United Nations is available. It could be very fruitfully used in this problem. I think that if North Vietnam were only willing to accept the good offices of people like Secretary General U Thant, then much of the Vietnamese difficulties could be cleared up.

If Vice President HUMPHREY said that the United States should not allow the National Liberation Front of Vietcong to participate in elections, then I disagree with him. I very much doubt that he said it. I think that the U.S. aim in South Vietnam is to give these people any kind of government that they want as long as they freely choose that government in a ballot box rather than at the point of a gun.

By pacification, I would suggest Mr. Stewart probably means that the country must no longer be seething with violence and terrorism, because in that kind of atmosphere, free elections can never take place.

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. Now, let's have a question from the American side to the Oxford side. Mr. Tribe.

Mr. TRIBE. It strikes us that the idea that the Americans should not carry out their commitment in Vietnam may differ greatly from the reality that the gentlemen from Oxford want to impose. We want to know whether they are advocating unilateral and immediate withdrawal. If not, are they simply advocating that we seek a negotiated end? If that's their point, I would like to remind them that the position of the U.S. Government has been and remains that we want peace in Vietnam, simply peace that will guarantee the right of self-determination to that wartorn country.

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. Mr. Ali?

Mr. ALI. Yes, I will reply to that, if I may. We have tried to point out, and not only us here in Britain this evening, but the North Vietnamese have been trying to point out that before the bombing of North Vietnam started, there were peace feelers from Hanoi via U Thant which said that Ho Chi Minh was prepared to go to Burma and discuss a negotiated peace with an American spokesman, but unfortunately, President Johnson was busy taking on Barry Goldwater and the elections, and Dean Rusk's sensitive mind thought that these offers were not sincere and, therefore, they were rejected.

As to the second part of your question—do I think that the United States should get out of Vietnam now, my answer is yes—without any qualifications, that the only way—it's made out very often that this is a very complicated issue. Perhaps I'm a bit naive, but to me it seems very simple. The United States is there, thousands of miles away from Washington. Surely you can't claim that this is self-defense and that the only way in which they can earn the respect of the world—better later than never—is by leaving Vietnam now, and this I think is the only alternative left to President Johnson. If De Gaulle can do it vis-a-vis Algeria, why not Johnson vis-a-vis Vietnam?

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. Professor Kissinger?

Mr. KISSINGER. I would like to make a slight factual correction about the overture of U Thant. I'm not here to defend every action of the American Government and I have often been critical of it in other fields, but the facts of the situation seem to me to be as follows: There was a feeler through U Thant, which was very ambiguous and which required us to negotiate without the government to which we were committed in Saigon. We attempted to determine through other sources just exactly what Hanoi had in mind and received very inconclusive and rather negative answers and on the basis of this information, the Government decided that it would be better not to pursue this overture. But it is not correct to say that a clear offer to negotiate was rejected, and whatever one's judgment about that overture, there have been more than 15 American proposals since then which surely could have provided an opening for another conversation.

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. Mr. Shrum, you were bouncing around there in your chair. Do you want to reply to Mr. Ali?

Mr. SHRUM. Mr. Ali said that he is in favor of complete withdrawal. Now, I think that he should probably discuss the implications of this, especially in light of the fact that people like Lin Piao, who is Chinese Defense Minister, have delivered statements—the one I'm specifically citing was on September 2, 1965—saying that the war in Vietnam is a test case and that if the Communists can win

there, they can then begin and start wars of national liberation all over the world. Of course, wars of national liberation is a euphemism for Communist takeover in these underdeveloped countries. I want to know whether he wants to substitute a new form of colonialism and a more iron tyranny for the one these countries have just gotten rid of.

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. Mr. Ali, you'd better answer that.

Mr. ALI. Yes, I will answer both Professor Kissinger and Mr. Shrub—sorry, Mr. Shrum. Professor Kissinger, first. I would like to make this point again, Professor Kissinger, with due respect to you and public opinion in the United States, that really, when you are bombing a nation, you can't expect that nation to negotiate with you. If the Japs had asked you to negotiate immediately after they started bombing Pearl Harbor, what would your answer have been?

As far as Comrade Shrum's point is concerned—I don't accept that wars of national liberation all over the world result in Communist domination. The Sino-Soviet split has shown that communism too has its own nationalisms. And I would like to ask Mr. Shrum, that—does he really believe that 12 Communists in Santo Domingo constituted a national liberation movement and were sufficient reason for the United States to intervene in Santo Domingo? And another point I would like Mr. Shrum to answer, that what he quotes Marshal Lin Piao as saying, when responsible American generals like Curtis LeMay say that the only way we can win this war is to bomb North Vietnam back into the stone age, when other responsible American commentators say that this is America's test case, when they are treating Vietnam as a war laboratory with which to test new weapons, which could be used in the future in Latin America.

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. Well, we're getting a little far afield in Santo Domingo, but I think Mr. Shrum ought to have a chance to answer that.

Mr. SHRUM. I don't think 12—I don't think 12 Communists in Santo Domingo necessarily constitute a Communist national liberation front. I don't want to really talk about Santo Domingo, but I think that thousands of Communists in Vietnam do constitute a national liberation front, and a real threat to the peace and security of the United States and of southeast Asia. Yes, this is a test case for the United States of America, and it's a test case because the United States has to prove to aggression that it cannot succeed and that communism cannot expand all over the world, simply through wars of national liberation. Because someone like Gen. Curtis LeMay sometimes might make an irresponsible statement does not discount Lin Piao's statement when he said that wars of national liberation could begin all over the world, taking their inspiration from the war in Vietnam. I'm not here to defend Curtis LeMay; I'm here to defend American policy in Vietnam, because I think it's right.

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. Now from England—Michael Foot, we haven't heard from you for a while.

Mr. FOOT. We are told that the aim of the United States in Vietnam is to prove that aggression doesn't pay. First of all, as I have said, they haven't yet proved that it's aggression. They haven't attempted to prove that it's aggression before any independent tribunal. One of the reasons why they have not done so, is because they wish to draw a veil over what really happened, and what are the real origins of the war in Vietnam. This maybe is the reason why we have had no answer in this debate and no clear answer from the U.S. Government in all the negotiations over—and all the discussions over these years as to whether they accept in full the Geneva settlement of 1954. At the time, most of the other countries concerned accepted that agreement, with its commitment to free elections in the whole of Vietnam, which we were told by the spokesman here is what the United States is fighting for in Vietnam. But, we've never had from the statement from the American Government that they accepted in full the Geneva settlement of 1954. If they would say that, there would be some advance, but of course, if they accepted that, one of the difficulties is that it would destroy a large part of the American argument. Because the Geneva settlement also laid down that Vietnam is not two countries, there is one country, and therefore, what has been happening throughout these years in Vietnam is not a war of aggression, but a civil war, and what the United States is doing is to intervene in a civil war, intervene in a manner which they've certainly got no international claim under any international law to do. They intervene in a manner which they have not been prepared to put before any international tribunal. Now, this is a very serious matter indeed, and you cannot say that they are doing it in order to uphold international law when they are not prepared to apply international law to their own actions and moreover, it's no good to say that they are repelling aggression. That's what the people in North Vietnam think they are doing.

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. Mr. Tribe?

Mr. FOOT. The people in North Vietnam say they want the right to shape their own right and to shape their own destinies. So they're fighting and will continue to fight very hard for those same things. Somehow we have to overcome that barrier and if we're going to do that, the American Government, the most powerful government in the world, will have to retreat from its present position, and be prepared to make proposals for a settlement very much in advance of anything they've yet suggested.

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. We'll give the American debating team an opportunity to answer the points made by Mr. Foot when we return with "Town Meeting of the World" after this message.

[Announcement]

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. In this transatlantic debate between students of Oxford and students at Harvard and Mr. Kissinger and Mr. Foot on both sides of the Atlantic via Early Bird, we've just heard a challenging statement on American policy, its defects, according to him, by Mr. Foot. Who on the American side would like to reply to that? Professor Kissinger?

Mr. KISSINGER. I would like to make—to reply both to Mr. Ali and to Mr. Foot, briefly. Mr. Ali presented the beginning of American bombing as if it were a decision that President Johnson took because he felt angry one Sunday morning and decided to proceed. I think the facts of the situation are that North Vietnamese — North Vietnam — had been encouraging, supporting and supplying an uprising in South Vietnam for 5 years; and it is not obvious to me what the moral distinction is between explosives carried on the back of foot soldiers and explosives carried by airplanes. Every argument that was made against negotiation on the part of Hanoi would apply equally well to negotiations on the part of Saigon, which has also been subject to attack. And I would say that the only way to escape this logjam, is to stop talking about the past and to try to see whether one can find comparable restraints on both sides to stop the shooting and to begin the negotiations.

Secondly, to Mr. Foot: It is not correct, I believe, to say that there were no international commitments in the case of other countries. At least in the case of Germany with which I am familiar, there was a commitment at the Summit Meeting of 1955, to settle—to achieve German unification on the basis of free elections, and no one would argue that the fact that no free elections have been held in East Germany, and that the government demonstrably does not enjoy the support of its population, that this entitles the West German Government to start a guerrilla movement in Eastern Germany.

Thirdly, it is the Geneva settlement. It is my belief that the United States should accept the Geneva settlement as a basis for the settlement of the present war in Vietnam; and it is my impression that the American Government has indicated its readiness to do so. The issue in South Vietnam with respect to pacification is not to kill every Communist. The issue is to induce the Communists in South Vietnam to accept the principle of free choice, and as soon as this is accepted, they should as individuals be permitted to participate in the political process.

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. The audiences on both sides of the Atlantic have been following with great interest. Let's bring them into this discussion now. You may ask questions of either side or individuals on either side, no matter which side of the Atlantic you happen to be on. Let's begin though with the American audience. Dave Dugan, do you have someone who wants to ask a question?

Mr. DUGAN. Charles, we have lots of people who want to ask questions. It's a matter of getting as many in as we can. I think in section D, in the front row, there's a gentleman, third from the aisle, who has a question if we could get a microphone to him.

Question. Yes, I'd like to direct this question to Mr. Foot. Does he believe that the way to achieve peace is to allow the spread of international communism to go unchallenged, much as Prime Minister Chamberlain did in World War II, when he gave Adolf Hitler Czechoslovakia in return for peace in our time?

Mr. FOOT. The prewar situation was that governments in Britain and America were appeasing fascism, and I think it was a very dangerous policy to follow. But I don't believe there's any comparison between what is happening in Vietnam and what happened in Czechoslovakia before the war. You see, I think what the United States is doing in Vietnam, so far from resisting the spread of communism, is increasing the likelihood of the spread of communism. I think that the more the United States continues to bomb North Vietnam, the more they will rally support behind the Government of North Vietnam, the more they will drive the rest of Asia into the hands of China. If that's what they want, if the U.S. policy was designed for spreading communism, then I think it's carrying it out extremely efficiently.

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. Now—now let's have a question from the audience in London. Bob Trout, do you recognize someone?

Mr. TROUT. Yes, Charles. After listening so far in comparative silence, I'm sure that our 50-odd Oxford students are eager to join the fray. Who does have the first question? In the first row on the right side?

Question. Professor Kissinger, I find American intervention in Vietnam as immoral as Nazi and Italian intervention in Spain before the last war. Why don't you?

Mr. KISSINGER. I don't find the intervention in Vietnam immoral because our purpose is to give the people of South Vietnam a free choice. The Nazi intervention was to deprive the people of a free choice, and I would have thought that people in Britain should know the difference between American and Fascist motivations.

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. Another question now from the New York audience.

Mr. DUGAN. Yes, Charles, in section C there is a gentleman in the third row on the aisle—if we could get a microphone to him.

Question. This question is directed to Mr. Foot. If you so ably agree with Mr. Chamberlain, how else do you think communism

would be able to be stopped throughout Asia if not by domination by the United States?

Mr. FOOT. I think it is a great folly and indeed one of the—I think it is a great folly and indeed one of the great mistakes made by the Government of the United States, and one that we could all suffer for, to equate international communism or communism with prewar nazism. They're two very different institutions indeed; and indeed, international communism has not shown anything like the aggressive tendencies which were shown by fascism before the war. Indeed, the meaning of fascism was that it was aggressive in that sense. I don't think necessarily that the international communism is aggressive in that sense, although it sometimes is aggressive. But you know, the United States is sometimes aggressive, and you see the actions of the United States in Vietnam are not merely actions taken in response to aggression. We've been trying to get to the bottom of this matter, right since this dispute began—this argument began. We asked Mr. Kissinger whether the U.S. Government accepted the Geneva settlement. If they accepted it, the war might never have started.

There would be no necessity to resist international communism in Vietnam; and incidentally, what right has the United States to say that we're going to pick on Vietnam for carrying out your crusade against international communism. What right have you got to pick on Vietnam, only if you can claim that there was an aggression that you had every right to resist, but you've never been prepared to take this before any international tribunal whatsoever for them to judge. Moreover, Professor Kissinger would not tell us whether the U.S. Government, his own government, accepted the Geneva settlement or not. He said they should accept it. Well, I agree, they should. Why don't they? He said it was his impression that the U.S. Government does accept it. I think for an expert of Professor Kissinger's eminence to say that it's his impression that they accept it—why does not the United States say quite clearly they will accept the whole of the Geneva settlement. If they did that, then I think we would make progress toward real negotiations and an escape from the present confrontation, which certainly will spread international communism much more likely than it will kill it.

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. Now, I don't want to turn this into just a debate between Michael Foot and Henry Kissinger. I'd like to get some of the students in, but I think I really must let Professor Kissinger have a chance to answer that.

Mr. KISSINGER. I used the words, "it is my impression" in deference to the debating skill of my British friends. I have every reason to believe that the American Government accepts the Geneva settlement, whatever may have happened in the past. I simply do not have the document in front of me in case I am challenged to produce the exact words.

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. Now let's have a question from the London studio, but let's address this one to one of the students and not to Professor Kissinger.

Mr. TROUT. In the front right section, you have a question?

Question. I don't mind which of the American students answers this question. The government which invited the American troops into Vietnam in the first place was not a democratically elected government. The government which is now supported by the American troops in Vietnam is possibly even less democratic, since it was installed by a military coup d'etat. I should like to know the legalistic basis on which the American Government claims to be justified in sending troops to South Vietnam.

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. They're both law students, but let's have Mr. Tribe answer that.

Mr. TRIBE. I think it's important to remember with regard to the particular governments in South Vietnam that our commitment is broader than a commitment to any one of them; but with regard to either the government of Diem or the government of Marshal Ky, Bernard Fall, recognized as an objective, impartial authority on this question, points out that at least 9 out of 10 of the member states of the United Nations have no greater a claim to legitimacy.

It is not our contention, and it is not the position of the United States, that any particular government of South Vietnam is the preordained and necessarily legitimate representative of the people. That is the contention of the North when it insists that no settlement can be reached which does not accept the Vietcong and the National Liberation Front as prima facie the representative of the people. What we want is to ask the people that question, and you cannot ask them that when the Vietcong are conducting terrorist raids within Vietnam. The only reason America is in Vietnam is to create a condition in which the people themselves can constitute a truly representative government.

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. Now, we have time for a very quick question from the American audience, and a very quick answer. Question from the New York audience, quickly.

Mr. DUGAN. Yes, Charles, in section A, in the second row, can we get a microphone down to the second gentleman from the aisle, please.

Question. A question directed to the American team. They have said that it is our purpose to give a free choice to the Vietnamese people. Let us attempt to expose this hypocrisy. As long as there is a chance, which is now good, that we will lose those elections, we will not permit them.

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. Quick answer, Mr. Shrum.

Mr. SHRUM. We're committed to democracy, and as long as we're committed to self-determination in Vietnam, all the North Vietnamese have to do is agree to free internationally supervised elections, and we will hold them.

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. Thank you very much. We'll be back with more of this transatlantic debate on "Town Meeting of the World" after this message.

[Announcement]

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. Let's have some more questions now from the audiences both in London and New York, addressed to the debaters on this "Town Meeting of the World." I think it's the London audience's turn. A questioner from London.

Mr. TROUT. The gentleman in the——

Question. Would a member of the U.S. team like to state quite clearly whether or not the United States would accept a democratically elected Communist government in South Vietnam?

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. Mr. Tribe.

Mr. TRIBE. The answer is yes. The United States has no ambitions in South Vietnam. We have no interest in creating an outpost of American democracy there. However, we think it is extremely unlikely that South Vietnam would be the first nation in the history of the world to accept in free elections a Communist government—unlikely not only because of the 1 million people who fled the Communist government from the north, but unlikely as well because of the fact that the basic traditions in Vietnam, the traditions of land ownership, of family and of religious belief, are inconsistent with the fundamental tenets of communism. Even if it were true that Ho Chi Minh had some popularity, it is certainly not demonstrable that the people of South Vietnam would, in any free election, elect a Communist regime. But I emphasize, our purpose is not to impose a particular government on South Vietnam. Our purpose is only to give them a chance to choose.

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. And now a question from the New York audience.

Mr. DUGAN. Yes, Charles, in section A in the front row, we have a gentleman right by the aisle, if we can get a microphone to him.

Question. I address my question to Mr. Foot, who says the United States picks on Vietnam, and to Mr. Ali, who says the majority of the people in South Vietnam support the Vietcong. If this is true, how do you explain the half million South Vietnamese soldiers who have been fighting and dying, and often dying valiantly, for their country; and how do you explain the fact that there are 1 million North Vietnamese who have fled their country and are now living as refugees in Saigon?

Mr. ALI. Yes, I'll answer to all three of your points. Point No. 1, how do I say that the Vietcong is supported by the majority of the people in Vietnam? I say this because it has been admitted by every—almost every—newspaper correspondent in Saigon and, indeed, even admitted by Mr. Kissinger. When he returned from a visit from South Vietnam he said he was distressed to find that the gulf between the Government and the people was very large. There's more evidence for this: the whole attempt to herd people into concentration camps or strategic hamlets, as you euphemistically call them, was an attempt to separate people from the Vietcong, an attempt which did not succeed. And also, the North Vietnamese, according to every American reporter and the State Department——

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. At this moment, Mr. Ali, I must interrupt you because our time is running out and I want to ask the senior members of both teams for a brief summation of the debate so far. And let's begin with Mr. Foot.

Mr. FOOT. Of course, all of us must be passionately concerned to see the end of this appalling war and I am glad that Professor Kissinger has said that the U.S. Government now accepts the Geneva settlement of 1954. I didn't ask him that as a kind of trick question. I wanted genuinely to know, and I think it is correct that they have said sometimes that they do accept the Geneva settlement. Unfortunately, they may have accepted it in the letter, but never in the spirit. This very weekend we have Mr. Rusk in Paris saying United States still wants peace talks on Vietnam, but only if South Vietnam's independence and territorial integrity are guaranteed. In other words, they are still saying two Vietnams. That is contrary to the Geneva settlement. The Americans refused free elections. That is contrary to the Geneva settlement. The Americans are obviously refusing to neutralize the area. That is contrary to the Geneva settlement. If the United States would come forward with proposals for genuinely seeking a settlement on the basis of the 1954 agreements, then we could begin to end this appalling horror which, if it continues, could drag not merely the United States but the whole world into nuclear catastrophe.

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. Sorry, Mr. Foot. And now, a last word, 1-minute summation from Professor Kissinger.

Mr. KISSINGER. The war in Vietnam is a tragic and desperate effort. I'm distressed that so many of the questions seemed to challenge not the judgment but the motivation of American policy. I would like to emphasize that our goal is and should be freedom for the people of South Vietnam to chart their own future, and freedom for the people of all of Vietnam to determine the future of their country. As Americans, we would far prefer to engage in tasks of construction. We would far prefer to do what President Kennedy said in his inaugural address, that to those people in the huts and villages of half the globe, we pledge our best

efforts to help themselves. But we do not have the choice between defense and construction. Unless we can do both, we will not be able to do either.

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. Thank you very much. Thank you, gentlemen of Oxford and gentlemen from Harvard, for an hour's interesting and provocative debate. This is Charles Collingwood. Good night.

ANNOUNCER. This "Town Meeting of the World" was produced in cooperation with the British Broadcasting Corporation, using the facilities of the Early Bird communications satellite. The Oxford students and Mr. Foot were seen from a BBC studio in London. The two Harvard students and Professor Kissinger were seen from a CBS studio in New York. We wish to thank the Oxford Union and universities in the New York area for their cooperation in helping us to select the student audiences on both sides of the Atlantic.

RESERVATION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS FOR A NATIONAL WILD RIVERS SYSTEM

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the pending business, which is S. 1446.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1446), to reserve public lands for a National Wild Rivers System, to provide a procedure for adding additional public lands and other lands to the system, and for other purposes.

THE VIETNAM CONFLICT

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the most pressing problem facing our Nation and the world today is the war in Vietnam. I hope our President will continue to strike out boldly for a peaceful settlement of this bitter conflict. Bona fide peace negotiations mean concessions by us, concessions by the Vietcong and a cease-fire with no one an abject loser and no one an arrogant winner. Unless there is a negotiated settlement, American GI's are likely to be fighting and dying in Vietnam until 1980.

President Johnson is to be commended for directing a pause in the bombing of North Vietnam. But standing alone, this is not enough.

In his outstanding state of the Union message, the President set forth our goals in Vietnam when he said:

> We seek neither territory nor bases, economic domination or military alliance in Vietnam. We fight for the principle of self-determination that the people of South Vietnam should be able to choose their own course, choose it in free elections without violence, without terror, and without fear. The people of all Vietnam should make a free decision on the great question of reunification.
>
> We have also made it clear from Hanoi to New York that there are no arbitrary limits to our search for peace. We stand by the Geneva agreements of 1954 and 1962. We will meet at any conference table. We will discuss any proposals—4 points or 14 or 40—and we will consider the views of any group. We will work for a cease-fire now, or once discussions have begun.

I wholeheartedly agree with the goals set by our President. However, because in the past there have been conflicting statements by our officials on our support for the Geneva accords, on negotiations with the Vietcong, and on free elections, we must further clarify our war aims and negotiating position.

We should clearly announce our willingness to seek a settlement based on the 1954 Geneva accords providing neutrality, self-determination, and free elections for Vietnam. The Geneva accords which we agreed to but did not sign state that "the military demarcation line at the 17th parallel is provisional and should not in any way be considered as constituting a political or territorial boundary." Historically, there is no North and South Vietnam.

We should indicate explicitly our readiness to participate in negotiations with all parties involved—I mean with delegates of the Vietcong, or National Liberation Front, so-called. We should agree to abide by the results of a peaceful, free election by the people of Vietnam of their own Government, their own leaders, and their own destiny. I know our CIA officials in Vietnam and Prime Minister Ky, of the Saigon government oppose an armistice at this time. Our President should overrule their views along with those of the Curtis LeMays.

If our President moves decisively for such peace our people will support him. If instead, he approves steadily expanding military involvement, he will please our militarists, and warhawks in Congress. Then in the 1966 congressional elections and in 1968, as casualty lists mount, some Republican politicians, now urging acceleration of the war by bombing Hanoi and Haiphong and even Red China, will be the first to denounce this as "Lyndon's war."

Were we to bomb Hanoi and Haiphong, thousands of Vietnamese civilians including women and children would be killed and wounded. If we failed to destroy all the war planes of North Vietnam some might bomb Saigon, and elements of the North Vietnamese army, numbering some 400,000, would cross the demilitarized zone and invade South Vietnam.

Pentagon gossip reports plans to bomb Haiphong and Hanoi followed by an amphibious landing at Haiphong and then "bombing Red China back into the stone age." That, to quote Gen. Curtis LeMay. Let us hope President Johnson rejects these proposals. Bombing Hanoi would be compared with the Nazi bombing of Guernica in the Spanish Civil War. Furthermore, no one can accurately forecast just how damaging the reaction would be. It would certainly at least outweigh any possible military gain.

From September 28 to last October 20 I was in southeast Asia most of the time. I went, looked, and listened. Very soon I learned we are involved in a civil war over there. In South Vietnam I was at every airbase except one—traveling through the entire area by helicopter, airplane, and jeep. It is my considered judgment that South Vietnam is of no strategic importance whatever to the defense of the United States. Furthermore, the fact is that the conflict raging in Vietnam is a civil war. General Westmoreland stated to me that the bulk of the Vietcong fighting in South Vietnam were born and reared in South Vietnam. General Stilwell, in Thailand, went further. He stated that 80 percent of the Vietcong fighting in the Mekong Delta area south of Saigon, were born and reared in that area. They were not infiltrators or Communists from the North.

No matter how often we profess our intention to defend freedom in Vietnam, the increasing escalation of the war is raising grave doubts throughout Asia and elsewhere in the world as to the wisdom of our policy. Attacks with sophisticated weapons on unsophisticated and illiterate Asians are building a vast reservoir of anti-Americanism and misunderstanding of our country among the masses of the people in Asia.

A military surrender to the United States will never produce acceptance of American presence in Asia by most Asians. It would be a legacy of ill will which we should not leave to future generations of Americans. Until Asiatics show more interest in defending themselves, then unilateral American involvement in Asia is doomed to failure. The ugly reality is that for the most part it is American GI's who are fighting and dying in Vietnam for the alleged defense of freedom in Asia. Do we Americans have a mandate from Almighty God to police the entire world?

President John F. Kennedy said on September 3, 1963, shortly before his assassination:

> I don't think that unless a greater effort is made by the Government to win popular support that the war can be won out there. In the final analysis, it is their war. They are the ones who have to win it or lose it. We can help them, we can give them equipment, we can send our men out there as advisers, but they have to win it—the people of Vietnam—against the Communists. We are prepared to continue to assist them, but I don't think that the war can be won unless the people support the effort, and, in my opinion, in the last 2 months the Government has gotten out of touch with the people.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Is it not a fact that when President Kennedy made that statement in September of 1963, we had been in Vietnam for practically a decade?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GRUENING. Yet, at the end of 10 years of assistance of all kinds, including vast sums of money, we had a situation that was deteriorating; and it was clear then, was it not, that the government of South Vietnam, either the puppet government that we had installed there, or its successors after various coups were out of touch with the needs of the people, were uninterested in those needs, and were doing little or nothing to bring about the reforms which President Eisenhower had made conditional upon our giving them aid for 10 years previously? Is that not a fact?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. That is true, of course.

Mr. GRUENING. Is that not a demonstration of the folly of our policies there?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I agree with the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, on our initial commitment to South Vietnam made by President Eisenhower in 1954 in a letter to the President of South Vietnam stated:

> I am instructing the American Ambassador to examine with you how an intelligent program of American aid can serve to assist Vietnam in its present hour of trial.

He added:

> The purpose of this offer is to assist the Government of Vietnam in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means. The U.S. Government hopes that such aid, combined with your own continuing efforts, will contribute effectively toward an independent Vietnam endowed with a strong government.

That was a very "iffy" commitment made by President Eisenhower.

Can anyone claim that Prime Minister Ky, of South Vietnam, who himself was born and reared in Hanoi, heads a strong, viable state? He could not remain in power 1 week except for the operations of our Central Intelligence Agency and the support of our Armed Forces.

To justify sending a military advisory group to Vietnam and increasing its size from 327 in 1953 to 685 in 1961, President Eisenhower on April 7, 1954, said:

> The loss of Indochina will cause the fall of southeast Asia like a set of dominoes.

That was in the Stalin era. Today, there is no bitter cold war between the Soviet Union and the United States as when Stalin was dictator. The Soviet Union is no longer a "have not" nation. It is veering toward capitalism. Its leaders and the Russian people seek coexistence instead of coannihilation. Moscow and Peiping are now in bitter conflict. This domino theory has been completely discredited.

Red China is a paper dragon. It is overrated as a great power. It has crude nuclear capability, that is true. However, it will take at least 5 or 10 years before it will have the know-how to deliver any nuclear warheads on targets. Its air force is inferior. It has no surface navy except a few torpedo boats and gunboats—no modern transports—nothing except thousands of junks. It is an agrarian nation, with 85-percent of its population engaged in agriculture. On the Pacific, under the Pacific, and in the air, we have a more powerful Navy, submarine fleet, and Air Force than all the nations of the world combined.

Red China does have a huge land army. The elephant can fight neither the eagle nor the whale. As General MacArthur in his "Reminiscences" stated:

> Anyone in favor of sending American ground troops to fight on Chinese soil should have his head examined.

Can anyone claim that we would lose face and that our prestige in Asia would be damaged were we to withdraw from this conflict? France was bled white during the 8-year struggle to save her vast colonial empire in Indo-China. France became a greater and more powerful nation following her withdrawal from what is now North and South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos. Furthermore, did De Gaulle lose face or prestige when he surrendered Algeria, that vast domain larger than France? A great nation like ours does not lose face by withdrawing from a miserable war. We have lost face by messing around with it in the first place.

The winds of freedom are blowing across the China Sea and elsewhere throughout the world in a manner and to an extent almost beyond belief. Surely we should not respond with our Armed Forces whenever the winds of change strike a country in southeast Asia or in Africa or elsewhere outside our hemisphere and sphere of influence. In Vietnam the security of the United States is not the issue. Saigon is not and never will be an outpost defending Seattle. Vietnam very definitely is of no strategic importance to the defense of the United States.

We should have long since learned that the outcome of a guerrilla war in the swamps, jungles, and highlands of southeast Asia does not threaten the security of the United States. We should, if we wish, give money, food, or guns, giving this aid from afar. We should withdraw from implicating ourselves so deeply into this conflict converting it into an American war.

This steaming jungle where thousands of American GI's have already been afflicted with malaria and other jungle diseases is the worst place in the world for us to wage a ground war.

Americans should not blindly accept the propaganda coming from Washington. If mistakes are compounded on mistakes, then the conflict will be expanded and escalated.

In my judgment, our national interest requires a redirection of our policy in Asia. We should not be the sole defenders of freedom as we define freedom in Asia. The Joint Chiefs of Staff and our CIA should take a back seat when it comes to formulating foreign policy. I hope that President Johnson will reassert that civilian authority must remain supreme over military authority. The men who wrote the Constitution of the United States provided that civilian authority in this Nation must always be supreme over the military. We should adhere to that.

Any forces we have in Vietnam should be only part of the forces of many nations under the United Nations and for peacekeeping and not warmaking purposes.

Vietnam is a land of breathtaking seacoasts, green jungles, fertile rice paddies, picturesque mountains—a lovely Garden of Eden converted into a hell on earth by man's inhumanity to man.

I have just quoted the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] who revisited the scene of his youth in the early part of World War II when he served as a marine in Vietnam.

Let it not be written by future historians that American boys died needlessly in far distant jungles because of weakness of diplomats and indifference of politicians. I wish I had as much confidence in the skill and intelligence of our diplomats in trying to settle this war as I do in the bravery and high competence of our soldiers fighting the war.

The primary reason for our being in Vietnam today is our stubborn refusal to admit a mistake in our attempt to make Vietnam a pro-American and an anti-Chinese state. More than anything else, we are fighting to avoid admitting failure. As Walter Lippmann bluntly put it, "We are fighting to save face."

The late President John F. Kennedy said, "Transforming Vietnam into a Western redoubt is ridiculous."

Sallust, the Roman historian, about 40 years before the birth of our Saviour wrote:

> It is always easy to begin a war, but very difficult to stop one, since its beginning and end are not under the control of the same man.

That is true now as it was then. President Johnson deserves praise for ordering a holiday in bombing North Vietnam while his executive department officials are seeking to secure an armistice and cease-fire at the conference table with representatives of the Vietcong or National Liberation Front, so-called, and Hanoi.

We Americans should not be so much interested in saving face as in saving lives.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Ohio on his forthright, penetrating speech. I think it is one of the most important statements that have been made in Congress on the war in Vietnam. It deserves the widest attention. I am happy to welcome the Senator from Ohio to the ranks of those of us who feel and for nearly 2 years have stated that our military involvement there is folly and represents a tragic mistake, perhaps the most tragic ever made by this country. As pointed out in the report of our distinguished majority leader, an expert on southeast Asia, and our colleagues who went to South Vietnam and other parts of the world, that unless we can bring the war to an end at the conference table there appears no prospect except more and more destruction and killing. I think we should get out in the best way possible and admit that we made a mistake. Individuals who do this are honored. Great nations find it harder to do.

I applaud President Johnson for the efforts he is making for peace, but I feel he is handicapped by some needlessly unqualified verbal commitments he has made.

Three Presidents did not, as President Johnson has indicated—I think he is mistaken in this—promise military aid and establish thereby a national pledge. President Eisenhower offered only economic aid, provided certain reforms were made. As the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] pointed out, it was a very "iffy" offer, and was contingent upon improvement and reforms in the then Diem government—reforms which never took place.

During the 6 years of President Eisenhower in the White House, there was no

military involvement, that is, no Americans were sent into combat, only a military mission with an advisory role. Under President Kennedy, we sent military advisers, and President Kennedy continued to maintain that it was South Vietnam's war—and that they had to win it. It has been only in the past year that we have become involved with our troops in combat—a tragic mistake.

I hope the speech that the Senator from Ohio has delivered will have wide circulation.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President I thank the distinguished junior Senator from Alaska. Contrary to what we sometimes read in the press, the Vietnam issue was debated in the Senate during the past year; and as we settle down to the final session of the 89th Congress the debate is renewed. There is a great difference of opinion among Senators.

It is going to be a good thing that all Senators debate this pressing problem, the greatest problem before the country at this time, and express their views.

Mr. President, supplementary to what I have said, I have a letter from a constituent of mine, Thomas A. Gianfagna, of 841 Alhambra Road, Cleveland, a valiant young constituent of mine. I do not know him personally, but he wrote me as follows:

DEAR SENATOR YOUNG: I have followed with great interest your views on the situation in Vietnam. As an ex-GI just recently granted the blessing of rebirth into civilian life and as a veteran of 2 months service in the central highlands of Vietnam with the 1st Cavalry Division, I want you to know that I agree with you 99 percent.

As you say, we are not the policeman of the world. As you say, the situation in Vietnam is more a civil war than a war of aggression or subversion. Thank you for saying it so loudly.

Thank you again.

Yours truly,

THOMAS A. GIANFAGNA.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I believe I heard the distinguished Senator from Ohio state that the senior Senator from Maryland had visited Vietnam during World War II.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I did so—inadvertently. I meant Okinawa.

Mr. BREWSTER. I thank the Senator, because I was in Vietnam only with the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], where the three of us spent some time. My world war service took me to Espiritu Santos, Guadalcanal, Ulithi, Eniwetok, Guam, and Okinawa, but not until recently was I in Vietnam.

My own observations are somewhat different from those of the Senator from Ohio, but I appreciate the deep sincerity with which the Senator from Ohio has expressed his point of view.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I greatly respect the Senator from Maryland who is a great Senator. He is one of the heroes of World War II, and he has a fine record in the Senate. It was a slip of the tongue when I used the word "Vietnam" for "Okinawa," because I knew he was with the Marines who conquered Okinawa in World War II.

I had two sons, both of whom served in the Pacific, and I know something about the hardships of those fine young men who, some 22 and 23 years ago, fought for their country in the Pacific.

Whenever I see a marine like DAN BREWSTER, of Maryland, who fought there, I feel like taking off my hat to him. Of course, I readily accept the fact that both he and Senator CANNON have views and conclusions somewhat different from mine. I know both of them and many other Senators will express those views later this year.

It was not a correct statement for anyone to assert that the Vietnam situation and the conflict there had not been debated in the last Congress; and it is fair to assume that it will be fully debated in the final session of this Congress. It deserves to receive more attention and no doubt will receive more attention, than any other issue.

I yield the floor.

BILLBOARDS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, last year Congress enacted the so-called billboard bill, or highway beautification bill, which many of us criticized vigorously and tried to correct in many different ways in order to make it a workable law.

I do not believe the purpose of anyone in this area is too different. My own record in that regard, when this first matter came up, with the Senator from Oregon, Richard Neuberger, is very clear. The two of us supported the measure on the floor at that time.

However, as everyone knows, the bill was hastily rewritten over the weekend and did not reflect the bill which the committee had reported, nor did it reflect, in my opinion, the will of the majority of the Senate, although the majority of the Senate voted for it.

A tremendous amount of pressure was brought on the Senate from down the street, and it was changed when it was taken up. As a consequence, as I have pointed out many times since, it is filled with faults. It is filled with errors, and it will have to be rewritten completely someday.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point an article written by William Logan and appearing in the Rocky Mountain News of December 10, 1965, which points out a few of the problems that are beginning to rise in our own State, although it refers to other States in this, as a result of the hasty and ill-considered action that was taken on that bill.

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

The article is as follows:

COLORADO BILLBOARD CONTROLS EXAMINED BY FEDERAL COURTS

(By William Logan, Rocky Mountain News writer)

The courts are going to have to decide whether Colorado and 21 other States that have championed highway billboard controls now face a prospect of being penalized in Federal funds for their efforts, State highway department officials believe.

Colorado was among States that agreed under the original 1958 Federal law to use its police powers to control signboards under Federal standards. Last spring's legislature enacted a law to control billboards that became effective July 1.

The new highway beauty bill of the Johnson administration, enacted after the Colorado law became effective, requires "just compensation" be paid to billboard owners when signs are removed.

The Federal Government will pay 75 percent of the cost of removing signs and States must pay 25 percent, under the Federal law.

CAN BE PENALIZED

Any State that refuses to pay—or that refuses to control billboards—can be penalized up to 10 percent of its Federal road funds, under the new U.S. law.

Many of the States that earlier enacted antibillboard legislation have listed the signs as public nuisances and have laws that prohibit payments to owners for removal of nuisances.

Colorado, in a series of notices just going into the mails to owners of signs found in violation by the highway department, is directing the owners to remove them.

The State isn't planning to pay costs for removal, but isn't terming them nuisances either. The notices merely state the signs are in violation of the new State law and ask their removal.

MOST NOTICES

Darrell Vail, highway department maintenance engineer, said most of the notices mailed thus far concern signboards erected since the law took effect "and are clearly in violation."

Notices will be mailed shortly to owners of signs put up earlier, ordering their removal, he said. Each highway department maintenance district is charged with enforcing the law in its territory.

Vail believes the fact Colorado is just beginning to enforce its law probably will mean the State can receive 75 percent of sign removal costs from the Federal Government.

But it's up to the courts to decide the whole course of the antibillboard legislation, he said.

A test case is pending in Denver District Court involving a sign on Interstate Highway 80S, about 5 miles northeast of Brush, a section of interstate highway that opened this fall along new right of way.

UNREASONABLE?

Fred Efken, motel operator and plaintiff, represented by Denver Lawyer C. Hamilton Evans, charges the State's antibillboard law is an unreasonable invasion of private rights, deprives persons of use of property without due process of law, is unconstitutional and is an unlawful delegation of legislative power to an administrative body.

Vail said the question of whether the highway department will have to compensate owners for their costs of removing signs also is raised through the suit.

ELIMINATE PROBLEM

The Wisconsin Highway Commission brought up the compensation problem recently when it asked the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads if Wisconsin would be penalized for not compensating sign owners whose billboards were scheduled for removal before the new Federal law went into effect.

BPR assured Wisconsin that billboards termed illegal under State law can be torn down without any compensation to their owners.

Wisconsin Democratic Senators WILLIAM PROXMIRE and GAYLORD NELSON are planning

to try to eliminate the problem by introducing amendments to kill out the compensation provisions in the Federal law.

A BPR official told reporters in Washington the new Federal law shatters State police powers.

If a State must pay for removal of a sign termed a nuisance, he asked, why shouldn't it pay the owner to close a house of prostitution, also a public nuisance?

Other States with billboard control laws are Ohio, Illinois, New Hampshire, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, and West Virginia.

Vail said although the 1958 Federal law paid States a bonus of one-half of 1 percent of its Federal highway funds for enacting billboard control laws, Colorado didn't remove any billboards before the new Federal law replaced it.

EARLIER ESTIMATES

There earlier were estimates the State could receive $400,000 to $1 million for controlling billboards, but this is now eliminated, Vail said.

He said, however, BPR officials have told the highway department the present Colorado law appears sufficient to prevent the State from being penalized in highway funds under the new Federal statute.

Enforcement of the Colorado law is placed with the highway commission. It has declared all 948 miles of the State's Interstate Highway System and about half the State's 9,000 miles of State highways as scenic areas from which billboards must be removed.

After the commission's declaration, the highway department surveyed all highways in the State, listing signboards in violation. An injunction following filing of the suit halted all enforcement operations for several weeks, but now has been lifted.

Mr. ALLOTT. I quote particularly one paragraph.

A BPR official told reporters in Washington the new Federal law shatters State police powers.

There is no question in my mind that parts of the bill are flatly and uncontradictorily unconstitutional, and we shall have to do on this bill the same thing that we will have to do on much of the legislation passed by the Congress last session, and that is to rewrite it at a slower pace so that it can be made workable.

NATIONAL WILD RIVERS SYSTEM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1446) to reserve certain public lands for a National Wild Rivers System, to prove a procedure for adding public lands and other lands to the system, and for other purposes.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the pending bill before the Senate is S. 1446. May I inquire if the Senate is now out of the morning hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. The pending legislation is S. 1446, and it pertains to national wild rivers. The title is, "To reserve certain public lands for a national wild rivers system, to provide a procedure for adding additional public lands and other lands to the system, and for other purposes."

This comes in the same category as much legislation we have had during the past year. The bill is cosponsored by quite a number of Senators. I have not stopped to count them but it is cosponsored by a significant number of Senators. It follows, generally, the concept of the wilderness measure, as it proposes to set aside certain areas of the country which have rivers running through them which are essentially of the wilderness type, or primitive type areas—and I am using those words in a broad general sense—and to retain such river areas in that fashion in the future.

I do not believe any member of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has any quarrel with the desirability of setting aside certain areas for this purpose. But since nearly all of the areas in the West have generally the same burden, I believe it pertinent to point out the problems which have afflicted the West for many years with respect to water, with which the eastern part of the country is just now becoming fully acquainted. Because there are problems in this bill which should be explored and discussed, and because it is necessary for the senior Senator from Colorado to be in his own State next week on official business—commitments that have been made for some time—I wish to discuss one or two of these matters very briefly today.

On page 14 of the bill, section 2(b) reads:

DEFINITION OF WILD RIVER AREA

(b) A wild river area eligible to be included in the System is a stream or section of a stream, tributary, or river—and the related adjacent land area—that should be left in its free-flowing condition, or that should be restored to such condition, in order to promote sound water conservation, and promote the public use and enjoyment of the scenic, fish, wildlife, and outdoor recreation values.

It will be seen that this is a definition of a wild river area; and no matter what language occurs in connection with wild rivers subsequently in the bill, we cannot avoid the definition of a wild river area as set forth in section 2(b) in these words—"that should be left in its free-flowing condition or that should be restored to such condition."

That is a cloud on anything inserted in the bill subsequently as an invasion of property rights in water and the ownership of water or the personal property or real property rights of an individual in the right to use that water.

This matter was discussed at some length in the committee, and when I say this I am not attempting in any way to try to belittle the efforts of the other members of the committee who wholeheartedly supported this bill. But the cold facts are that the problems involved concern not only all of the national water laws that we have or laws pertaining to water, but they involve the water laws of each and every State in the reclamation States particularly, which will be involved.

It might be significant to point out generally where these are.

Section 3(a) sets up five areas, two in Idaho, one in Oregon, one in New Mexico, and one in Missouri.

Then as we read through the bill, we find that other areas are set up for study; namely, Tennessee, West Virginia, Wyoming, New York, Montana, Nebraska, Washington, New York, and Pennsylvania in one section, Wisconsin, Georgia, and Florida together, and Maryland and Pennsylvania again together. So as this subject and concept progress, it is evident that a good portion of the country will be involved in the questions that are raised concerning wild river areas. As I say, they are raised immediately by the definition of "wild river areas," to which I have just referred.

I shall read the two clauses in the bill that create the major problem, because I think they are highly important. The first is section 5(d), which is as follows:

The jurisdiction of the States and the United States over waters of any stream included in a wild river area shall be determined by established principles of law.

That is the jurisdiction. I continue to read:

Under the provisions of this Act, any taking by the United States of a water right which is vested under either State or Federal law at the time such river is included in the Wild Rivers System shall entitle the owner thereof to just compensation. Nothing in this Act shall constitute an express or implied claim or denial on the part of the Federal Government as to exemption from State water laws.

Section 5(h) reads as follows:

Designation of any stream or portion thereof shall not be construed as a reservation of the waters of such streams for purposes other than those specified in this Act, or in quantities greater than necessary to accomplish these purposes.

Minority views were filed with respect to the bill. The minority stated:

The jurisdiction of the States over waters of any stream included in a Wild River area should not be affected by the passage of this bill. The Federal Government should be required to comply with State laws when acquiring water rights or vested interests therein.

It is true that each State has its own provisions. I am speaking particularly of, and my discussion will relate particularly and solely to, the Western States, not to the water law, generally, of the Eastern States or the South.

The bill, especially the two paragraphs which I have just read, together with the definition, constitutes an imposition of new Federal law upon water rights in the river or rivers in which the Federal Government may establish a wild river area. I should like to cite an example, because I want to be exact as to what will happen or what could happen under the bill as it is now constituted.

Assume an average virgin riverflow of 1,000 cubic feet of water per second and perfected diversion water rights above the designated wild river area of 300 cubic feet per second of consumptive use, including credit for return flow. Assume that the Secretary makes a reservation of 700 cubic feet of water per second

for the wild river area. Of course, that would be below the prescribed diversion rights. What would happen in a year of water shortage?

Let us assume that the riverflow is only 600 cubic feet per second in a particular year of shortage. The purpose of section 5(h) of the bill, on page 27, is to make certain that the Secretary will not reserve more water than is necessary, and that the water will be open to appropriation once it has left the wild river area.

Let us assume that the Secretary has made a finding that 700 cubic feet a second is necessary for the purposes of the act. Obviously, under the example I have given, where the river has a flow of only 600 cubic feet a second, it is already short 100 cubic feet per second. Inasmuch as the wild river area was established by Federal law, which has declared certain policies relative to the maintenance of free-flowing streams, the courts would most likely determine that a superior right had been vested in the Secretary, or the United States, despite the fact that the irrigators have had rights adjudicated and decreed for many years. Therefore, the irrigators upstream from the wild river area would not be permitted to divert water, since their diversion of water would further diminish the flow through the wild river area, which is already below what the Secretary had determined to be the necessary flow through the wild river.

However, because of section 5(h), the irrigator downstream from the wild river would still be able to divert the full flow of the river coming out of the wild river area. The decreed rights of the irrigators upstream, or at least a part of them, may be senior to the decreed rights of those downstream from the wild river; yet in operation, their rights are made junior to all the irrigators downstream. However, they are not actually made junior by the provisions of the bill. The bill is drafted and written in such a way that there is a grave question whether a court could so find, if the question came before it.

From what I have said, it is evident that the enactment of the bill in its present form would do tremendous mischief to established water law and could do irreparable damage to vested water rights—damage which may or may not be compensable. Most likely it would not be compensable, since a drought is an act of God.

Furthermore, the downstream irrigator would have his water right improved by the operation of law, if the bill became law.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SIMPSON. I am much interested in what the Senator from Colorado is saying about the bill. As he knows, we have worked together on it in committee.

Would it not be the interpretation of the Senator from Colorado that any commitments made against our river streams in Colorado and Wyoming would be subject to the wild river bill, even though there is a commitment for delivery of water at Lee Ferry under the Colorado River compact?

Mr. ALLOTT. I believe they would. Actually, if there should be an attempt to establish wild river areas in any of the tributaries of the Colorado River, the effect, in my opinion, would be to rewrite not only the Colorado River compact, but also the Upper Colorado River Basin compact, without benefit of the participation of the States which are parties to them.

Mr. SIMPSON. I agree with the Senator's statement. I wanted to be certain that that was made adequately plain for the RECORD.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the distinguished Senator from Wyoming. He is a valued Member of this body. He has practiced law in Wyoming for many years, and besides having had a distinguished career as Governor of his State and as Senator, he is one of the most knowledgeable and capable lawyers, not only in Wyoming, but in the West, particularly with respect to water law, which he knows so well. Therefore, his remarks are well founded and are of great help to me.

Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from California offered an amendment which I understand is satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior. I can understand fully why the Secretary of the Interior would be satisfied with this particular amendment.

In my opinion—and I have discussed this with the senior Senator from California—this amendment does not meet the very objection that the senior Senator from California raised repeatedly in committee, and about which he is concerned. He believes that this amendment, if agreed to, would remove his problems, which are the problems I have just been discussing.

The amendment which, I believe, is printed, or, perhaps it will be offered and printed Monday, is as follows:

On page 27, line 9, add a new subsection (i), as follows:

"The jurisdiction of the States over the waters of any stream included in a wild river area shall be unaffected by this Act to the extent that such jurisdiction may be exercised without impairing the objectives of this Act or its administration."

Mr. President, I have been a lawyer concerned with water matters for over 35 years. I must confess that this particular section leaves me in a total state of confusion. I do not know what it means. Of one thing I am reasonably certain, and that is that the objectives which the senior Senator from California wants to accomplish, which are also my objectives, would not be accomplished by this section. This amendment would only serve, in my opinion, to further complicate the problems that will now arise as we discuss this matter.

Therefore, Mr. President, at this point I send to the desk an amendment which would provide as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 475

On page 27, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following new subsection:

"(i) Other provisions of this Act notwithstanding, whenever either Secretary shall reserve any portion of the waters of a stream for the purposes of this Act he shall comply with the laws of the State with respect to water and water rights, and any rights perfected under the applicable State laws shall be subject to State law with respect to the allocation of waters in years of shortage."

Mr. President, this amendment would clear up the mumbo jumbo that is now in the bill. I do not say this disrespectfully in the least, but I believe that the confusion would be added to by the amendment offered by the senior Senator from California.

I have submitted this amendment to clear the matter up and to make it crystal clear that the Federal Government cannot by this act come in and usurp water which has already been placed to a consumptive, beneficial use, and which is now being used, and on which persons and residents of that State have already perfected their property rights.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. I compliment the Senator again with respect to the amendment. I should like to be considered a cosponsor of the amendment along with the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I should be very happy to have the distinguished Senator from Wyoming listed as a cosponsor of the amendment.

I send to the desk the amendment and ask that it may be printed and lie on the desk today for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). The amendment will be received, and, as requested, will lie on the desk.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I believe that this amendment is absolutely necessary to determine the rights of the Federal Government and State governments with respect to water.

The Senator from Colorado is giving a very clear dissertation on all aspects of the question.

Did I understand the Senator to say that he would not be present during the ensuing week?

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SIMPSON. Would it be permissible for me to call up the amendment?

Mr. ALLOTT. It would be entirely agreeable.

Mr. SIMPSON. The Green River in Wyoming was originally included in the bill. It was eliminated in the committee due to my protest. We are just as vitally interested in the question now because we go on the assumption that the Federal agencies cannot outwit us, but they can outwait us.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is correct. If the bill were to be passed in its present form, I believe that, rather than accomplish the purpose which most of us have, of preserving the State law and rights with respect to these rivers, we shall have given the Secretary of the Interior an opening in which to place a great big foot leading toward the establishment of the kind of rights that the administration wants over the river systems of this country.

This is a very important point. I am afraid that with this bill as it now stands, even with the amendment of the Senator from California, we would be actually increasing and strengthening the position

of the Secretary of the Interior on the claim of the United States to these waters, rather than keeping them under the jurisdiction of the State law, where they belong by virtue of the approval of the constitutions of the States of Colorado, Wyoming, and other Western States, all of which constitutions have specific provisions, supported by statute, as to where the ownership of the water lies, and how the water shall be administered and handled.

Mr. President, I believe that I have stated the case reasonably well. It was necessary that such a statement be made at this time.

The incursions of the Federal Government on our water system and our water courses in the West have been constant. The attempts to control them have been constant.

I am sorry to say that the attempted controls have not always been wise. However, at any rate, we in Colorado feel, as do most Westerners, that the administration of the water and the ownership of the water belong to the State, and that if the Federal Government wants to acquire title to or use of the water, as would be the case under this bill, it should comply with the laws of the State, as any other person would have to do.

There is no valid reason, except the pride of the executive department, the Department of the Interior, and the Attorney General, why they should not do so.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from attendance at the sessions of the Senate during the ensuing week so that I may attend to official business in the State of Colorado.

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

VETERAN ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE EMPLOYEE RETIRES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, during the recess of Congress it was announced in Montana that one of the veterans in the electric cooperative movement was retiring. Max Mathews managed the Yellowstone Valley Electric Cooperative for 25 years and was a true pioneer in the movement before that time.

Max Mathews has been a friend for many years and it was a great pleasure working with him on matters of importance to the rural electric cooperative movement and issues of general importance to the State. In the instance of one cooperative its total investment has grown from $200,000 to over $3 million under the guidance of Max Mathews.

I wish Max and his wife every success in their retirement, knowing full well that they will continue their active interests particularly in programs involving the youth of our State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks an editorial appearing in the November 1965 Pacific Northwest Public Power Bulletin.

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

MAX MATHEWS RETIRES

Max Mathews, manager of Yellowstone Valley Electric Cooperative since 1940 and a member of Northwest Public Power Association's board of trustees since 1961, retired October 1, 1965.

Honoring Mathew's long service, the Montana Associated Utilities annual meeting in Missoula, October 6–7, adopted a resolution recognizing Max as "dean of Montana rural electric cooperative managers."

One of the organizers of MAU and long active in NRECA Mathews is devoted to rural electrification and has offered his services to the AID program. He says he wants to go wherever coal-oil lamps are used—and watch the countryside light up as it has in Montana.

Max pioneered in the rural electric cooperative movement, setting the first pole for rural electricity in Montana in 1937. As REA construction superintendent he helped build the first four electric cooperatives in Montana: Yellowstone Valley, Lower Yellowstone, Vigilante, and Park.

During the 25 years Max has managed Yellowstone Valley, the co-op has grown from 990 consumers and 337 miles of line to 3,300 consumers and 1,275 miles of line. Total investment has grown from $200,000 to $3,376,242.

Max has always taken a keen interest in youth programs and the cooperative has sponsored Future Farmers of America and 4–H Clubs. It was one of the organizers of Montana Youth Electric Fair. Since 1947 the co-op has hired four college students during the summer months each year.

We join in the MAU resolution as it closes with "heartfelt thanks and best wishes for the future" to Max and Mrs. Mathews.

REPLY TO CRITICISM OF CIA

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, for some years now I have been privileged to sit on the special subcommittee which deals with the work of the CIA. Throughout my service on the subcommittee I have been impressed by the dedication of the people working in that agency and by the skill with which they have carried out their very difficult and important jobs. We know that from time to time criticism of the CIA is heard. Unfortunately the many successes of the agency are seldom mentioned in the press and often are not even known since publicity might endanger the success of future programs and even the lives of those carrying them out. On the other hand, when the CIA's judgment appears faulty, sharp criticism sometimes follows.

A recent article which appeared in the Washington Star and other newspapers seems to me to outline very well some of the special problems which face the agency. It was written by one of the persons most knowledgeable about the work of the CIA, Carl Rowan, former Director of the USIA and former Ambassador to Finland, who has now returned to his earlier occupation as a syndicated columnist. As Ambassador Rowan points out:

> A good intelligence system has become as crucial to national security as an army, or air force, or an arsenal of powerful weapons.

I think we should recognize the important role which the CIA has played in our national security. I think, too, that we should give credit where credit is due: Over the years the CIA has done a good job in carrying out the tasks assigned to it. I hope it will continue to do so.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Ambassador Rowan's article be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, Dec. 19, 1965]

REPLY TO CRITICISM OF CIA

(By Carl T. Rowan)

Pity the poor old Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). It is the perennial whipping boy of the columnists and Congressmen and of just about every foreign dictator seeking to divert attention from his own crookedness or ineptitude.

As one who knows a bit about CIA (which most of its critics decidedly do not), I get a little sick of seeing it badgered and abused by just about everybody capable of scratching out a sentence or calling a press conference.

Now this may be interpreted as my being in favor of sin (which most people are) but put me on record as saying CIA does a pretty darned good job of protecting not only U.S. security but that of many weaker countries all over the world as well.

True, it makes mistakes. Big ones. But only at about the same rate that the State Department, the Defense Department, the White House or my old agency, the U.S. Information Agency makes booboos.

And you'd be hard pressed to convince me that CIA's ratio of incompetents is any higher than that of the U.S. Senate.

Those who leap to the firing line when they discover it's always open season on CIA seem to ignore one inescapable fact: A good intelligence system has become as crucial to national security as an army, or air force, or an arsenal of powerful weapons.

The foreigners criticizing CIA most (the Russians, President Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana, etc.) know this and nobody expends more effort than they do trying to perfect their cloak and dagger operations.

What we ought not forget is that in many critical situations these last few years, the United States has been able to make the correct decision to guarantee our security because CIA had secured information that our enemies thought we could not possibly possess. The Cuban missiles crisis is an example.

Having said all this, I must concede that CIA is at a critical point in its history. Not only is it scorned the world over, but the standard device for discrediting the Peace Corps, USIA and other American agencies is to link them to the CIA.

During the recent tour of East Africa and southeast Asia, it was made clear to me that suspicion and fear of "the CIA" has become a sort of Achilles heel of American foreign policy.

This may seem to justify the attacks on CIA in Congress and elsewhere but the truth is just the opposite. The home-grown critics are 100 times more to blame for the wild and irrational foreign fear of CIA than is the agency itself.

A Ghana official recently was lamenting the fact that the United States denied a food request because Nkrumah published a book attacking CIA and labeling just about every American who ever put foot in Ghana as a "CIA spy."

"Are you surprised that Americans would react unfavorably to this kind of attack?" I asked.

"We are surprised that you would direct your anger at us," said the Ghana envoy.

"Our President took practically everything he wrote out of American books and other publications."

At a dinner in Lusaka, the Vice President of Zambia began conversation by asking me to give him an appraisal of "The Invisible Government," a book by two of my journalistic colleagues about so-called CIA cloak-and-dagger operations abroad.

I ducked the question by commenting: "I only wish CIA were capable of half the things for which it is blamed or praised."

Several Zambian Cabinet members refused to let me duck, however, and I soon found myself caught in a wild discussion with people who believe fervently that CIA is in the business of overthrowing and installing governments all over the world—without the approval or knowledge of the Secretary of State or the President.

I later learned that every top and middle-level Zambian official had been instructed to read "The Invisible Government," Andrew Tully's book "The CIA," and Morris West's new book "The Ambassador."

I'm not naive enough to suggest that newsmen and authors stop writing about CIA. Our society is naturally intolerant of secrecy (which any good intelligence operation requires), so the questioning and criticism will go on.

But it would sure help if some of the critics conceded that, whether we like clandestine intelligence operations or not, they are indispensable in this crazy, crooked, bellicose world in which we live.

IRON HOSS SHAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Sunday Gazette-Mail State magazine, published in Charleston, W. Va., is a weekly treasure trove of news for and about the Mountain State. The January 2 edition carried an article that is a commentary on past transportation glories in the United States. Entitled "The Wonderful Iron Horse Shay" it delves into the history of the Shay engine used to haul passengers on the Cass Scenic Railroad, originating in Cass, W. Va.

I ask unanimous consent to have this newspaper article by Mr. William C. Blizzard printed in the RECORD.

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

THE WONDERFUL IRON HORSE SHAY—BUILT FOR MOUNTAIN CLIMBING, IT'S SLOW, MIGHTY SLOW ON THE OVERLAND TRIPS

(By William C. Blizzard)

This year the Elkins Forest Festival, plagued by rain and dismal weather, was pulled out of the slough of despond by one of the powerful little logging locomotives admirers call the Wonderful Iron-Hoss Shay.

During the 3-day festival over 4,000 passengers, despite a cold and persistent rain, paid money to take short rides behind the 80-ton Shay locomotive, an antique vehicle which ordinarily chugs up Bald Knob on the Cass Scenic Railroad. Although the miserable weather may have halved the number of paying customers, the little Shay remained a stellar attraction.

It was difficult not to notice the locomotive, for its shrill and penetrating steam whistle bent more eardrums and cleared more sinuses in 3 days than could be inspected by a dozen otolaryngologists in a year of practice. How do you ignore a festival attraction with a sort of built-in calliope which can be heard for 5 miles? You don't, especially if the calliope has only one note, or, at most, two.

There were those who, in self-defense, hauled out midwinter ear muffs; others merely gritted their teeth in silent protest against the dawn-to-dark steam-siren symphony. But most people accepted the locomotive whistle as a mild nuisance indicative of a strong benefit, and were glad the Shay was in town.

Few towns in the United States can boast of the presence of a Shay engine at any time of the year. Informed sources estimate that not more than 40 of the old steam locomotives exist in the United States today, and few of these are any longer able to shake, rattle, and roll. How did such a rare antique happen to be hauling passengers in Elkins during the Forest Festival?

It happened partly because rail lines belonging to the Chesapeake & Ohio and Western Maryland Railroads exist between Cass and Elkins. Four Shay engines are at Cass. During the summer months they (the three that operate) snort and puff on the Cass Scenic Railroad, this season hauling 38,857 paying customers up Bald Knob for 4 miles and back again.

Last year, someone had the idea of bringing one of the Cass Shays to Elkins for the Forest Festival, where the public would be treated to short rides for a small fee. The idea was a happy one: The Shay was a sooty Cinderella who became the belle of the ball.

It was decided to repeat the Shay performance for the 1965 Elkins Forest Festival, and the department of natural resources, which owns the Shays, agreed. Further, someone thought it might be a good idea to invite the press and other guests for the 60-mile ride, as the Shay shimmies, from Cass to Elkins.

This was done. About 2 dozen passengers accompanied Shay No. 4, followed by several passenger flatcars and a caboose, as it left Cass about 9:30 on the morning of October 6.

The ride, interrupted by three watering stops (for the locomotive, not the passengers) and another stop for minor repairs, took a bit longer than anticipated. It was about 6:30, and getting dark, when the little Shay crept into Elkins. Maximum speed had been about 8 miles an hour.

The 2 dozen who had started the trip at Cass had, at the Elkins finish line, dwindled to something less than half that number. Of those who stayed all the way with the Shay, four were women. They were Mrs. Violet Snedegar of Elkins; Mrs. Mabel Fretwell of Buckhannon; Katherine McMullen of Milwaukee, Wis., editor of Better Camping magazine; and Rosemary Entringer, also of Milwaukee, managing editor of Trains magazine.

Inasmuch as the 60-mile trip from Cass to Elkins took about 9 hours, it may fairly be deduced that the Shay is the tortoise of the locomotive world. What, then are its virtues?

Its principal virtue today is its remarkable popularity as a novelty railroad tourist attraction. In West Virginia, North Carolina (where one Shay still serves as a common carrier), South Dakota, Pennsylvania, New Hampshire, and, possibly, elsewhere, Shays and similar, geared-type locomotives built to compete with the Shay operate on tourist railroads. Shay production, begun in 1879, ceased in 1945.

The principal virtues of the Shay in its heyday were its traction and power, its safety, and its economy. Authorities in the field agree that the Shay would haul greater tonnage at a smaller operating expense, with less original cost per unit of power, than any other locomotive ever built.

The little engines were named for Ephriam Shay of Haring, Mich. Shay was a 19th-century Michigan lumberman who sought better ways of geting timber out of the woods. In his seeking, he invented and built the locomotive that bears his name. His crude prototype worked so well at his own operations that he took his plans and patents to the Lima (pronounced lime-uh) Machine Works of Lima, Ohio, urging that company to make such locomotives for widespread use in the timbering business.

Shay's visit was fortunate for the Lima Machine Works. The company made the first Shay in 1879 for the J. Alley Co. of Michigan. The Alley machine was narrow gage, but as demand for the Shays increased, Lima made them bigger and better. By 1900, Lima had quite general machine production and was concentrating on locomotives. The company changed its name to Lima Locomotive Works, Inc.

Lima made conventional locomotives as well as the Shays, increasing work in the former field as the lumbering industry demand declined in importance. Lima produced its last Shay, the 2,761st, in 1945.

The Shay engine had competitors built on similar "geared" principles. The major ones were the Heisler and the Climax.

The last Heisler, a locomotive invented by a Cornell engineer named Charles Heisler, was manufactured in 1941, and Climax went out of business in 1929.

The Shay and its imitators differed from conventional steam locomotives in that they were designed to haul heavy loads on steep grades. Called geared engines, as opposed to general-purpose, main-line locomotives which used connecting rods from drive wheels to pistons, the Shay had a number of small wheels which afforded great traction because each was a driving wheel.

On main-line engines, the number of drive wheels varied, but they were relatively large in diameter, heavy, and demanded smooth track which in turn required constant maintenance. Additional small wheels on the big steamers held up weight and served as rail guides, but otherwise were functionless.

Not so on the Shay. The wheel sets (called trucks) under both locomotive and tender are connected to steam cylinders transmitting power through a crankshaft and flexible couplings. Every wheel does work.

The Shay is easy to get around curves, is easy on track, and can adapt to rough roadbeds that would stall or wreck conventional locomotives. The Shay is slow, but it could pull tons of logs up a grade three times as steep as a rod-engine locomotive could ascend, and safely get the same tonnage down the steep grade on the other side of the hill.

With the demise of the U.S. logging industry as it was in its heyday, the Shay virtues found no niche they could fill, and manufacture ceased.

According to John P. Killoran of the department of natural resources, who has made himself an authority in such matters (and who furnished the technical data for this article), the last three geared locomotives ever built spent their entire work careers in West Virginia, and all three still exist.

They are not now, however, in the Mountain State. One, a Shay that was operated by the Western Maryland on a steep coal-haul in Tucker County, is now displayed at the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad's Transportation Museum in Baltimore, Md.

The last Climax to be manufactured now hauls passengers on the Carroll Park and Western tourist railroad at Bloomsburg, Pa. It was an iron-horse work horse for the Elk River Coal & Lumber Co. out of Swandale, Clay County.

The last Heisler locomotive ever built is now on display in the public park of Washington, N.C., Charles Heisler's hometown, but it spent its working career as No. 6 of the Middle Fork Railroad at Ellamore, in Randolph County.

Of the four Shays at Cass Nos. 5 and 1 were built in 1905, No. 7 was built in 1920, and No. 4 in 1923. The Lima Locomotive Works, merged with the huge Baldwin Locomotive

Works of Philadelphia in 1950, not only has quit making Shays, but no longer builds locomotives of any kind.

Lima now builds power shovels, an adjustment to market conditions which are a reflection of the changed manner in which many men wrest a livelihood from their environment.

The few operating Shays which yet exist at Cass and elsewhere carry not only tourist passengers. For old loggers and railroad men they also carry endless vivid memories of a vanished past.

DEATH OF FOREIGN CORRESPONDENT MARGUERITE HIGGINS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the well-known foreign correspondent, Miss Marguerite Higgins, who died in Walter Reed Hospital on Monday, January 3.

I consider Miss Higgins one of the greatest foreign correspondents of our time.

For me, Miss Higgins' passing is a personal loss which leaves the world a much emptier place.

I first came to know her during the Nuremburg trial, when she was covering Germany for the New York Herald Tribune. Although she was then very young as foreign correspondents go, even at that early date she commanded recognition as one of the ablest members of the American press corps in Germany.

In the 20-odd years that have elapsed since the Nuremberg trial she has many times covered herself with glory and brought credit to her profession.

Miss Higgins was not merely a correspondent with rare powers of observation and political understanding. She was a person of absolute integrity, who somehow managed to retain both her warm heart and her idealism in a profession that all too frequently makes for cynicism.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to insert into the RECORD the obituary article on Miss Marguerite Higgins which appeared in the New York Times for January 4, 1966.

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

MARGUERITE HIGGINS DIES AT 45—REPORTER WON 1951 PULITZER PRIZE—KOREA CORRESPONDENT WON FAME FOR STORIES FROM FRONT—SYNDICATED COLUMNIST

WASHINGTON, January 3.—Marguerite Higgins, the columnist and war correspondent who won a Pulitzer Prize in 1951 for her frontline reports from Korea, died today in Walter Reed Army Hospital. She was 45 years old.

Miss Higgins had been confined to the hospital for 2 months, suffering from a rare tropical ailment she picked up on a recent tour of Vietnam, Pakistan, and India. Doctors said she had died of complications apparently caused by a tropical parasite.

She was the wife of Lieut. Gen. William E. Hall, USAF, retired.

She also leaves a son, Lawrence O'Higgins Hall, a daughter, Linda Marguerite Hall, and her mother, Mrs. Marguerite Higgins, of Oakland, Calif.

A funeral service will be held Friday at 10:45 a.m. at the Fort Myer Chapel, Arlington, Va. Burial will be in Arlington National Cemetery.

SCORED IN A MAN'S WORLD

Marguerite Higgins got stories other reporters didn't get.

She did it with a combination of masculine drive, feminine wiles, and professional pride. She had brass and she had charm, and she used them to shoot right to the top of a profession that usually relegates women to the softie beats of cooking, clothes, and society.

Miss Higgins made it big in a way any man would be proud of. She won a Pulitzer Prize for her reports from the Korean warfronts for the New York Herald Tribune, after she fought her way into that war over the objections of an American general.

She sat across the polished desks in the world's capitals and crossed ideas with De Gaulle, Khrushchev, Chiang-Kai-shek, and Tito.

She was with the Allied troops in Europe in World War II, and sometimes in advance of them, to cover the liberation of the concentration camps at Buchenwald and Dachau and the capture of Hitler's mountaintop hideaway at Berchtesgaden.

And in the final illness of her life, despite raging fevers and a debilitating blood ailment, she continued to turn out her three-times-a-week column for Newsday and 92 other newspapers. She agreed to cut her work to one column a week only in the last 2 weeks of her illness.

There was steel in Marguerite Higgins' character, but it was concealed in a feminine figure, and the femininity always showed, even when she was slogging along the muddy roads of Korea in baggy pants and a man's shirt with her blond curls tucked into an Army fatigue hat.

A colleague who remembered Miss Higgins as a cub reporter at the Herald Tribune said she had often endured broken fingernails, torn stockings, and carbon paper smudges on her nose, but what he remembered best was her bright blue eyes.

Miss Higgins won her job at the Herald Tribune in a characteristic way. She was a student at Columbia University's Graduate School of Journalism in 1942 and at the same time was hoping for a job while serving as the newspaper's campus correspondent.

INTERVIEWED MRS. CHIANG

She heard that Mrs. Chiang Kai-shek was a patient at the Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center and had refused to see reporters or grant interviews. Miss Higgins got to Mrs. Chiang's room, got her story—and her job.

Miss Higgins was born in Hong Kong in 1920. Her father was Larry Daniel Higgins, a veteran of the Army Flying Corps. Her mother was a Frenchwoman, the former Marguerite Goddard. The family lived abroad for many years and Miss Higgins obtained her early education in French and English schools.

She was graduated with honors from the University of California in 1941 and then worked briefly for the Vallejo (Calif.) Times-Herald.

This first brush with journalism confirmed her intention to become a reporter. She enrolled at Columbia and received a master's degree in 1942.

During the next 2 years, Miss Higgins covered fires in New Jersey, circus disasters in Connecticut, and women's war efforts in New York. All the time, she begged for a chance to cover the war overseas. Her chance came in 1944, when she was sent to the Herald Tribune's London bureau and then to Paris because of her fluency in French.

It was in this period that Miss Higgins' bylines began appearing in New York over stories on the triumphant march of the Allied armies across Europe to Berlin. In 1945, at the age of 25, she was appointed chief of her newspaper's Berlin bureau.

But it was her reports on the Korean war that made her a national figure. Miss Higgins was sent to Japan as the Herald Tribune's Far Eastern correspondent in 1950, shortly before North Korean troops crossed into South Korea and began their drive to Seoul.

ORDERED OUT OF COUNTRY

She was ordered to leave Korea, along with all other American women, by Lt. Gen. Walton H. Walker. The general explained "This is just not the type of war where women ought to be running around the front lines."

Miss Higgins was outraged. She put her case to General of the Army Douglas MacArthur and he rescinded the order the next day. Miss Higgins returned to Korea and began filing the stories that won her the Pulitzer Prize. Later, she wrote a bestselling book on her experiences, "War in Korea: The Report of a Woman Combat Correspondent."

She did not forget her brushes with the military. "I have observed that the main effect of military public relations officers is to hamper correspondents," she said in her book.

Miss Higgins remained in the Far East until 1958, when she returned to this country to be a diplomatic correspondent in Washington. She became a columnist for Newsday, the Long Island daily newspaper, in 1962 and her syndicated reports began appearing from trouble spots all over the world.

In her last column, published on Friday, Miss Higgins criticized President Johnson for treating the war in Vietnam as a "pesky but peripheral one in an atmosphere of business as usual."

"What now seems to have dawned on the President and his advisers," she wrote, "is that Hanoi is in the south for keeps. An awareness of this within the administration has led to the unhappy conclusion that priorities must be established and that many elaborate hopes of the Great Society have to be minimized."

In 1952 she was married to General Hall. In recent years they made their home in the Georgetown section of Washington.

Miss Higgins won a flood of awards during her career. Ten years ago, on the publication of another book, "News Is a Singular Thing," she added up the plaques, certificates and prizes that had been awarded to her and found they came to 50. After that she stopped counting.

Perhaps the best tribute to her came in a letter of complaint about one of her stories from Korea. The story was incomplete, an Army colonel wrote, because it did not mention Miss Higgins' personal activities.

"Completely disregarding her own personal safety [she] voluntarily assisted by administering blood plasma to the many wounded as they were carried into the temporary aid station. This aid station was subjected to small-arms fire throughout the attack.

"The regimental combat team considers Miss Higgins' actions on that day as heroic, but even more important is the gratitude felt by members of the command toward the selfless devotion of Miss Higgins in saving the lives of many grievously wounded men."

A FOUR-POINT POVERTY PROGRAM

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on January 10, I issued a statement in which I proposed a four-point legislative program to help salvage the war on poverty. I ask unanimous consent that my statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY U.S. SENATOR HUGH SCOTT, JANUARY 10, 1966

America is the richest Nation history has known, yet millions of Americans are

trapped in the dead end street of poverty through illiteracy, lack of basic skills, racial discrimination, broken homes, age, and ill health. Such conditions are hardly touched by the general economic growth and affluence of our society.

That is why I supported the war on poverty.

I voted for the declaration of war against poverty in 1964, and I voted to escalate that war last year.

I supported that effort because, despite our enormous agricultural surpluses, about 2,000 Americans still die yearly from diseases of malnutrition, and many American children still go to bed with empty stomachs.

I supported that effort because more than 34 million Americans have been estimated as living in poverty or near poverty. Fifteen million of them are children and over 5 million are old people.

From the wornout country hollows of Appalachia to the gray slums of our big cities, America's poor huddle in hopelessness and despair, and many Americans do not even know they are there.

Poverty is the real trojan horse in our midst. It insidiously gnaws away at our ideals of equality and often makes a mockery of American democracy in the eyes of a watching world.

Our battle with communism in Vietnam dominates the headlines today, and is consuming American lives and resources. But it would be an empty victory if we won the war against communism overseas and lost the war on poverty here at home.

And I fear that we are losing the war on poverty.

The war on poverty, as administered from Washington by the Office of Economic Opportunity and implemented at the local level by community groups, is distinguished today not for its accomplishments, but for its failures. The war on poverty has degenerated into a nightmare of bureaucratic bungling, overly paid administrators, poorly organized fieldworkers, and partisan politics.

These developments would be serious enough in any Federal program. But its real tragedy is that in this program money that should be going to the poor is not reaching the poor, because the principal concern among too many people in the war on poverty today is simply: Who is going to control the loot?

This was expressed most poignantly by the Reverend Lynward Stevenson, head of a local community organization in Chicago, who said:

"The records are full of direct political patronage. How do you think we poor feel when we know that men who drive Cadillacs, eat 3-inch steaks, and sip champagne at luncheon meetings, discuss our future while we are pushed off the highways of self-help and told to keep our hats in hand?"

THE OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

The Economic Opportunity Act is administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), whose Director is Sargent Shriver. The original legislation enacted in August 1964, authorized appropriations of $947.5 million for fiscal 1965. It was extended in August of last year through fiscal 1968 and appropriations of $1,785 million for fiscal 1966 were authorized.

Key sections of the act authorize: (1) the OEO to operate a Job Corps to provide work experience and training to youths in conservation camps and urban and rural residential training centers; (2) the domestic peace corps, called the Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA); and (3) the community action program under which the Federal Government financially and technically assists a variety of local "human development" efforts.

I hesitate to place all the blame for the problems of the war on poverty on the shoulders of Sargent Shriver, because he is an able and well-motivated administrator. But since he has retained his position as Director of the Peace Corps, the war on poverty has been run by a part-time general.

Moreover, as the minority members of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee pointed out, in the OEO there is 1 supergrade (highly paid) official for every 18 ordinary Government employees. For purposes of comparison, there is 1 supergrade employee for every 1,000 Government employees in the Department of Defense, and 1 supergrade for every 500 employees in the Department of Agriculture.

With all these chiefs to supervise so few "Indians" it is unfortunate that they have not found more time to supervise some of the projects in various other parts of the country which have been using Federal money to implement the war on poverty.

For instance, I have never seen an explanation for this type of lopsided development in the Job Corps:

One of two brothers from an Indiana community, recently was serving under enemy fire in Vietnam, while the other brother became a school dropout, having beat up his mother and his teacher. The brother in Vietnam was being paid $78 per month, while the dropout was being given $200 monthly by the Job Corps for running a lawnmower.

Nor for these costly attempts at news management:

Jack Steele of the Scripps-Howard newspapers reported that in the St. Petersburg Women's Job Corps Center no officer may talk to the press without reporting the conversation by long-distance telephone to Washington.

LEGISLATION

However, it serves little purpose to cite isolated instances of problems in the war on poverty. Nor would one accomplish much merely by suggesting that some vague changes in the administration of the programs would end the turmoil.

Rather, I propose to discuss specific faults within the war on poverty and make legislative recommendations which might bring the war back to its main objective: defeating poverty which besets so much of America.

COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

The most frequent problems in the war on poverty seem to occur in the community action program. The CAP has as its functions to (1) coordinate and utilize a broad variety of resources available within a community; (2) provide—through these varied services—projects and assistance to those in need of them; (3) combine in its structure "the maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served;" and (4) be run by either a public or a private nonprofit agency.

But from one end of the Nation to the other there are reports of turmoil in the community action program.

In my own city of Philadelphia, the program first foundered, then floundered, and is still not fully underway.

Community action program agencies come in three basic varieties: (1) existing municipal governments which take on poverty war functions, (2) foundation structures, and (3) nonprofit corporations. Philadelphia tried them all.

First, something called human renewal was set up with 13 city officials as members. It was a paper plan designed to give the mayor control of Federal antipoverty money so it could be used to finance existing municipal departments. When funds were requested, Washington saw through the scheme and said no.

Second, Philadelphia's mayor tried the foundation approach and attempted to work through the Ford Foundation sponsored Philadelphia Council for Community Advancement. But that group had already reduced its staff from 35 to 9, and, despite maneuvers to restaff the organization from city agencies and to use another name, Washington again said no.

Private groups next attempted to set up an agency, but the city government met that threat to their own power by declaring that a nonprofit community action corporation unconnected with city hall would be illegal. This was done despite the fact that such groups were operating and receiving funds in Pittsburgh and Washington, D.C.

Finally, a community action program agency called the Philadelphia Antipoverty Action Committee was established.

Among the first 16 group leaders hired under Philadelphia's poverty program to work with youngsters in the Neighborhood Youth Corps, 13 had arrest records which included larcency, assault and battery, and morals counts involving minors.

In the words of the Greater Philadelphia magazine, "until Philadelphia's poverty program is completely extracted from politics and patronage, the most likely gainers will not be the poor."

Los Angeles furnishes a most tragic example of the ineptitude of the community action program. The mayor has charged that one of the causes of last summer's riot in the Watts district was the "deliberate and well-publicized cutting off of poverty funds to this city, pending our efforts to reorganize the youth opportunities board to meet the chameleonic OEO criteria."

Sargent Shriver responded that "a few local officials have made it extremely difficult for the private agencies, minority groups, and the poor to join in the war."

Then the nonpartisan commission to investigate the Los Angeles riots concluded that one cause of the riots was the widespread publicity about Federal antipoverty funds that for various reasons "did not live up to their press notices" in Los Angeles. Prior to the riots the war on poverty received much publicity but the Watts district had received no aid.

In Chicago, city hall controls the appointment of 42 representatives out of a total of 75 on the committee that operates the local community action program. This has enabled the mayor to maintain iron control over the $21 million which has been received and, in the words of one observer, to use those funds to "oil his political machine."

In New York City, Harlem's poverty agency, Haryou-Act is reportedly unable to account for up to $2 million of the funds it has received in the past year. Its executive director has stepped down temporarily, ostensibly to work full time on the agency's books.

Newark, N.J.'s city councilmen fear that that city's independent community action agency—the United Community Corp.—poses a political threat to them. As of December 7 they were trying to place it under a politically appointed commission. In retaliation, the corporation's president has vowed that the agency "would alter the power structure of the city." While the battle for control in Newark rages on, the poor remain poor.

For whatever the reasons, the Office of Economic Opportunity has been unable to find the answer to these and other problems that plague the community action program. Therefore, I propose that the community action program be removed from that agency and placed in the newly created Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development. Special provisions should be made to protect the interests of rural communities with community action programs.

Administration of this program by the new Cabinet-level Federal Department would take the program out of the "crisis to crisis" and often overly political atmosphere of the OEO and bring its administration into the mainstream of urban planning, development, and renewal.

POLITICS

One of the most prevalent problems in the war on poverty has been its intermixture with partisan political activity. Money designed to help the poor has been diverted instead into helping the "poor" politician.

Early in the program's conception, the Johnson administration delivered to each Democratic Congressman's office a "poverty kit" for use in the 1964 elections. Chairman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL of the House Education and Labor Committee has described the program as "giant fiestas of political patronage."

A director of the privately sponsored Woodlawn Organization of Chicago said during hearings that the list of those running the war on poverty in Chicago read "like a fundraising committee for the Democratic Party."

Syracuse University received a grant to train students who would then organize low-income groups into what have been termed "politically effective citizens." A New York Times writer said the program turned into a pretty specific effort to organize "the poor to fight city hall." Antipoverty funds were used to pay babysitters and hire taxis to register voters in a heavily Democratic public housing area and to transport people to heckle Syracuse Mayor William F. Walsh during his reelection campaign.

Therefore I propose that legislation be enacted that would put under the Hatch Act—and thereby prohibit partisan political activity—those employees of private organizations conducting community action programs whose salaries are in principal part paid from Federal funds.

The Hatch Act already covers the employees of State and local governments who administer programs financed by Federal funds. If we put under the Hatch Act employees being paid through the war on poverty, it would make some of the pork-barrel aspects in the present arrangement far less attractive to the big city political bosses who now tend to confuse the U.S. Treasury Department with their county campaign finance committees.

GOVERNOR'S VETO

The original act of 1964 provided that no community action program, adult basic education program or Neighborhood Youth Corps project could be undertaken in a State if the Governor of that State disapproved the program within 30 days of its submission to him.

Last year the Congress, in a move that I opposed very strongly, emasculated that provision to the effect that the Governors no longer have a veto.

This action was taken despite the fact that the Governors of 49 out of the 50 States opposed such a change. Its net effect was to reduce still further the controls on war on poverty programs, increase the instability of existing local programs, and encourage duplication and waste. In other words, the majority in Congress took the war on poverty one step still further away from helping the poor.

I propose that the Governors be given back the veto power as originally provided in the law.

SALARIES OF POVERTY OFFICIALS

Finally, the salaries paid some officials of the war on poverty have been scandalously high.

One of Chicago's top poverty officials who had previously made $14,000 jumped to $22,500 when he enlisted in the war on poverty. It was recently revealed that the New Jersey director of the program was being paid $25,000 annually, more than any member of the Governor's cabinet. In Washington, D.C., the local poverty war director has been getting $25,000 annually, which is the same amount received by two of the three District Commissioners. Just prior to the riots in the Watts district of Los Angeles, the head of Los Angeles' poverty effort was drawing a salary of $25,000 and his two top assistants were receiving $25,000 and $21,000. But the Watts district had received no aid.

I therefore propose that legislation be enacted that would put reasonable ceilings on all salaries paid under the war on poverty.

NEED FOR ACTION

I do not believe that these legislative proposals are the only ones needed, nor that they, of themselves, will radically change a situation that has deteriorated so seriously. But I believe that the Congress has an obligation to deal forthrightly with problems that are very important to the welfare of our Nation.

There was an inadvertent deception involved in the publicity buildup for the war on poverty. There are many people who, throughout their lives, have been waiting for someone to come along and give them a helping hand.

In the war on poverty they saw hope for the first time, an opportunity to pull themselves up out of the mire of hopelessness—a chance to learn a new trade, give their children a better start than they had themselves, hold their heads a little higher.

But disillusion followed the early promises and—as we saw in the Watts riots—for some this bitter disappointment led to violence and bloodshed. For many others it merely meant a return to the old and bitter ways, back to the alleys that have no exits.

For the sake of these individuals and for the sake of society itself, we must rectify the wrongs done by the maladministration on all levels of the war on poverty, and we must do so promptly.

A GREAT APPOINTMENT—THAT OF ROBERT C. WEAVER, TO HEAD THE NEW DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT.

Mr. GRUENING. President Johnson is to be commended on the excellence of his nomination of Robert C. Weaver as the head of the new Department of Housing and Urban Development. Not only is it an excellent appointment but it is also the best possible choice that could have been made. It happens that I have known Robert Weaver during the somewhat more than 30 years since he first came into the Federal Government. The periods of our public service more or less coincide. For it was in 1934 that he began to work in the Interior Department, shortly before I was appointed the first Director of the Division of Territories and Island Possessions. I became acquainted with Dr. Weaver at that time. Since then, Dr. Weaver, who acquired his doctorate in economics from Harvard University in 1934, has been a specialist in housing and related activities. So he brings to his new and important Cabinet post not only nearly a third of a century of intensive and pertinent experience, but also a record of dedicated and effective performance. The long delay in making this appointment since the Congress created the Department which he is to head, had left some of us who were fully aware of Dr. Weaver's outstanding qualifications of this post troubled at the possibility that he might not be named. Obviously, there were reports and rumors to the effect that President Johnson was looking elsewhere. Fortunately, this suspense which President Johnson apparently enjoys creating has now been happily ended.

We can look forward to a continuation of the outstanding service on the part of Dr. Weaver he has rendered in the past and feel the administration and the Nation are to be warmly congratulated on this choice.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from this morning's January 13 New York Times, entitled "New Man in Cabinet," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

NEW MAN IN CABINET: ROBERT CLIFTON WEAVER

WASHINGTON, January 13.—If the bald, mustached man in the neat gray suit had trouble concealing his pride and pleasure as he walked into the Fish Room of the White House late this afternoon, it was hardly surprising. At his side was the President of the United States and behind him, to a rising murmur of surprise and comprehension from the press corps, walked the members of the President's Cabinet, one by one.

For Robert Clifton Weaver, it was the end of a long, long road, the full measure of recognition for which he had worked and fought, as a Negro, for most of his 58 years in the largely white and often hostile worlds of Government and politics.

After President Johnson described the intricate problems implicit in the new Department of Housing and Urban Development, he turned to the man he had chosen as its first Secretary, grinned and said:

"May the good Lord have mercy on you."

HARDLY NEEDS HELP

Dr. Weaver did not appear in need of such assistance. He seemed, in fact, to be enjoying hugely the fact that he had finally won the highest governmental office ever held by a member of his race—an office that much of official Washington believed he had long since lost any chance at.

In the months that the new Cabinet post was under discussion and the weeks that it remained unfilled, the name of the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency had been moved from the top of the eligible list to the bottom and then stricken off by most students of Johnsonian politics—but never by Dr. Weaver himself.

"Bob Weaver is the smartest politician in Washington who doesn't live in the White House," said one of his jubilant friends after the word was out. "Do you know anybody else who ever turned L.B.J. around?"

The smiling, genial, heavy-set man who stood at the President's right today was the Robert Weaver of warmth and friendly grace who inhabits the social world.

SELF-MADE EXPERT

There is another Dr. Weaver, the Government professional who virtually made himself the urban affairs expert of both his race and his party. That man is a loner, who does not draw his associates close around him, a sort of self-insulated leader.

Often he has needed that insulation to protect himself from his so-called friends. In recent years, ambitious Negro politicians, riding the rising tide of equality, have tried in vain to promote him into a series of elective offices he did not want.

Dr. Weaver's aids pay the highest tribute to his intense personal discipline and dedication to work.

For the new Secretary-designate, service in Washington is an old story. He first came here, with two fresh Harvard degrees, in 1933 to work under Harold L. Ickes in the Department of the Interior.

His job was adviser on Negro affairs to the Secretary, but his activities were far ranging. They included desegregating the employees' cafeteria in the Interior Department with a group of his friends.

Having acquired his doctor's degree in economics from Harvard in 1934, Dr. Weaver worked as a special assistant in the Federal Housing Authority from 1937 to 1940 and with the War Production Board and the War Manpower Commission during World War II.

TAUGHT IN COLLEGE HERE

After the war he taught at Columbia and New York Universities. When W. Averell Harriman was elected Governor of New York in 1956, he first named Dr. Weaver as a deputy State housing commissioner, and later to be State rent administrator.

In the last post, Dr. Weaver became the first Negro to sit in a New York Governor's cabinet.

OF MIDDLE CLASS FAMILY

Dr. Weaver is the product of a tidy, careful, conservative middle-class family. He was born December 29, 1907, in the Brookland outskirts of Washington, the son of a postal clerk. He learned the electrician's trade as a young man and still takes on wiring jobs.

In 1935 he married the former Ella Haith, a drama student at Carnegie Institute of Technology. She is now a teacher and speech therapist at Brooklyn College. Their 22-year-old adopted son, Robert, Jr., shot himself fatally in an apparent accident in 1962.

His friends report that Dr. Weaver turned down two attractive academic job offers while the secretaryship was hanging fire in the White House.

"He could have told the President to go to hell, but he stuck it out and won," a friend said with satisfaction.

WEST VIRGINIA, A GARDEN OF EDEN

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in the midst of the winter weather which is to be the lot of our Nation for the next few weeks, Americans may wish to think ahead to a vacation this spring in the mountains of West Virginia. Perhaps the traveling public will be interested in knowing that at one time West Virginia was believed to be the site of the Garden of Eden by some people.

While as a Mountain-State Senator I do not wish to be so immodest as to claim that my State is a Garden of Eden, I do wish to point out that its attractions have in the past moved some people to so characterize it, as discussed in the November 28, 1965, issue of the Sunday (Charleston, W. Va.) Gazette-Mail State magazine.

I ask unanimous consent to have this newspaper article printed in the RECORD.

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

THE GARDEN OF EDEN (REDISCOVERED) IN FAYETTE COUNTY—ABOUT MIDDLE OF 19TH CENTURY SPIRIT MESSAGE SENT RELIGIOUS SECT TO FIND EDEN HERE

(By Roger Morris)

The West Virginia Progress Corps will have to get down to its press releases if it expects to keep the pace that a group of settlers established over 100 years ago in promoting the State as a heaven on earth.

While the modern-day boosters resort to such paradisiacal praise as referring to West Viriginia as the Mountain State and Little Switzerland of America, their predecessors worked on a larger scale. West Virginia (then a part of Virginia), they said, was the site of the original Garden of Eden. Fayette County to be exact.

Although such a contention might cause skeptical eyes to be raised today, it was not too unusual for its time, which was the 1st half of the 19th century.

This period between 1800–60 witnessed a good deal of what might be termed "mildly original" religious thought. During this time Joseph Smith was visited by the angel Moroni and told where to find the golden plates which were later to form the genesis of the Mormon Church; the Shakers were establishing colonies from New England to Missouri; and Horace Greeley was expounding the tenets of fourierism when he wasn't advising young men to hie themselves west.

Most of these religious sects either were ostracized or willingly isolated themselves from the more sedate elements which dominated the old frontier. As a result, religious colonies sprang up in most regions of the American Midwest.

Many if not most of these religious sects and colonies originated in upstate New York in such cities as Rochester, Palmyra, Auburn, and Batavia. After this rather frequent experience, this section has never been the same and has voted conservative Republican in penance ever since.

It was in Auburn that the idea of West Virginia as the site of the Garden of Eden took hold among the Spiritualists. There is a Biblical saying that "God works in mysterious ways," and the Spiritualists believed that He spoke through a knocking or rapping.

The way that this would work was that a religious person would be "visited" by rapping spirits, who would knock in a certain cadence on some wooden object, usually a table that was being used at the time. The person would then interpret this message, which was usually some commandment to action. (These people should not be confused with the followers of George Rapp, the Rappites, who were also prominent at this time.)

A group of Spiritualists under the leadership of Thomas Lake Harris were visited by the rappings in 1851 which told them to go to Virginia to await the millennium in the Garden of Eden which they would rediscover there.

John Humphrey Noyes in his book, "History of American Socialisms," quotes a letter sent to the Oneida Circular in which it was published November 16, 1851. In one part the writer refers to a letter he had seen from one of the founders of the Virginia move, Ira S. Hitchcock:

"Yesterday in their (the New York Spiritualists) meeting, I heard extracts of letters from Mr. Hitchcock written from Virginia; in which he states that they have found the Garden of Eden, the identical spot where our first parents sinned, and on which no human foot has trod since Adam and Eve were driven out; that himself, Ira S. Hitchcock, was the first who had been permitted to set foot upon it; and further, that in all the convulsions of nature, the upheavals and depressions, this spot has remained undisturbed as it originally appeared. This is the spot that is to form the center in the redemption now at hand; and the parts adjacent are, by convulsions and the reverse process, to be restored to their primeval state. This is the substance of what I heard read. The revelation was said to have been spelled out to them by raps from Paul."

About a month later, the same writer told of receiving a copy of the message which had been dictated by St. Paul "in this manner, viz: the words were written in a vision, printed in space, one at a time, declared off by him (a Mr. Scott, one of the leaders), and written down by someone else."

The message said in part:

"Go. Scarcely let time intervene. Escape the vales of death. Pass from beneath the cloud of magnetic human glory. Flee to the mountains whither I direct.

"The city of refuge is builded as a hiding place and a shelter; as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land; as an asylum for the afflicted; a safety for those fleeing from the power of sin which pursueth to destroy. In that mountain my people shall rest secure. Above it the cloud of glory descendeth. Thence it encompasseth the saints. The angels shall ascend and descend. There the soul shall feast and be satisfied. There is the bread and the water of life. 'And in this mountain shall the Lord of hosts make unto all people a feast of fat things, a feast of wine on the lees, of fat things full of marrow, of wines on the lees well refined.* * *'"

With this commandment in mind, over 100 people migrated to Fayette County and set up a spiritualist community at Mountain Cove along the old James and Kanawha Turnpike. Although the town of Mountain Cove is not on today's road maps, Fayette County historian, the Reverend C. S. Donnelly, identifies the site of the "Garden of Eden" as Hico and Lookout. Only the mountain lying along U.S. 60 between Cove magisterial district retains the name now.

Practically nothing was written (or at least reached the hands of the historians) about how the community was established and subsequently operated.

However, we do know that it was largely self-sufficient, and its members included farmers, blacksmiths and assorted craftsmen. One source suggests that some members of the colony were held in slave status, but this may not have been the case.

The pride and joy of the community was the Mountain Cove Journal and the Spiritual Harbinger, a newspaper which was for all intent and purposes a running spiritual tract. Although it gives much insight into the beliefs of the spiritualists, such as communication with the dead, it neglects all comment on daily life in Mountain Cove.

In any event, Mountain Cove became divided over the issues of property and government. Noyes cites a letter from a disgruntled former Mountain Cove citizen:

"The principal mediums, James L. Scott and Thomas L. Harris, profess absolute Divine inspiration, and entire infallibility; that the infinite God communicates with them directly, without intermediate agency; and that by him they are preserved from the possibility of error in any of their dictations which claim a spiritual origin.

"By virtue of these assumptions * * * all the principles and rules of practice, whether of a spiritual or temporal nature * * * are dictated by the individuals mentioned above. Among the communications thus received, which are usually in the form of arbitrary decrees, are requirements which positively forbid those who have once formed a belief in the divinity of the movement, the privilege of criticizing, or * * * having any reason or conscience at all, except that which is prescribed to them by this oracle."

Scott himself replied to the charge referring to himself and Harris as the "human viceregents of God" who neither owned property at Mountain Cove or had any "pecuniary supporters there," men who were "surrounded by circumstances calculated to try men's souls."

After about 2 years of existence, the colony proper broke up in 1853 and its members for the most part scattered to other parts. Some of them went to other Spiritualists communities, most of which met with less success than the one at Mountain Cove.

Reverend Donnelly states that some of the colonists stayed on and fought on the side of the Union in the Civil War less than 10 years later. A few scattered descendants of the community live today in Fayette County, and Reverend Donnelly says that two of the original houses are still standing.

Thus the Mountain Cove community came to a quick end with the later denizens of the Garden of Eden proving no more able to live there than their predecessors. They discovered that although Adam and Eve had left the Garden, the snake lingered on.

THE FBI'S SECRET WAR

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, there has come to my attention a fine article in the January 1966, issue of the Reader's Digest entitled "The FBI's Secret War Against the Ku Klux Klan." This article clearly demonstrates the dogged determination and outstanding achievements of the FBI in carrying out its responsibilities—this time in the field of civil rights.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the article in the RECORD, and hope that every American would read it.

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

THE FBI'S SECRET WAR AGAINST THE KU KLUX KLAN—BEHIND THE SCENES OF RACIAL TUMULT, FBI AGENTS ARE FIGHTING A DESPERATE AND THANKLESS BATTLE AGAINST KLANSMEN, COMMUNISTS, AND KILLERS

(By John Barron)

The FBI is "following the path of appeasement" of segregationists, said Martin Luther King, Jr., president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

"For Negroes, the FBI has become part of the oppression of the South," said the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee.

"Little or nothing is done to hunt down and prosecute the bombers, the burners and the killers," said Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., vice chairman of Americans for Democratic Action.

Such has been the litany of abuse heaped upon the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The truth is, however, that nearly 2,000 FBI agents are today risking their lives to defend the legitimate cause of civil rights against terror, subversion and anarchy. At this very moment they are desperately engaged in a deadly, secret war that rages from dark thickets in Mississippi to fiery streets in Los Angeles to packed slums in northern cities. Their mission is the most difficult and thankless in FBI history.

At midnight, two Ku Klux Klansmen steal across the campus of a Negro college in Little Rock. Against a dormitory wall they lay a black box containing 40 sticks of dynamite and a fuse attached to a candle. Suddenly flashlight beams strike from the darkness. "FBI. You're under arrest."

Dumbfounded, the klansmen find themselves surrounded by agents. The klansmen know that they have been betrayed. What they will never know is how the FBI succeeded in putting an informant into their midst.

A group of furtive men crowd into a New York City hotel suite, lock the door and draw the blinds. For 3 chilling days they plot a campaign to exploit racial hatred and to undermine the American defense of South Vietnam, in the name of civil rights. Each conspirator is a Communist Party boss. One, though, is also an undercover agent of the FBI. Less than 2 hours after the Communists abandon the suite, he dictates a detailed report which is flown by courier to Washington.

Two agents lie listening in a Georgia field as klansmen discuss plans to shoot down the first Negroes who attempt to enter a theater in the town of Covington. Next night, when carloads of heavily armed klansmen pour into Covington, alerted Georgia State troopers and local police fill the main street. The would-be killers can only look on sullenly as 18 Negroes enter the theater, sit through the show and leave without incident.

These cases from recent FBI experience are typical, but they only hint at what the FBI men must contend with.

In Mississippi, search for a Klan hideout led two agents to a darkened cellar. "Watch out, Bob," one yelled. "This place is full of snakes." Slowly and fearfully, the agents backed away from a writhing sea of rattlesnakes and moccasins that klansmen had collected to slip into the FBI men's cars and homes.

In Alabama, an agent was photographing hoodlums who were threatening the participants in civil rights demonstration. Suddenly a rubber hose whipped across the back of his neck. Lying on the sidewalk, he groggily reached out for his camera. A foot stomped down. Then there was only blackness.

In a Mississippi town, a cross was burned on the lawn of an agent 1 week after he had been transferred there with his family. The phone rang with obscene, threatening calls to his wife. "Sure is a pretty little girl you've got, honey. Be a shame if something happened to her. If you want to keep them kids, honey, you'd better get out of here." Once, while the agent was away on assignment, a call awakened his wife late at night. "This is the State highway patrol," a voice said. "Your husband was killed a while ago in a car accident. Where shall we deliver the body?" The wife was still in tears when FBI headquarters assured her that she had just been the victim of a macabre Klan hoax—her husband was all right.

These barbarous tactics remind one of the Ku Klux Klan in its heyday. Actually, the organization is a far cry from what it was then. During the 1920's, membership topped 4 million and extended into such States as Indiana, Kansas, and Colorado. Many southern officeholders owed their success at the polls to the bloc votes of the Klan. But over the years corruption and senseless violence proved to be the organization's undoing, and it was reduced to little more than a nuisance—until 1954, when a concerted revival effort began pushing Klan membership toward 10,000, with many other active sympathizers. Today the membership—most strongly concentrated in North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana—is well past 10,000, and is growing.

These hard core fanatics can and do cause a lot of misery to the fighters for civil rights. And aggravating the FBI's problems are Communists and riffraff who are determined to stir up disorder and racial hatred through infiltration of civil rights organizations.

In defense of civil rights, the FBI has developed four basic tactics:

MASSIVE INVESTIGATION

In emergencies, as many as 250 agents are assigned to investigate a civil rights crime. Minutes after Washington headquarters decides that more men are needed, agents around the country are likely to receive the order that FBI wives dread: "You will report immediately to the special agent in charge (name of the city) for a special assignment of undetermined duration."

Such immediate action often detects vital clues before they vanish. A country church in Georgia was set afire with kerosene shortly after midnight. By 2 a.m., a dozen agents were blanketing the vicinity. Shortly after sunrise, at a house less than a mile from the church, one of the investigators smelled spilled kerosene. Had the agents delayed, the telltale odor would have disappeared, and the guilt of the occupants might never have been established.

RECRUITMENT OF ALLIES

Agents strive by personal example to enlist local authorities as allies in upholding Federal civil-rights laws. In September 1964, two agents, local policemen, a sheriff and his deputies gathered in front of a grocery store in the Negro section of Canton, Miss. A bomb composed of eight sticks of dynamite had just been discovered against the store's foundation.

The agents did not have to tell each other that they were on trial before the sheriff and local officers, whose support they had been trying to win. Though admittedly afraid, they crawled under the store, defused the bomb and brought it out.

On a rainy morning 7 months later, when 55 Negroes marched on the courthouse to register to vote, this same sheriff greeted the leaders with, "There's no use you getting wet out here. Make yourself at home inside while your people are registering."

An important turning point in the war against the Klan in Mississippi came when J. Edgar Hoover personally enlisted the cooperation of Gov. Paul B. Johnson, Jr. At a private conference, Hoover declared that the FBI was determined to uphold the civil-rights law and suppress Klan activities. Although a segregationist, Johnson agreed to help. The two then worked out an arrangement whereby the FBI is training large numbers of Mississippi State policemen and sharing with them secrets about terroristic activities. Now Johnson has purged the State police of all Klansmen and let it be known that any State employee found to be a member of the Klan will be summarily fired. A result: the incidence of racial violence in Mississippi has been steadily declining.

PSYCHOLOGICAL WARFARE

Soon after a man joins the Klan, an FBI agent visits him. "If anything happens around here, you're automatically a suspect so long as you stay in the Klan," the agent tells him. When a Klan attempted to organize in Mississippi last year, 45 men attended the first meeting. Within 3 days agents called on all of them. At the next meeting, only five showed up.

Agents take up every challenge the Klansmen issue. As a Klan meeting broke up, one Klansman boasted, "First time I catch one of them nigger-loving FBI's, I'm going to kick his ribs in so he won't breathe right for a month."

The next morning, an agent strode into the railroad yard where the Klansman worked and tapped him on the shoulder. "I'm from the FBI. I hear you've been looking for somebody like me."

"I ain't been looking for no one," the Klansman answered.

"Hey, boys, here's a Kluxer who says he's going to beat up the FBI," the agent called to workmen nearby. "Come watch."

The Klansman backed away.

The agent said, "I guess we can't expect any guts from a man who has to hide behind a sheet, can we?"

COUNTERINTELLIGENCE

The most important tactic of all is infiltration of Klans and Communist cells with informants—patriotic men who risk death to forewarn of subversion and violence, who identify terrorists and gather evidence against them.

One Sunday morning an agent invited a young farmer for an auto ride. In the car he handed the farmer some photographs—bloated bodies of two teenagers, a man almost decapitated by a shotgun blast.

Later he stopped at what had been a farmhouse until set afire a few hours earlier. In the one remaining room, a fearful Negro woman was trying to feed a squalling baby and two small children while her husband searched the ruins for the few belongings not charred beyond use. "The Klan was here last night," the agent said. "I need to talk to these people a few minutes more. Look around."

As they drove away, the agent asked, "Wouldn't you like to help us put a stop to this?"

"What do you want me to do?" asked the farmer.

"Have you ever thought about joining the Klan?" the agent asked.

In the next days, the farmer was taught how to apply for Klan membership, how to survive screening by the "Klan Bureau of Investigation," how to act at meetings, how to communicate secretly with the FBI, and what to do in emergencies. Ever since, he has been a courageous and valuable source. Today, because of the FBI, every Klan group is infiltrated with such loyal Americans.

All four of the foregoing tactics had to be used in the infamous civil-rights case which began when two shotgun blasts struck a car traveling through Georgia in predawn darkness. The driver, Lt. Col. Lemuel A. Penn, a Negro educator from Washington, D.C., who had just finished Army Reserve duty at Fort Benning, slumped over dead.

FBI Director Hoover was aboard a plane when the report of the murder was radioed to him. "If they get away with this, they'll think they can get away with anything," Hoover said to his assistant, Clyde Tolson. "Ask Atlanta how many extra agents they need. I want them all to report there today."

By nightfall, 78 agents were at the murder scene and combing the countryside. At Atlanta headquarters, analysis pored over 1,214 confidential dossiers. Working around the clock, they compiled a list of 14 Klansmen considered most likely to commit such wanton murder. Then, with the help of informants and cooperating Georgia authorities, they checked where each of the 14 had been when Penn was shot. When the whereabouts of three could not be established, agents started visiting them with questions, each time making it clearer that the FBI knew their alibis to be lies.

Less than a month later, one of the Klansmen talked. He signed a detailed confession revealing how he had driven the car from which the other two suspects had fired the fatal blasts. Hours later, a fourth Klansman signed a statement saying that these same two suspects told him they had killed Penn.

The FBI could scarcely be blamed for the tragic aftermath. At the resulting trial, the Klansmen repudiated their statements. The jurors returned a verdict of not guilty, then some shook hands with elated Klansmen. Imperial Wizard James Venable chortled. "You'll never be able to convict a white man that kills a nigger what encroaches on the southern way of life."

An even more shocking case was that of Mrs. Viola Liuzzo. On the night of last March 25, four Alabama Klansmen overtook Mrs. Liuzzo, mother of five, as she was driving from Selma to Montgomery with a 19-year-old Negro boy to pick up civil rights demonstrators. Guns flashed, and Mrs. Liuzzo fell dead against the steering wheel.

"Let's go by the Dragon's house and tell him what a good job we did," said one of the Klansmen. But another occupant of the car, Gary Thomas Rowe, was thinking only of how to get to a phone. Rowe, an FBI informant since 1960, had been powerless to prevent the murder, but by 2 a.m. the FBI in Mobile reported to Washington: "We've got an eyewitness to the Liuzzo murder. Three Klansmen did it. We'll move as soon as we get warrants."

The trial of Klansman Collie Leroy Wilkins, Jr., resulted in a hung jury, although Rowe was so impressive on the stand that 10 jurors voted for conviction. Last October, at the retrial, Wilkins was acquitted as courtroom spectators cheered. Still, the glare of publicity has helped further reduce Klan effectiveness.

By the record, the FBI has handled 14,000 civil rights cases in the last 4 years, more than a third of them outside the South. In just one case, the murder of three civil rights workers near Philadelphia, Miss., it spent $768,000 and more than 175,000 man-hours before arresting 19 suspects as conspirators in the plot. And, at the same time, agents have quietly passed on intelligence which has enabled loyal civil rights leaders to thwart Communist attempts to subvert their organizations.

Through their thousands of investigations, agents have identified the persons responsible for virtually every major racial crime—even though it may be a long time before the guilty pay. For instance, they have put the finger on those responsible for the bombing of a Birmingham Negro church 2 years ago in which four small girls were killed. Director Hoover ordered them to keep building this case until it is so strong that no jury in the land could refuse to convict. Thus, ever since, wherever the killers have gone, agents have haunted them, watching for chances to add more evidence against them.

Yet there is no end to the abuse being heaped on the agents who fight daily in the frontlines of the sinister and shadowy civil rights war. Hoover is philosophical about this. Recently he said to a group of his men, "If we do our job right and impartially, the extremists on both sides are going to scream at us. In fact, the louder they scream, maybe the better we're doing the job."

LET US KEEP THE SCHOOL AID PROGRAM INTACT

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the first session of this 89th Congress has been credited with doing more to further the general education of Americans than any Congress in our history. This is a matter of great personal satisfaction to those of us who supported the basic assistance measures that emerged as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the Higher Education Act.

The first fruits of those bills are now being harvested in thousands of school districts across the country. But none of these bills was designed to be the panacea for all financial ills in education, nor were they intended to replace essential special assistance programs previously in effect.

It is for this reason that I find it exceedingly disturbing to hear reports that the Public Law 874 program, which provides financial assistance to school districts in federally impacted areas, may be scheduled for sharp curtailment.

I speak now, not just for the school districts in my own State, but for every small school in the country that finds itself inundated by a wave of children coming from a nearby military installation or other Federal facility.

Public Law 874 was specifically written to provide needed financial assistance to these schools, since the transient nature of the Federal population does not sufficiently contribute to the regular tax sources of the school district. Without this assistance, many of the schools would have been unable to function. Nothing in recent legislation has changed that situation.

While there are many benefits to be realized under the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Act, nothing can replace Public Law 874 funds which are based on an actual pupil count. Many of our large military bases, by their very nature, are best located in isolated rural areas with sparse indigenous populations. This does not imply that the school districts were impoverished prior to the establishment of the governmental installation. They were just small—big enough to meet local needs and to be supported by local and State finances. Accordingly, these schools do not have a large underprivileged student population. What they do have is a large student population resulting from a nearby Federal installation, and one which does not contribute fully to local school revenues.

Any attempt to cut back this kind of Federal assistance could be disastrous for hundreds of small school districts throughout the country.

Let me illustrate with some financial facts on schools and property revenues in my own State of Idaho. These figures will compare with those of other Western States where the Federal Government owns most of the land.

Idaho has 53,476,480 acres of land. The Federal Government owns more than 33 million acres, or 64 percent of the land in Idaho, while the State owns more than 3 million acres. In other words, Mr. President, in one of the larger States in the Union, less than 30 percent of the land area is available for property taxation. It is from this limited tax base that 628 elementary and secondary schools must draw their principal revenue.

There are more than 170,000 youngsters in our Idaho elementary and secondary schools. Of this total, Mr. President, nearly 15,000 children come from families employed by the Federal Government in impacted areas. They represent 9 percent of our total school population and, in the last fiscal year, the Federal Government contributed $2,337,553 to their schools.

There are 116 operating school districts in my State. Last year 51 of these districts received Public Law 874 funds. Let us also bear in mind that Public Law 874 covers only maintenance and operation. Its companion measure, Public Law 815, supplies funds for construction of necessary facilities to house the children in schools in federally impacted areas. Since Public Law 815 became law, 55 of Idaho's 116 school districts have received construction funds resulting in 467 classrooms to house 13,230 pupils.

Again, Mr. President, let me repeat that the majority of school districts in Idaho which qualify for assistance under both Public Law 874 and 815 are in rural areas. I feel sure that this is the case in most sections of the country. The loss of this Federal assistance, while the pupil loads from federally employed families remain, will cause severe financial distress within these small districts.

It is for these reasons, Mr. President, that I will oppose any effort to repeal or curtail the Public Law 874 and 815 programs. I urge my colleagues to join in giving continued support to this most necessary educational program.

A 35-YEAR WATCH OVER THE NATION'S RESOURCES BY THEODORE C. FEARNOW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, it is with a complete sense of

pride that I speak today of the service performed to the United States by Mr. Theodore C. Fearnow, of West Virginia. A sportsman, naturalist, dedicated conservationist, and public servant, Ted retired from the Forest Service, USDA, on December 30 after more than 35 years of employment with the Federal Government. But those who have known and worked with Ted over the years are well aware that his active interest in the out-of-doors will not diminish with his retirement. Ted has lived and breathed conservation for as long as he can remember.

Born in Berkeley Springs, W. Va., where he still makes his home, Ted served an apprenticeship at the U.S. Fisheries Station at White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., while still in high school, accepting employment soon after graduation as West Virginia State fish culturist. Within a year he was promoted to chief of the West Virginia Department of Fisheries, and, in 1934, he was employed by the U.S. Bureau of Fisheries as stream improvement supervisor. The following year he entered the Forest Service to serve as assistant conservationist and aquatic biologist, principally in the Allegheny National Forest in Pennsylvania.

During his early years with the Forest Service, Mr. Fearnow designed and supervised the construction of an experimental unit for transporting live fish from hatcheries for stocking National Forest streams and lakes; undertook biological surveys on Forest fishing waters; and headed up a Forest Service deer study project in the Allegheny National Forest, in cooperation with the U.S. Biological Survey.

In 1939, he moved to the Jefferson National Forest in Virginia where he not only handled game and fish management, but also took over information work for the forest. Three years later he transferred to the regional office in Upper Darby, Pa., as wildlife specialist and regional biologist. Promoted in 1958 to assistant regional forester, Mr. Fearnow served for his last 7 years with the Forest Service as Chief of the Division of Information and Education for all Forest Service work in the Northeast.

In recent years Ted Fearnow has taken active part in the development of the Mount Rogers Scenic Area in the Jefferson National Forest in Virginia and the Spruce Knob and Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area in the Monongahela National Forest in West Virginia, where his enthusiasm and know-how have been a vital contributing factor to their general success and continuing popularity. A tireless public speaker on his favorite subject of national forest conservation, Ted has also published a number of papers in this field and was winner of the Nash Conservation Award in 1955.

An ardent partisan of the West Virginia countryside, Ted is familiar with every hill and hollow in his corner of the State and is continually concerned with projects for the preservation of some and the better use of others. From a lifetime of close association, Ted knows his West Virginia neighbors—their present needs and their accomplishments. He is at present engaged in writing a history of his section of West Virginia.

THE NATIONAL CITIZENSHIP TEST

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, an eloquent and articulate Farm Bureau member from Wyoming, Mrs. Pegge A. Cooksley, has authored an excellent comment on the recent national citizenship test conducted through the services of the Columbia Broadcasting System. I believe her comment, released through the Sheridan County Farm Bureau last December 3, will be of interest to my colleagues and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I ask that it be printed therein.

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

STATEMENT BY PEGGE A. COOKSLEY

The recent CBS citizenship survey revealed much about the Americans serious lacking of knowledge of the affairs of their government and responsibilities of the individual citizen. It indicates that the voter had better shape up before they place their little x's on the next election ballots.

To add fire to these findings is the fact that we are finding more of our citizens who are proposing that socialism or communism is the only thing for us. Such people's minds are working in a whirl of materialistic ideology, not stopping to give credence to capitalism for the materialism it has not only offered or promised but given its people. Let us remember that government did not give us the things we value but, instead, it was the system. We have become a great nation not by reason of what government has done for us but by reason of what it has allowed us to do for ourselves.

For the benefit of those who have lost interest in and loyalty for our form of constitutional government we might ask: Why has our country never suffered a famine? Why do Americans enjoy the highest of living standards? Why is it that communistic forms of government have been unable to survive without the assistance of capitalistic nations (such as the assistance we have given Russia since the 1890's)?

Then we should point out to our nonbelievers that to place the United States on the same progressive plateau as those governments they admire we would have to: eliminate freedom to travel when, where, and how we chose; eliminate privacy of home and personal papers and right to own and bear arms; eliminate rights to work where we please at the occupations of our own choice, private ownership of property and business, right to study the trade or profession of our dreams and ambitions, right to live as a family unit and rear our own children; right to religious worship and to govern ourselves.

Among the material things we would have to destroy would be: three-fifths of our steel capacity, two-thirds of our petroleum, 95 percent of our electric motor output, two of every three hydroelectric plants, all but one-tenth of our natural gas, 14 out of every 15 miles of paved highways, 2 out of every 3 miles of main-line railway tracks, 8 out of every 9 oceangoing ships (plus our inland boats and yachts), 19 out of every 20 cars and trucks (plus our ski-doos and motorbikes), and reduce our civilian air fleet to a shadow of its present size. We would have to cut our living standard by three-fourths, destroy 40 million TV sets, 9 out of every 10 telephones, and 7 out of every 10 houses. Then we would have to put 60 million people back on the farms.

Now, really, does this make sense?

EXPERIMENTS IN FEEDLOT CONSTRUCTION LOOK PROMISING

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the livestock industry is one of the most important elements in the economy of the State of Montana. A great deal of the progress and improvements in ranching today are the result of research and experiments. It is in this area that Montana has also contributed a great deal. Considerable research is now underway in our schools and on our ranches.

Just recently I was told about new experiments taking place at Montana State University in Bozeman, Mont., which might change the feeding habits of cattle throughout the Nation. This experiment will also improve the market for concrete. The campus at Bozeman has the first all-concrete model feedlot. The all-concrete feedlot can handle up to three times as many cattle as can be accommodated on a dirt surface feedlot the same size. In brief it will take some of the risk out of cattle feeding.

Mr. President, the December 1965 issue of This Earth published by the Kaiser Cement and Gypsum Corp. discusses this development in more detail. I think the article will be of great interest to my colleagues from livestock-producing States.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

EXPERIMENTS IN FEEDLOT CONSTRUCTION LOOK PROMISING—MONTANA CATTLE GET FAT ON CONCRETE

New experiments taking place at Montana State University in Bozeman, Mont., could possibly change the feeding habits of cattle throughout the Nation and substantially increase the farm market for concrete.

Last spring, ranchers and farmers attending a special beef cattle program at the Bozeman campus were shown for the first time an all-concrete model feedlot, complete with a feed alley, concrete feed bunks and an automatic system for the disposal of manure. A feedlot is a confined cattle feeding operation, as opposed to open range grazing, and is used extensively in California and other areas where cattle are finished off for the market.

The Montana ranchers were surprised to hear from university officials that an all-concrete feedlot can handle up to three times as many cattle as can be accommodated on a dirt-surface feedlot the same size. The reason? Concrete is far easier to maintain and keep clean, allowing for the feeding of more cattle in the same area without increasing the health hazard.

This is good news, indeed, for cattlemen whose biggest worry, outside of prices, is the health of their animals. As Henry Schacht, agricultural columnist for the San Francisco Chronicle put it: "Cattle feeding is no business for the nervous man; the danger of sickness can eat up potential profits like a harvest hand goes through hotcakes."

Bozeman University officials feel that all-concrete feedlots could take some of this risk out of cattle feeding.

Since manure disposal is obviously a major problem in confined feeding operations, one feature of the university's feedlot which will be followed with interest by ranchers is the simplified manure disposal system.

Constructed parallel to the feed bunk is a 9-foot-wide, 8-foot-deep pit covered with prestressed concrete slats. This is where the cattle must stand while feeding, and this is

where most of the manure accumulates. As the cattle move, the manure is ground through the spaces between the slats to the pit below.

A pumping system keeps water circulating in the pit and liquidizes the manure. The next step in the operation is to pump this liquid fertilizer into a tank truck and spread it on the fields. Pit dimensions also allow for the movement of small tractors for scoop manure disposal.

The slat arrangement apparently poses no problem for the cattle. As one rancher points out, they move over far worse terrain than slotted floors to feed on the open range.

New to the United States, this ingenious system has been used for cattle, sheep, and hogs in Europe for a number of years, with great economic success. A common term in such countries as England, Sweden, Norway, Germany, and Australia is "beef parlor"—a complete slotted floor, total confinement house.

Kaiser Cement & Gypsum Corp. donated Permanente cement for the construction of the experimental feedlot. In addition, the company produced a program—complete with the set of plans used to construct the feedlot, information on practical concreting and a file folder—for distribution in its Rocky Mountain division.

The Bozeman University experiment and the Kaiser Cement program have been enthusiastically received in the area, where more than 140,000 farms and ranches obtain 50 percent or more of their income from cattle.

RETIREMENT OF U.S. FOREST SUPERVISOR ALFRED H. ANDERSON

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I would like to call to the attention of the Senate the retirement of Alfred H. "Andy" Anderson, forest supervisor of the George Washington National Forest, which is located in West Virginia and Virginia. Mr. Anderson retired from Government service at the end of December, terminating 37 long and fruitful years with the U.S. Forest Service.

"Andy" started his forestry career back in 1928 with a job on the Pedlar Ranger District of the old Natural Bridge National Forest—now part of the George Washington National Forest. Later he served as district forest ranger on the Ouachita National Forest in Arkansas and on the Cumberland National Forest in Kentucky. In 1941 he transferred to the Monongahela National Forest in Elkins, W. Va., where he served as assistant supervisor, subsequently serving in a similar position on the White Mountain National Forest in New Hampshire. Then came a year of administrative work in the Forest Service Regional Office in Upper Darby, Pa.

In 1946, he was appointed forest supervisor of the Allegheny National Forest in Pennsylvania. Three years later he was promoted to supervisor of the Monongahela National Forest and in August 1952 he moved to his present position in Harrisonburg, Va.

As supervisor of the national forest closest to the District of Columbia, Anderson has contributed greatly to public understanding of the Forest Service management for multiple use. He has helped make the 1.8-million-acre George Washington accessible to active recreationists through development of scenic trails and hunter access roads, and has supervised the placing of innumerable waterholes for wildlife throughout the forest.

Mr. Anderson played a prominent role in the recent expansion of the Elizabeth Furnace camp and picnic area to include the Pig Iron Trail and an amphitheater where the visitor can learn all about the old iron furnaces and how they operated.

One of his most noteworthy accomplishments has been the rehabilitation of streams and hillsides which were seriously ravaged by the floods of 1949. Under his supervision, eroded hillsides were seeded with cover crops and trees were planted. Through the construction of little dams, dikes, and retaining walls, streams were directed back into their channels. "Andy's" notable work with streamflow includes the pioneer use, in the East, of gabions to stabilize stream banks and control the flow of the waters. Another first—at least for eastern U.S. forests—was aerial tree seeding, done under Anderson's supervision.

For the past several years, he has served as chairman of the Recreation Committee for the Interstate Commission on the Potomac. He has continued to take an active part in civic organizations wherever he has been stationed. "Andy" and his wife, Virginia, plan to continue to live in Harrisonburg, Va.

THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, during my recent trip abroad, I was afforded the opportunity of looking over the programs and activities of the Central Intelligence Agency in many countries. Prior to departure, I received extensive briefings from the Agency and during my trip talked in detail with all Agency representatives in the country in question, as has been my custom in past years when visiting abroad.

All felt the latter's programs were fully coordinated with U.S. policy of the Agency with every Ambassador. In every case, no exception, the Ambassador expressed his complete approval of the functioning of the Agency.

I found no instances of any kind where CIA activities were uncontrolled, or contrary to U.S. policy. Indeed it would appear difficult, if not impossible, for such uncontrolled activities to occur. This belief is based on existing coordination procedures and policy directives stemming from the Washington level, plus the controls applicable to field activities.

I have always been impressed, in my contacts with the Agency, with the integrity and professional competence of its representatives. Only twice, in over 10 years, have I found anything to the contrary. Based on the present rules, I doubt if those cases of disagreement could now be duplicated.

It is a pleasure, therefore, to present to the Senate the fact that I agree with Secretary Rusk who, in talking about CIA people, stated:

> There is a good deal of gallantry and a high degree of competence in those who have to help us deal with that part of the struggle for freedom.

The Central Intelligence Agency has a difficult, and at times a very dangerous mission to perform. Not all men, or women, of this or any other agency, are perfect, and it is easy to criticize any group which cannot defend itself because of the nature of its work. Nevertheless it is my considered judgment that the American public should be proud of this organization and its people, a group who serve our country with unstinting devotion.

In addition to this brief report, which of necessity must be general, I am also reporting my findings and conclusions in more detail to Chairman RUSSELL and the Subcommittee for the CIA of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S HIGHWAY SAFETY PROPOSAL RECEIVES ENDORSEMENT

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, President Johnson's call in his state of the Union message for a new national effort to reduce the tragedy and loss resulting from highway accidents coincides with a rapidly developing public consciousness on this issue.

Since so much attention was focused on highway safety in the last session of Congress, a groundswell of support for a major highway safety program has been developing all across the Nation.

Our leading auto manufacturers, foundations, and civic-minded organizations are teaming up with universities in various States to set up research centers and far-reaching studies in this field.

The Federal Government has a responsibility to provide leadership and resources to support such efforts.

The cooperative model that the States and the Federal Government have developed in building highways shows us the job can be done.

It is now time to begin. I am sure the Congress and all Americans will rally around the President on this issue.

CHICAGO'S MIRACLE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, of great interest to me was an article which appeared in the January issue of Harper's entitled "Chicago's Commuter Railroad Miracle."

It is a brief description of the successful effort that has been made to restore satisfactory and profitable commuter railroad service in our Nation's third largest city.

And more importantly, it is the story of how bold, creative thinking and work can overcome great odds.

So many people, railroad men, public officials, and the general public, throw up their hands in despair over the seeming hopelessness of the commuter problem.

Obviously if people in the business and public officials are resigned to not solving

commuter problems, nothing constructive will be done, or even tried.

I hope some of the commuter train "Cassandras" will read this article, for which I now ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point.

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

CHICAGO'S MIRACLE: HOW A UNIQUE RAILROAD MAN IS MAKING MONEY OUT OF COMMUTERS—AND MAKES THEM LIKE IT

(By Andrew Schiller)

The poor and the wealthy sleep side by side in the cities; the middle classes run back and forth to suburbia. The only trouble with the arrangement is that the cities are being strangled in ribbons of concrete and choked by automobiles. For most Americans, the really dramatic challenge of the 20th century is not how to establish a colony on Mars but how to find a parking space downtown; the threat that hangs over us is not instant annihilation by the atom but slow strangulation by the auto. Commuter railroads, instead of expanding prosperously to meet the burgeoning need for transportation, are collapsing one by one, victims of the automobile, the bus, the tides of history, and sometimes of downright mismanagement. The plight of the New Haven Railroad (and of its passengers) epitomizes the problem. Without transportation a city perishes. If private industry cannot do the job profitably, must the Government take it upon itself, as it must provide water and collect garbage?

The answer almost everywhere is yes. But in the generally dismal scene there is a bit of cheer. One commuter line—only one—has transformed itself in a few years from a hopeless loser into a profitable business which is a model for the railroad industry. And the man who did it, Ben W. Heineman, was no railroad man at all but a successful corporation lawyer who fell into the job almost by accident. How was this miracle accomplished? Was it a freak, or is it possible that commuter traffic can make money, and nearly all the railroad presidents have been wrong all the time?

Ben Walter Heineman, boss of the Chicago & North Western Railroad, is a complicated man who fits no stereotypes. He is balding, middle-aged, pleasant of face, but in no way striking. Ben Heineman is not obviously anything. He could be your corner druggist, but he happens to be the most successful railroad executive in the United States. But to say so does not describe him. His colleague, Wayne Johnston, president of the Illinois Central, is as archetypal a railroad tycoon as EVERETT DIRKSEN is a Senator. He travels about in his private railroad car—a relic of Chester A. Arthurian splendor—and in his office, encrusted with railroading prints and equipped with a working cuspidor, he is attended by a solicitous Negro in a white porter's jacket. (I waited to hear Mr. Johnston call him George, but it never happened.) The Heineman office bespeaks the longhair—sleek furniture, abstract and impressionist paintings, an astounding collection of pipes.

He is an authentic intellectual, a trustee of the University of Chicago, and chairman of the State board of higher education, not to mention an impressive catalog of civic responsibilities for which he somehow makes time. He lives in Kenwood, an integrated neighborhood in the University of Chicago area, in a handsomely restored old brick mansion. He is even a Democrat, who served as a special prosecuting attorney under Governor Stevenson and later as an organizer in his presidential campaigns. There is a persistent, uncontradicted rumor that he was offered, and refused, a high post in the Kennedy administration.

But he eludes the stereotype of the intellectual Democrat. In command of the North Western he has behaved, at times, more like old Commodore Vanderbilt than W. Averell Harriman. He has slashed ruthlessly at payrolls and he shows little sympathy for workers whose jobs have become obsolete. "The unions claim that the fireman is necessary for safety. But in the old days, when the fireman had his head down shoveling coal, he wasn't a lookout. And you have only one man in the cab of a subway, or an electric train. Nobody complains about that."

When I asked him what, if anything, the Government ought to do to help the North Western, his answer was quick and sharp. "Get off my back." He is a man who, as the saying goes, would rather do it himself. And when he took over the line in its bleakest days he proved that private enterprise could go it alone.

SHE WAS DYING UNLOVED

A decade ago the CNW commuter line was like an alcoholic duchess expiring on skid row, still attired in silks and tiara. Riders with a taste for the antique loved the ancient intercity cars. The comfortable plush seats were stuffed with real horsehair, and through crazed, glass-thick varnish one could still see faintly the original walls, an exquisite mosaic of inlaid woods. Up ahead, a venerable coal burner huffed and puffed grandly through the suburbs.

But most commuters were not nostalgic rail fans, and the old lady was dying ignominiously. Over the generations the car interiors had absorbed a hopeless quantity of soot and cinders. The windows were broken and the doors came off in your hand. The sheet-metal roofs were cracked. On a rainy day passengers sat under umbrellas—or if they had none, huddled miserably in the wet green velvet. Timetables were a gallant fiction. The first snowfall each year was enough to cause operations to collapse into a snarl. But in any weather, scheduled runs would simply be scratched because the engines could not be repaired in time. Nor did departure guarantee return. The leaking locomotives ("Old Soaks" the crews called them) would fall apart so regularly that the enginemen carried baling wire to hold the machinery together. On one famous day the cab fell off, leaving the engineer and fireman naked to the world.

The North Western was not a carefree, romantic, bohemian railroad. The keynote was irritation and surliness, shared alike by passengers, crews, and management. When a train was canceled the next would be so crowded that the conductors couldn't get through the crowds in time to collect all the fares. Some of the conductors, in any case, were pocketing fares and the management was quite helpless to do anything about it. Morale was low. Trainmen didn't bother to wear white shirts; their vests were unbuttoned and their uniforms unpressed. Sometimes there were fistfights among the crewmen, and between passengers and crew. Unexplained stops were commonplace. Passengers were so accustomed to them that they didn't even bother to ask why the train wasn't going anywhere. But on one occasion, in 1952, after half-an-hour, even the North Western commuters began to wonder. Passengers wandered out to investigate and discovered that the cab was empty. The engineer and fireman were finally discovered in a nearby diner, eating their dinner. They explained to the angry passengers that, according to their contract, they were entitled to a bean hour and, by God, they were going to have it. The fact that they were only 20 minutes from the end of their run was just tough. The train could wait. The fury of the passengers was matched by the management, and the union as well, when the story broke. But what was there to do? The whole line was on the verge of collapse.

By 1956, bankruptcy was imminent. The North Western was $212 million in debt while its common equity was worth only $22 million. Cash was draining out by unaccountable millions each month. At this desperate point a group of investors, who held among them 30 percent of C. & N.W. voting shares, demanded representation on the board of directors. To this end, they engaged a young lawyer, Ben W. Heineman, who had made a reputation for himself in railroad circles by having won, 2 years earlier, an unprecedented victory in a proxy fight against the Minneapolis & St. Louis. ("Misery and Still Limping," they called that one.) When, in January of 1956, Heineman walked into the boardroom the stage was set for an explosive meeting and the beginning of a bitter battle for control of the dying railroad. Incredibly, no such thing happened. Heineman was able to convince the board of directors that he did not represent a group of financial ghouls who wanted only to pick the bones of the business before abandoning it—"special-situation men" is the euphemism of the trade—but a group, rather, which intended to revitalize the road. Adding conviction to the argument was Heineman's own astute management during the past 2 years of the M. & St. L. By the time he walked out of the room, the attorney had brought the board and his group to come to a final agreement; the investors were to get 5 of the 17 directors' seats, and Ben W. Heineman was named chairman of the board on April 1. He was just 42.

FIRST, TURN OFF THE FAUCETS

Things began to happen fast. Heineman's first step was to bring in as president and chief of operations Clyde J. Fitzpatrick, a veteran of 31 years on the Illinois Central, but himself only 47 years old. Together they went on a 6-week inspection tour. They looked, listened, and learned that the railroad was in an unbelievable mess. The patient, they decided, could be saved—but only if major surgery were performed immediately.

Close to home was the sprawling Proviso freight yard. A sign boasted that it was the largest in the world. The new boss said, "Tear it down." He didn't want the biggest yard, but the most efficient. Part of the yard was dismantled, and the scrap brought in welcome cash. More important, 74 acres were released for valuable industrial development. But that was only the beginning. The North Western, since its chartering in 1836 (it is Chicago's oldest railroad), had acquired a considerable amount of real estate. The new management instituted a survey to find out just what they had (nobody really knew) and how to convert land holdings from taxeaters to income producers.

The repair facilities were as outmoded as outhouses. Of 14 repair shops, only 2 were roofed. Expensive mechanics had to shovel snow to get to their work and then lie down in the slush to do it. In one shop the new managers found that the pistons of a diesel were being overhauled, even though they were barely broken in, simply because the company policy was to overhaul the engines every 3 years. Maintenance was promptly changed from a calendar to a mileage basis, and the scattering of inadequate repair facilities was scrapped. At a cost of $6 million, a modern assemblyline shop was built in Clinton, Iowa. The investment yielded a quick return. The new shop could do everything, from overhauling the delicate watchlike mechanisms of air brakes to building entire freight cars. Cars came out worth more than when new. There was even a school for mechanics.

As for organization, Heineman's comment was succinct: "Too damned much management." The North Western was the last major railroad which still retained a departmental structure. Under this system, if a section of track in Wyoming, let us say, needed repair it would be reported to the head of maintenance-of-way in Chicago, and not to the local superintendent who was responsible for getting trains over that track. Heineman reorganized the railroad on a divisional system, in which the superintendent of each geographical division was totally responsible for everything within his purview. Whole echelons of administration were eliminated and control was tightly centralized. There was bloodletting on the bottom as well as the top. By the end of a year, one out of every six employees had been dropped from the payroll. One of the survivors, an engineer, put it this way, "It was a quick, rough change. We cant get away with what we used to."

In those first few months, Heineman and Fitzpatrick were busy diagnosing the North Western's ailments and making long-range plans. But the urgent need was to stay alive long enough to put the plans into effect, running around and turning off faucets. The railroad, in those dying days, was so close to the bone of bankruptcy that the new management was reduced to selling rails for scrap simply to meet the payroll, which is like a starving man amputating his own leg and eating it.

In this appalling situation, the new management decided to invest $50 million—much of it borrowed from the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.—to acquire new equipment for the commuter service. On the face of it, this was a lunatic act. No railroad had ever succeeded in making suburban service profitable. Even the North Western's prosperous neighbors—the Burlington, and the Illinois Central—were just breaking even on commuters. But for Heineman it was an inevitable decision. He gave his staff three alternatives. First: Get out of commuter service. But this was politically almost impossible, and socially unthinkable. Second: Go on as before. But this was economically impossible. Third: Since you're stuck with the job, do it right. It was a daring gamble.

At the time of the takeover, suburban equipment consisted of cars and locomotives which had been demoted from the intercity trains. Scarcely anything was less than 30 years old and some cars were of turn-of-the-century vintage. Every major railroad had been dieselized by 1956—but not the North Western. Or so it seemed. But the fact was, as President Fitzpatrick put it, "They were dieselized and didn't know it." Diesel locomotives were laid up in the shops; two or three were being used as switch engines where one could have done the job. By keeping them running around the clock and using the rest elsewhere, by more efficient servicing and assignment, the line was dieselized in 40 days without buying a single locomotive.

Even the old steam locomotives turned out to be an asset. Each one represented about $6,000 in scrap. But the old iron mastadons were relics, too, with a cash value to sentimentalists. The bells were advertised for sale—about 250 of them—and they can be seen and heard now all over the world; one, for example, became a dinner bell in a Michigan hunting lodge, another went to a bombed-out church in Greece.

HOW TO IMPRESS A COMMUTER

But you can't attract commuters simply by switching from coal to oil. You have to offer them transportation attractive enough to get them out of their automobiles. The odds against it are admittedly enormous. A recent Harris survey revealed that 90 percent of the Nation's commuters actually preferred to drive, even when public means were available. Heineman's gamble (and what would a horseplayer say of a $50 million bet against such odds?) was that commuter tickets can be sold by vigorous merchandising, just like soap flakes. But where the contents of one box of soap is largely indistinguishable from another, the commuter knows precisely what he is getting for his dollar. Trains either do or do not run on time; they are air-conditioned or they are not. All the services are tangible. "To make matters more difficult," as Ben Heineman points out, "we get the commuter at the two worst times of his day—early in the morning when he's grouchy, and in the evening when he's tired. How do you impress a commuter?"

You give him swift, unobtrusive, and dependable service, more comfortable than his own car, and cheaper. And how do you achieve that? In the first place, it is necessary to decide what a commuter line is not. It is not, for example, a city bus or streetcar. It is not designed to stop every half-mile, nor to service in-city passengers. Accordingly, the North Western eliminated 22 of its local stations, almost all of them inside Chicago, over the objections of the affected neighborhoods. Merchants lost money and their aldermen made speeches, but Heineman got away with it. Why should his railroad, he asked, do the work of the Chicago Transit Authority? The North Western quite deliberately gave up 3,000 riders in order to give better service to the suburbs.

A simple innovation—Clyde Fitzpatrick's idea—added trains to the timetable without buying a single car. Once a train had pulled into the final station, the "relay" operation to get it headed out again required a switch engine, a turnaround, and a five-man crew working for half an hour. Why not equip the cars with little cabs for the engineers, like subway trains, with remote controls? Today the locomotive always stays at one end of the train, pulling on the trip out, pushing on the trip in. When the train gets to the station, or the end of the line, it's ready to go again in 10 minutes, and the relaying requires no switch engine or extra crew. The same number of trains are now able to make extra runs during the peak hours.

The old coaches, too, were discarded, and new ones were designed to North Western specifications. They were double-decked, air conditioned, well lighted, comfortable, and meticulously clean. A typical 6-car train has 960 seats; it had required a 10-car train of the old coaches to provide the same number. And—very important—the dead weight per train was decreased by about 130 tons. In short, these new trains were hauling not equipment, but people.

But would the people pay to ride these splendid new trains? In the age of the freeway, railroads have a precarious hold on their commuters. With each fare increase a certain number of passengers abandon the train for the highway, and the attempt to raise fares to a profitable level becomes a self-defeating treadmill. Once again, Ben Heineman took a step which flew in the face of all past experience. He raised the price of commutation tickets, not inch by inch over a period of years, but in one bold thrust.

The pricing system is an antique—in fact, an accident. A century ago the railroads, which were then entirely in the business of hauling freight and intercity passengers, began the practice of picking up passengers at nearby stops as they approached the cities. The fare was set at an appropriate fraction of the distance traveled by the through passengers, and hence very low. But as the metropolises grew, two things happened. The little town became a suburb, and the casual pickup became a scheduled stop. During the same period, the private auto virtually destroyed the intercity passenger business.

And so it came about that commuter service, which had begun as a bit of frosting on the cake, turned out to be the whole meal. And the railroads got sick on the diet. The fares had been frozen into a basic-price structure which now turned out to be inadequate. What Heineman asked—and in December of 1958, got—from the Illinois Commerce Commission, was not merely a fare hike but a fundamental change in the concept of what a commuter is supposed to get for his money. The decision marked a turning point in the historic function of the railroad as a passenger carrier. It is a revolutionary change which most of the railroads and the State regulatory bodies of this country do not yet grasp.

SEATS BY THE MONTH

Traditionally, when the passenger bought a ticket he was paying for a ride, and the cost of the ride (setting aside class) depended simply upon distance. But this won't work for a commuter line for the simple reason that every morning you must carry a great number of passengers into the city, and back again every evening—but in between, and on weekends, most of the equipment is doing nothing but adding to the total cost. The North Western's innovation was not to sell rides by the mile, but transportation by the month. When a man owns an apartment house he figures his total operating cost, and with this as a base he determines what a monthly rent must be. It is none of his business whether his tenants occupy their apartments constantly or leave them empty part of the time. And so when the North Western commuter buys a monthly ticket, he is entitled to unlimited access. He has rented a seat for the month.

The theory is logical, but the question was, could the riders be persuaded to buy it? Heineman bet all the stockholders' money that they could. In the first place, he sought to stabilize the price charged for a ride. Since December 1963 the commuters have found Christmas cards on their seats each year, telling them that their Christmas present from the line was that there would be no rise in fares for the coming year. Furthermore, he promised that the money would be used to improve equipment and service; and that promise was kept. Finally, the new ticketing system turned out to be irresistibly convenient. If you are a North Western commuter, the mailman brings you your ticket a few days before the beginning of each month (and you have until the 10th to pay for it). The ticket has your name, address, and phone number on it, in case of loss. (One lady brought in a wad of gooey pulp, which was all that was left after her baby had chewed up her ticket. The ticket agent decided it was the right kind of paper and issued her a replacement. The ticket itself is an IBM card, part of which goes into a computer. You merely show it to the conductor, who has no tickets to punch, no stubs to count. Now a train with 1,400 passengers can be operated by a few crew members. Some conductors resisted the change to flash tickets, not because it threatened technological unemployment but because the ticket punch (and the calloused hand) had been a status symbol.

Aggressive advertising brought in new riders. For example, the North Western sponsored the traffic helicopter on radio station WGN. Twice a day the motorist, inching along miserably in a solid mass of metal from his suburb to the Loop, is given a collision-by-collision analysis of the tangle, followed by a suggestion that he'd really be better out of it if he rode the train. Many, in this period of maximum frustration, got the message.

And the passengers were courted. Trainmen, who had to lose their old churlish ways, were sent through "charm school." There is no advertising in any North Western train. There isn't even an advertising slogan on the

outside of the train for the line itself. There is no piped-in music, either in the train or in the stations. Each rider, having rented his space, is entitled to privacy, and to being treated like a trusted member of the family. For instance, on rainy days a cart full of umbrellas is set out in the center of the North Western station—"Rainstick Junction"—and any passenger is entitled to help himself. Also, he is expected to return it some sunny day. Only 1 out of 20 does so. Since these are unclaimed umbrellas from lost and found (and hence in endless supply), the company doesn't worry about it overmuch. "Look at it this way," one official told me. "These people are stealing their own umbrellas. Maybe the fact that we stamp them makes them souvenirs, like hotel towels."

But the North Western steadfastly held to its policy of acting toward its patrons like a well-bred chauffeur rather than an ill-tempered landlord. It was a daring gamble—the $50 million invested was an important outlay—but it paid off. North Western riders today are like members of a club. Talk to any of them and they have nothing but admiration and praise for Ben Heineman. He runs their railroad.

And it all translated into money. In 1956, the suburban service had a deficit of $2.1 million, but in 1964 it made a net profit of $706,000, and it is expected to earn over a million for 1965. This has happened despite the fact that in 1960 Chicago opened two major expressways, now called the Eisenhower and the Kennedy, each of which parallels the North Western tracks. As a result, revenues dropped sharply in 1961. Then, in 1962, just when the railroad was winning back some of its lost passengers, the telegraphers struck. Ben Heineman, despite his politics, behaved exactly like a railroad executive. He stubbornly refused to give in to telegraphers who, he said, had no messages to send, and he endured a 30-day shutdown. During this period he was cheered by letters of support from his suburban Republican patrons. He won the strike but lost the revenues.

He also lost some of his employees' good will. Efficiency, like all beautiful things, has a sad underside. You don't hear it from the crewmen—not at first. Fremont Schultz (his real name), an engineer in whose cab I rode, admitted that the Heineman regime was tough and uncompromising. But he said it proudly; it reflected his own professional code. He understood that the rules of survival were stern. And, like Heineman himself, he saw things from the top. Engineers are the leading tenors of the company. But the chorus of lesser employees is all but mute.

Although 1962 was a bad year, it was not altogether unlucky for Heineman and the stockholders. The expressways which hurt the North Western were actually fatal for two small commuter lines, the North Shore, and the Chicago, Aurora and Elgin. Upon their demise, the North Western inherited most of their passengers. Since 1963 the news has been progressively more cheerful. While the profits have been modest—and by General Motors standards even minuscule—the importance of this success story is not to be measured in money. Commuter rail transportation is the only basic industry in the United States which is actually going out of business. As our country is becoming more urbanized, transportation—upon which urban living utterly depends—is collapsing. Railroad men everywhere have given it up as hopeless and, as in the case of the Long Island and the New Haven, have sought Government support. If in a single case anyone can demonstrate that hauling passengers can be made profitable—as Ben Heineman has—then this is news of acute importance, not just for the railroads but for all of America, and indeed the world. Perhaps it is possible for cities to break free of the concrete noose in which they have been strangling themselves and to breathe again.

With this in mind, I asked Mr. Heineman if the unprecedented success of the North Western suggested some formula that all other railroads could apply. Had he, in short, found "the answer"? He looked amused at the question. (He has a reputation for business, in railroad circles, and of being overquick with advice. But this time—perhaps because he was speaking to an innocent layman—his answers were undogmatic.)

"No," he said. "There is no easy answer. No formula. What we've done here has worked here. It might be all wrong someplace else. For example, you couldn't use our double-decker coaches in New York. They wouldn't fit through most of the tunnels."

And what, I asked, about intercity passenger trains? Could the same good management revitalize that part of the industry? Here the answer was a flat "No". "Ninety-one percent of all intercity travel today is by automobile, so that the whole transportation industry is fighting over just 9 percent. Airplanes are faster, buses are cheaper. All we have to offer is standby service. There's no future in the intercity train."

It was the only gloomy statement I heard from the lips of Ben Heineman—and history may soon prove him to be wrong. The new Tokyo-Osaka train, which attains speeds up to 130 mph, may yet find its counterpart in a Boston-Washington train. The U.S. Government, at any rate, has allocated funds to study the feasibility of such a project. The significance of such superspeed trains is clear: just as the commuter train satisfied a need in the metropolis of connecting the city with its outlying suburbs, so the trains of the future must satisfy a similar need for the megalopolis. A half-century ago it was unthinkable to commute from 30 miles out; in a few decades people who live in, say, the Gary-Chicago-Milwaukee area, or the Boston-New York-Washington area, will be commuters within those complexes.

But if time proves Heineman wrong in this, he will admit it very quickly, and go on to profit by his error. "We examine postulates," he once said. "We don't fall in love with them." He is the kind of realist who wasn't too proud to buy a couple of airplanes in order to run his railroad.

Despite his hopeless view of intercity train travel, Ben Heineman is a practical visionary. "It isn't enough to run a railroad well," he said. "The average rider lives within two-and-a-half miles from the station. When he gets to the city, he probably needs to ride a bus or a subway to get to his office. We need a transportation system that interlocks. We should have feeder buses, taxi stands and parking lots at each suburban station. In the city, we need a subway belt that connects all the railroad stations. Ideally, there should be a transfer system so that a single fare takes a man from end to end with no fuss."

"Can we do this in Chicago?"

"Absolutely. In fact we must. The mayor is for it. It's just a matter of getting moving."

As it turned out, this was no idle talk. Shortly after our interview, in October 1965, Mayor Richard Daley announced that the Federal Government had granted the city a million dollars to study a plan to tear down the elevated (that famous Loop) and to rebuild the subway so that it would link all the city's railroad stations. Ben Heineman had been preaching this for years.

COULD WE JUNK IT ALL?

And so I asked him: If he had it in his power to build a dream railroad, what would it be like?

"Go to San Francisco," he said, "and you'll see it coming into being." I did. The Bay Area Rapid Transit is fantastic. Trains will run (controlled by radar and computer only) at 80 miles per hour, 90 seconds apart. There are no straps to hang from because every passenger is guaranteed a seat (and a bucket seat at that). You will insert your credit card into the gate when you enter and again when you leave. At the end of the month the computer will mail you your transportation bill—like any other utility. The system will make every other line in the United States seem ancient and obsolete, for the excellent reason that it is. BART is the first transportation system to be designed, from the ground up, in half a century. Since the city of Philadelphia in 1907 designed its rapid transit system, there have only been additions and extensions to existing facilities.

"Why can't we do it in Chicago?" I asked Mr. Heineman.

"Because we already have existing rail transportation. We simply can't afford to junk all of it. San Francisco, luckily, had next to nothing. And that's not the whole story, either. We could do a great deal with automation. Modern technology is very sophisticated. But the unions would never let us get away with it."

"Then what is the answer to the problem in those cities where there are existing, inadequate, or poorly patronized railroads? In short, how do you run a railroad?"

"Don't ask me. I don't know how to run a railroad; I know how to run this railroad. There are no problems in general, just specific problems."

"All right—specifically. Do you think that government subsidies are a bad thing?"

"Not necessarily. If in a specific case it's the only thing to do." He finished with a wave of his hand.

"In short, you are a pragmatist."

The tycoon smiled. "Is there any other way to be?"

SALUTE TO THE REPUBLIC OF CHAD

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I wish to offer my compliments and best wishes to the people of the Republic of Chad who this week celebrated their national holiday. More than 5 years ago, on August 11, these people achieved their national independence, and they have set aside January 11 as their special day for national celebration.

To a nation such as ours which cherishes the principle of national self-determination, it is a pleasure to witness the growth and progressive fulfillment of the national aspirations of the Chadian people.

Under the dedicated leadership of President Francois Tombalbaye, Chad is striving for economic and social advancement, emphasizing education and technical training, improved internal transportation, local processing industries, and tourist facilities for developing the economic potential of tourist trade for which their climate and natural landscape are admirably suited.

In the international community Chad has earnestly undertaken her responsibilities as a sovereign state, actively participating in the United Nations and other international institutions including the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. She maintains close and fruitful ties with France and enjoys warm and friendly relations with the United States.

Mr. President, I join with well-wishers throughout the world in saluting the people of Chad on this special occasion. I know that my colleagues join with me in extending hearty congratulations to President Tombalbaye and to His Excellency Boukar Abdoul, Ambassador to the United States.

SKIING IN WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, our Chief Executive has asked that patriotic Americans help resolve our Nation's balance-of-payments problem by refraining from traveling abroad and planning to "Travel America" instead. I wish to support him by suggesting that all who are lovers of winter sports, winter mountain scenery, and relaxation in a beautiful, peaceful, and unspoiled mountainous clime should visit Davis, Blackwater Falls State Park, and Weiss Knob in West Virginia, the State which is often called "America's Little Switzerland."

The Weekender section of the Evening Star—Washington, D.C.—provides a lively account of the resort area's attractions and makes enthusiastic suggestions for winter pleasure in and around Blackwater Falls State Park, in the Saturday, January 8, issue. Believing it will be helpful to potential mountain travelers to clip it for handy reference in making future winter travel plans, 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:

WINTER WONDERLAND ISN'T FAR AWAY

(By Marj Hoskin)

Now is the time for you to pack flannel pajamas, even for those family members belonging to the antipajama cult, and take a midwinter jaunt to West Virginia's mountains.

Your destination: the 1,600-acre Blackwater Falls State Park in Davis, W. Va., about 180 miles from Washington, via U.S. Routes 50 and 219, and West Virginia Route 32.

In the summertime, the park reverberates with the yells of West Virginians reveling in a myriad of outdoor activities. It is almost impossible for an out-of-Stater to reserve a housekeeping cabin or a room in the lodge.

But in winter, the park becomes a quiet haven for couples or families. There are no scheduled activities; do-it-yourself fun is the order of the day. If you are lucky, you may be in the park during a snowstorm, a likely possibility at this time of the year.

Ranging in elevation from 2,500 to 3,400 feet, Blackwater Falls State Park is within 30 miles of the highest points in both West Virginia and Maryland. (Spruce Knob, 4,860 feet, West Virginia; Backbone Mountain, 3,360 feet, Maryland.)

The amber-colored waters of the Blackwater River gush through a deep, narrow gorge within the park. It is difficult—in fact, impossible—to resist engaging in a snowball rolling contest down the canyon's 500-foot sides to see whose snowball travels farthest.

But the delight is the falls where the river drops 63 feet over a sandstone ledge. Most of the cataract is frozen now in a delicate, lovely sculpture even a Michelangelo would admire.

HAVEN FOR WILDLIFE

The park is surrounded by the Monongahela National Forest, home of bear, deer, and other wildlife. But the tracks leading to and from the trash can on the cabin back stoop are most likely those of the inquisitive rabbit or unpopular skunk.

While you can stay at the lodge (from $12 double, European plan), be an adventurer in 1 of the 25 woodpaneled housekeeping cabins. They accommodate two, four, or eight persons, but rented cots or cribs increase sleeping facilities.

The cabins, with sturdy, modern furniture in the interior, are seasonally decorated on the exterior by hundreds of sparkling icicles clinging to the roof edges. Each cabin has an electric refrigerator, kitchen range, water heater, and bath with shower. The rustic stone fireplace is backstopped by a forced-air furnace. All cooking and eating utensils, and bed, bath and kitchen linens are furnished.

A 3-night stay for four in a two-person cabin (one double bed, two cots) costs $35.50.

To keep your youngsters (or yourselves) amused, bring sleds or rent them at the lodge. A ride down the 1,500-foot sled run, within walking distance of the cabins, is an invigorating thrill for the young, or the young at heart.

The gentle slope is also ideal for beginning skiers. Those more experienced drive 12 miles to Canaan Valley, where privately operated ski areas with tow lifts are usually open into March.

Ice skating can be enjoyed in Canaan Valley as well as in Davis.

There is a television set in the lodge lounge, but transistor radio broadcasts in your own cabin can be more fascinating. (Bring your own radio.) The darkness encourages transmissions from Chicago and points west, Canada, and even Cuba.

LOCAL PROVENDER

Grocery stores in Davis amply supply your pantry provisions. Local ham and homemade sausage are tasty, but if you cannot exist without filet mignon, you better bring it from home.

If you tire of your own cooking, the lodge has a dining room perched on the edge of the canyon. On your way, you may be sidetracked by the sparkle of West Virginia glassware in the gift shop.

You can take a trip to see this glass made. It is less than 75 miles to the Morgantown Glassware Guild, Inc., blowers of the official crystal service at the White House. The West Virginia Glass Specialty Co., Inc., noted for its stemware as well as apothecary jars, hurricane lamp shades, candy jars, and the like, is in Weston, a drive of about 80 miles.

When you tire of your private ice and snow carnival, drive back to Washington via U.S. Route 33 and the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks area. The U.S. Forest Service is leading the way here to the establishment of a new national recreation area that encompasses some 100,000 acres. Sheer 3,500-foot drops and the 1,000-foot towering rocks made this Swiss-like region one of the most impressive in the East.

Skittery about driving in the mountains in winter? Snow removal crews efficiently and faithfully tend the major highways. Traffic is light, and you need have no fear of that malady known as Washington Snow Panic.

For Lodge reservations, write to Blackwater Lodge, Davis, W. Va.; for cabin reservations, Division of Parks and Recreation, Department of Natural Resources, Charleston, W. Va.

THE ALBUQUERQUE SUNPORT

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, it was my pleasure last November 12 to be present in Albuquerque, N. Mex., for the dedication of the new Albuquerque Sunport. The main speaker at the dedication ceremony was Mr. J. L. Atwood, president of North American Aviation. Mr. Atwood's presence in Albuquerque that day was somewhat of a homecoming for him since he had spent his early school days there.

Mr. Atwood has an outstanding record as a leader in the aerospace industry. Before joining the aviation industry in 1928, Mr. Atwood served in the Army Air Corps. In 1948 he was elected president of North American. In 1960 he became chief executive officer, and chairman in 1962.

In 1949 Mr. Atwood was awarded the Presidential Certificate of Merit for his contributions to the war effort during World War II, and in 1955 the Republic of Italy conferred upon him the Commander of Merit decoration for his personal contribution to the aviation industry.

Mr. Atwood is a member of the board of governors and executive committee of the Aerospace Industries Association and is also a fellow of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astrophysics. In 1958, as chairman of the Industry Consulting Committee of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Mr. Atwood contributed to the creation of NASA.

Throughout his career Mr. Atwood has been an asset to his profession and to his country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

REMARKS OF J. L. ATWOOD, PRESIDENT OF NORTH AMERICAN AVIATION, INC., AT THE DEDICATION OF THE ALBUQUERQUE SUNPORT, ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., NOVEMBER 12, 1965

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, the dedication of this fine new Albuquerque Sunport is a great occasion for your city and for the Southwest, and I am delighted to be here to enjoy it with you. Although I cannot claim to be a native son, I did spend about 7 happy years of my boyhood here, attending the old Third Ward School and Albuquerque High School. In fact, I lived in various parts of the Southwestern United States for most of my youth, and received all my education in the Southwest. So it has always been very close to my heart.

We are here tonight to celebrate another step forward in that remarkable human enterprise called aviation. You and I have seen aviation change the world, and indeed, make its share of changes in New Mexico.

As we think back to 1928, and remember the small adobe building and the dirt runway that became Albuquerque Airport in that year, we cannot help being astonished at what has grown from the small beginning, and how much aviation has changed our lives in the 37 years since then. Few of us who were alive then would have guessed that by 1965 there would be 4 airlines serving this community with 635 takeoffs and landings every day; that transcontinental jetliners would be carrying passengers from here to either coast in a few hours, and onward to all parts of the world overnight.

Nor could we have foreseen that aircraft would be flying several times each day from here to a place called Los Alamos, half an hour away by airliner. We could scarcely have guessed that there would be huge places hereabouts called Kirtland Air Force Base, and Sandia Base, and White Sands Missile Range. We could scarcely have imagined that this same White Sands would be the

scene of equipment testing for a manned flight to the moon. We could not have known that there would be a Lovelace Clinic pioneering in something called aerospace medicine, and making examinations to help select explorers called astronauts. All this has happened because of aviation.

We all know that the history of mankind reached a turning point south of here near Alamogordo on a July morning in 1945. We have seen how the work accomplished there shortened a tremendous world conflict, created an entirely different pattern of international relations, and led us into a new era of atomic energy with possibilities of future change still unimaginable. Albuquerque has come to be called heart of the nuclear space age, and with good reason. All these dramatic changes, too, have been spurred along by aviation.

As we think back over all that we have experienced in the past 37 years, I ask you to consider whether anything like this scientific and economic transformation has ever occurred before in human history. What other major historic change has been as rapid, as sweeping, and as deep?

There have been creative revolutions before; at the beginning of recorded history, there was the great agricultural revolution that made civilization possible. In the 18th century there began the industrial revolution that started the long process of elevating the standard of living in the Western World. But these and other lesser revolutions like them, took centuries to produce their great transformations. Whereas the revolution of aviation and aerospace has taken place in a lifetime, in the lifetime of men and women now sitting in this room.

Many of us here tonight were actually around when aviation began. The Wright brothers' flight at Kitty Hawk occurred before I was born, but I must admit it was not very long before. As a boy I was one of many who were fascinated with the new adventure called aviation. But in those days, when I rode my bicycle as far out as Tijeras Canyon and played in the sand dunes, I certainly did not dream that the coming aviation revolution would be chiefly responsible for filling the canyon and the sand dunes with new homes during my own lifetime.

Many people in this room saw Charles Lindbergh fly into Albuquerque on his way across the continent; saw Art Goebel, winner of the Dole Prize for the first flight to Honolulu, land here; saw the arrival of the first airmail flights, and the opening of the Western Air Express ticket offices for the first passenger flights.

Some of you were at White Sands in 1946 when men began launching experimental rocket engines—the first engines that are not earthbound, since they do not depend on oxygen in the earth's atmosphere. You have seen White Sands helping the Nation develop rocket engines that now can propel a giant missile 6,000 miles in 35 minutes, or send astronauts orbiting around the earth at 300 miles per minute.

We have watched the aviation industry grow great from small beginnings, to the point where it has outgrown its own definition and has changed its name to the aerospace industry. And we know that this industry has changed the shape and size of the world we live on. Our own continent of North America was 5 days wide in the 1920's. Now it is 5 hours wide. Not so long ago the cities of Asia were half a world away and so far out of reach that we scarcely ever thought of them. Today those cities are much nearer to us in Albuquerque than was New York in 1928. By the 1970's there will be supersonic transports that can fly us across the Atlantic in 2 hours.

And in the 5 hours that we need to cross the continent today, we will be able to go to New Delhi, to Zanzibar, to Rio, to Tokyo, or to Melbourne on the other side of the earth.

Witnessing these changes, we have an exhilarating sense of progress. It is good to see a new industry create jobs for 800,000 people and contribute some $6½ billion per year to the gross national product. It is good to have swift transportation for New Mexico's products to buyers all over the Nation and abroad.

But we are perhaps so close to this aviation revolution that we have difficulty realizing its deeper significance. The swiftness of all these changes may make them more dramatic but may also blur their broader impact. Having lived through this exciting period ourselves, we know that something unprecedented, something overwhelmingly important, has happened to mankind in our lifetime. But we find it hard to see exactly what is really happening.

To approach such an understanding, we would do well to isolate a major aspect of this change—improvement in transportation—and then consider the role that transportation has played in the epic of mankind. In a sense, man's progress can be measured by his progress in transportation. Remarkable as all our subsequent innovations have been, there is good reason why historians still regard the invention of the wheel as one of the genuine milestones in the rise of civilization. Another giant stride was the development of sailing vessels that enabled Mediterranean peoples to venture beyond the Straits of Gibraltar and into the oceans of the world.

The first result of these new transportation modes was improved trade with other peoples. Local artisans could manufacture new and useful goods, but it was transportation that introduced these goods to the markets of the known world. With this came an exchange of goods, rewarding each locality by enabling it to specialize in the products that it could make better or cheaper than any other locality. This division of labor—first between individuals and then between whole settlements—has been cited by historians as one of the requisites in the elevation of man. It was—and still is—made possible by transportation.

Another obvious outgrowth of transportation has been the carrying of civilization to remote and primitive corners of the world. One of the most recent of world history books to challenge the thinking of historians is "The Rise of the West," by William McNeill. Instead of the more accepted view of history as an inevitable cycle of rising and falling civilizations, his theme is the gradual rise of the Western World in competition with other cultures, culminating in the exploration and colonization of all the primitive lands on the globe by Western peoples.

This theme is not diminished by the emergence in our time of independent nations out of former colonies.

The success with which they have built their independence has been in direct proportion to their absorption of Western culture. They emerge now in a framework of values and ideals brought to them by the former colonists. The very freedom they now achieve is a Western concept. Their educated leaders have done their homework in the writings of Jean Jacques Rousseau, John Locke, and Thomas Jefferson. And they have seen the fruits of liberty in the Western lands they have visited.

The point I wish to make is that the spread of civilization to the ends of the earth could not have been accomplished without great improvements in transportation. More than material goods have been carried by the vehicle and the ship. They have also carried knowledge and ideas.

Indeed, we hardly need to call upon world history and geography to grasp the importance of travel and commerce. New Mexico knows something about the history of transportation. It was the Santa Fe trade that opened the Southwest to American influence. The Santa Fe and Southern Pacific Railroads brought markets and population to what had formerly been a vast cattle range. Beginning in the 1920's, surfaced highways around the southern end of the Rockies brought an even larger movement of families by automobile.

In this sense, New Mexico's history is the history of its transportation. This State presents a classic example of the progress achieved by the movement of goods, people, and ideas.

In our time, this same progress is conveyed not only by the older forms of transportation, but also by the newer form that takes to the air. And this form has brought, in the span of two generations, an acceleration of progress undreamed in centuries past. If the exchange of cultures and of knowledge has been facilitated by earlier modes of travel, it is vastly advanced by our own. I have already touched upon the incredible velocities by which we are transported from one country to another—close to the speed of sound today, three times the speed of sound tomorrow. In fact, the triple-sonic XB-70 research aircraft that North American Aviation has developed is of a comparable size and weight to the planned supersonic transports. It has already flown at its design speed of 2,000 miles per hour, and is scheduled later for long distance cruises at the same speed.

Traveling in supersonic transports at this velocity, we will easily surpass the rotation of the earth if we fly westward. Among the curious results of such travel will be to see the sun appear to move backward in its path, rising in the west and setting in the east. Another will be to reverse the order of our meals—having dinner in London, lunch in New York, and breakfast in Los Angeles, all in the same day.

What is the significance of such speeds? For one thing, offering fast and convenient transportation to more distant points, they increase the volume of travel. This has been the pattern of air transportation since its beginning not long before the original Albuquerque airport was established.

In just 35 years—from 1929 to 1964—the number of passenger-miles traveled annually on the world's civil airlines increased from 105 million to more than 105 billion—almost a thousandfold. This figure is derived, of course, from both increased passengers and longer routes flown. If such a number is too staggering to imagine, perhaps my point could be made just as well by considering only the increase in number of passengers per year, and within a shorter time period. In only 15 years, between 1949 and 1964, the annual number of passengers on world civil airlines increased from 27 million to 154 million—nearly sixfold.

Moreover, equally dramatic figures emerge when we forecast future airline traffic. A Stanford Research Institute study predicts that passenger-miles on the free world's scheduled airlines—which were 105 billion in 1964—will reach approximately 229 billion in 1975, only a decade from now.

Not to be overlooked is the continued rise of general aviation, which includes business, private, and training aviation. At major American airports having control towers, such as this one, general aviation constitutes two-thirds of the landing and takeoff activity. And bear in mind that these airports make up only 3 percent of the more than 8,000 airports in this country. At the rest, virtually all airport activity is in the category of general aviation.

The trend of this type of flying in the United States alone may be gaged by the estimated miles flown per year—94 million in 1931, more than 2 billion in the latest available estimate. Just in the decade between 1955 and 1965, the number of aircraft operated in general aviation increased 55 percent.

Admittedly, it is more difficult to project the future of private flying than of commercial aviation. Much depends on technical innovation, family income levels, and the development of appropriate traffic control systems. I do not maintain that we are on the brink of an age of flying flivvers, with a pilot in every family. But we are already in an age where prophets tend to fall short of the actual fulfillment. I may remind you that when the railroads came into New Mexico in the 1880's with mass, scheduled transportation, few would have predicted that within 40 years, people would be driving into New Mexico and from coast to coast in their own powered conveyances. Nowadays, the riskiest statement of all is to say that something is impossible.

Nor do these observations really cover the impact of an aerospace industry that embraces not only transportation, but also advanced communication, navigation, atomic power, and space exploration. The Telstar satellite is already a means by which the arts of communication and transportation are combined to bring the people of the world closer together in knowledge and in cultural expression. The achievements that lie ahead in the realm of space are no longer visionary, but are being pursued at the level of practical engineering. This year the Apollo program, in which North American is a major participant, passed important milestones with the successful testing of key structures and equipment. We are more confident than ever of achieving the dramatic objective of sending Americans to the moon and back.

Beyond this, we are already studying the application of Apollo technology and the adaptation of Apollo equipment to other uses in space. These will add immeasurably to man's knowledge of his environment, and should lead to new and now unimaginable uses of that environment.

We are finding, moreover, that the management of technical programs on such a scale has given American industry a capability that it did not have before. Designing such complex systems and managing such vast development projects has provided techniques for solving other human problems, from controlling our weather to managing the use of our natural resources.

These are some of the further developments that are growing out of what was once called the aviation industry. That industry has found more ways to apply its technical and managerial abilities than in transportation alone, and these new activities continue to promote the progress, the elevation, and the cultivation of man. If early forms of transportation played their part in the exchange of goods and knowledge, travel by air has added to that the ability of millions to travel among other peoples and to understand their ways. If early transportation once enabled Western nations to explore the world, modern transportation and communication enables Western businessmen to help raise living standards around the world through foreign investment.

The result is to multiply the ties and the contacts that the people of the world have with one another. It is human nature to distrust strangers. But the more we see and understand others, the more we realize that they are basically like us, and the more we care what they think about us. A world that was once full of strangers can take no better example of mutual trust than the thousand miles of unfortified border that lie between two neighbors and friends, the United States and Mexico.

These are some of the considerations that come to mind with the dedication of this fine new Albuquerque Sunport. Your city's airport development is symbolic of these dynamic changes wrought by aviation. In 1928, when air travel was still in its youth, two far-sighted citizens of Albuquerque borrowed city road equipment and worked evenings and weekends to build the first municipal flying field. That pioneer airport was improved over the years to match the dramatic strides being made in aviation. Today the people of Albuquerque have committed $2.5 million to this jet-age airport that will match any in the world for cities of comparable size.

I congratulate you on your foresight and your enterprise. I note that this is the beginning of a $6 million airport improvement program over the next 10 years. And I predict that even this magnificent Albuquerque Sunport is not an end to your city's response to the age of flight.

POLICE HEROISM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, during late December, a letter came to me from a resident of the District of Columbia, providing a newspaper clipping reporting on an outstanding act of heroism by members of the District of Columbia Metropolitan Police Department. I have concurred with the writer's conviction that some congressional recognition of the bravery and service performed by Pvt. Timothy C. Voellinger and Pvt. George J. Pagac should be rendered.

I, therefore, wish to commend these young officers upon their bravery and to call to the attention of the Members of this body the report of the action which these policemen took in saving the lives of District residents from fire.

I ask unanimous consent to have the newspaper article from the December 22 edition of the Washington (D.C.) Star, printed in the RECORD.

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

TWO POLICEMEN HELP DOZENS FLEE BLAZE—BOTH ARE INJURED IN RESCUE EFFORT ON SECOND STREET NW.

(By Walter Gold)

More than 2 dozen residents of a burning Northwest Washington rooming house were led to safety uninjured last night by a pair of District policemen. Both of the policemen were injured and one was hospitalized.

The officers about 7 p.m. rushed into the rooming house at 745 Second Street NW, after seeing flames spurting from the building's second floor.

While searching for stragglers, one patrolman became trapped by smoke and flames and had to be rescued himself.

The rescuers are Pvt. Timothy C. Voellinger, 27, and his partner, Pvt. George J. Pagac, 24, both of the first precinct. The men were to be nominated for their department's Policemen of the Month Award, officials said.

TWO OTHERS TREATED

Voellinger was described in fair condition today at the Washington Hospital Center with third-degree hand burns, first-degree face burns, and numerous cuts and bruises. He was burned after being trapped on the third floor of the rooming house.

Pagac was treated at the Hospital Center for smoke inhalation and later released.

Another policeman and a fireman were treated for minor injuries at the Hospital Center and also released.

The fire destroyed several second-floor rooms in the three-story red brick rooming house. The cause of the blaze is under investigation.

After the policemen spotted the flames, Voellinger used their police car short-wave radio to call for firemen and Pagac drove alongside the burning house, sounding the car's siren and flashing its emergency lights to alert the occupants.

Voellinger then ran into the house while Pagac climbed up a fire escape and assisted more than a dozen men, women and children down from the second floor.

Inside, Voellinger kicked in doors on the second floor and led confused residents to the building's lone center stairway.

GOES TO THIRD FLOOR

"People were in one of the burning rooms yelling, 'Help me, help me,'" Voellinger said later from his hospital bed.

After satisfying himself that everyone was off the second floor of the house, Voellinger went upstairs looking for more residents.

"Suddenly, I was surrounded by smoke, so I thought the fire had burned up to where I was on the third floor," Voellinger said. "I kicked out a window and leaned outside for fresh air. There was no fire escape * * * I couldn't get down."

Unknown to Voellinger, his partner had helped firemen get water hose lines into the second floor, then went upstairs to search further. Although the two policemen probably were only a few feet apart on the third floor, neither saw the other while searching for a way out because of the thick smoke.

Eventually, Pagac found his way back to the fire escape and descended to the sidewalk. But when he learned that his partner was still inside, he ran up the building's stairway back to the third floor, where Voellinger had returned to the broken window in desperation.

HANGS OUT WINDOW

Firemen, meanwhile, had raised a portable ladder to the third-floor window where Voellinger was awaiting rescue. The police officer, however, is a big man—about 250 pounds, his colleagues reported—and fire officials were afraid to lower him on the ladder.

So for about 10 minutes, Voellinger hung with his body draped over the ladder and supported by firemen, and his feet on the window ledge.

After extinguishing the fire, firemen made their way to the third floor. Voellinger was brought inside the building again, led down the charred stairway to safety, and taken, with Pagac, to the hospital.

Police Pvt. Jackie D. Atkins was treated for smoke inhalation and Pvt. George Kenney, of the fire department, was treated for a cut hand at the Hospital Center. Both were later released.

Traffic in the area of Second and H Streets NW was rerouted for about an hour.

Police Inspector Karol L. Kratochvil said Voellinger and Pagac "risked their lives to save a number of persons."

AMERICANS SHOULD SPEAK UP FOR FREEDOM

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, during the congressional recess while many misguided and ill-advised college professors and students were organizing movements designed to give aid and comfort to militaristic communism and to provide foreign agitators with a distorted image of this country's determination to resist and repel the Communist invaders of South Vietnam, one of South Dakota's highly respected radio spokesmen and managers delivered an editorial of the air which won wide acclaim throughout the State. I refer to the October 27 commentary of Ross E. Case of KWAT, Watertown, S. Dak., which he entitled, "Comments On Americanism."

Mr. President, the commentary of General Manager Ross E. Case of Radio Station KWAT, Watertown, S. Dak., so fa-

vorably impressed the listeners of this station that it was necessary to prepare several editions of reprints to reply to the many requests for copies which were received by the station.

For the information of the Congress and the country, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the commentary by Ross Case be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. I do so in the hope other commentators and editors will devote their talents to expanding on the patriotic theme so dramatically developed by Mr. Case.

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

COMMENTS ON AMERICANISM

(By Ross E. Case)

The following should be considered a KWAT editorial, perhaps it sounds more like it might be a sermon. This is Ross Case speaking. These comments are brought about because of the story that I read on my noon newscast of yesterday, which I hope that many of you heard. I'd like to repeat that story first of all:

"The New York World-Telegram said today an antidraft group known as the May Second Movement is sending blood, first aid supplies and money to the Communist Vietcong. The movement was among those involved in recent demonstrations against the war in Vietnam. The report said a blood donor drive has been organized in the movement's west coast chapter, and blood and first aid material already has been shipped to North Vietnam. The paper said the New York chapter plans to send blood donated by its members and send the money to the Vietcong through the Algerian National Liberation Front. The report said the movement has 17 chapters across the country, with the New York City chapter having 200 members.

"The paper also quoted one Columbia University student—identified as a member of the May Second Movement—as indicating that the movement in Michigan is training volunteers to join the Communist forces in Vietnam. The student, when asked about the report, was quoted as saying: 'That's not far from the truth.'"

So much for the story. It's time for the average, decent, red-blooded American to stand up and be counted. Do you or do you not believe in the concept of liberty and justice, tempered with faith in those who lead our country and have the authority to direct our actions? Isn't it time to quit snickering about being a flag waver and really show our patriotism?

I challenge every veteran's organization to become militantly aggressive in the purpose of bringing home to the people, especially our younger people, the need for military preparedness. I challenge the fraternal organizations such as the Elks, the Masons, the Eagles, and others who stress Americanism in their rituals, to give it more than lipservice. I challenge the civic organizations, business firms and individuals of this community, to put God and country above business in observance of patriotic holidays, to help drive home the principles of democracy that guide our country. I challenge the churches to preach to their congregations why the need for belief in what our country stands for. I challenge the youth group leaders; such as Scouting, FFA, YCL, Hi-Yi and all the rest, to make Americanism and an understanding of loyalty to country and constituted authority, a major portion of its regular programing and instruction. I challenge the teachers to educate our students from the very beginning about our country and what it represents. I challenge the young people of our area to think clearly and honestly about their future. They have no place to go if they don't believe in the principles of the American way that history and tradition have created. And, most of all, I challenge you parents to undertake the task that is your most solemn obligation—that of guiding your youngsters by experience and example. If you don't believe in what our flag stands for, if you don't participate to the fullest extent in the practice of democracy, if you let someone else do the job of protecting your rights; then don't expect your youngsters to be any different than you. Someone has got to tell these young people why they have to expect to face sacrifices in behalf of their country. Someone has got to get across to them the reasons for respecting authority and discipline. Someone has got to give them enough faith and belief in that which is right so that they can't be hookwinked and misled by fuzzy thinking and deliberate subterfuge. And, parents, that someone has got to be you.

Patriotism, love of our flag and country, respect for the rights of others, these are the lessons that must be taught at home. They have to be started young and they have to be told often. The attitude and approach to thinking on the matter of serving our country and accepting our responsibilities has sunk to a new low. Our apathy and evasive stand on the problems facing the United States in our conflict with our enemies are hard to comprehend.

Somebody, somewhere has got to start the ball rolling. Somebody, somewhere has got to fire up a very tiny flame that at one time was bright enough and warm enough to create the greatest country in the history of the world. There's no reason why that somebody can't be you and I. There's no reason why that somebody must not be you and I.

Take the time to think about it and you'll suddenly realize that time is running out on our way of life. If that's the way you want it to be, keep on doing what you've been doing. As for me, I'm joining the parades—I'm going to wave the flag—I'm going to sing the "Star Spangled Banner." Are you ashamed to join me? I don't believe so. But, just nodding your head in agreement, talking about it over the coffee cup this morning and forgetting it—that's not going to improve the situation. You've got organizations you belong to. There are people who will listen to you. Most of all, you have kids that need your instruction and example. Let's get on with our job of being acting, active, aggressive, and proud Americans. And, let's show the light of truth to those around us who aren't too sure about it all.

Finally, here's a comment written by a Peter E. Gianutsos, an American officer serving in Vietnam. I'd like to read his comments:

"A legacy of ignorance: Time was when a boy when to college to study law, medicine, engineering or one of the arts. And girls went to get their Mrs. degree. But, that was in the past. Today's crop of college cutups are no longer content to swallow goldfish, crowd themselves into telephone booths, or foreign cars. They now insist on dictating Government policies and are ready to parade, demonstrate or sit-in at the drop of a cause.

"The latest gimmick among these intellectual midgets is a campaign to urge all members of the Armed Forces to desert their posts rather than serve in Vietnam.

"As a member of the race that started this democracy kick (quick, Socrates, the hemlock!), I have no quarrel with the right of the individual to voice his opinions. However, the hysterical babbling of these burgeois boors, borders on sedition if not treason. I leave that to the legal eagles in the Justice Department. It is a sad day indeed when the words honor, duty, and country have come to mean so little. As a member of the military family, I have spent the better part of my adult life in the Saigons of the world. It never occurred to me to disobey an order, to question the right of my Government to send me anywhere to protect and preserve its interests.

"Like a lot of us here, I have had occasion to be at the base theater during one of the daily memorial services, and I have witnessed the loud music, the slow walking, and heard the soft prayers for those to whom fygmo charts and rotation dates are no longer important. I muttered my own prayer, as well as giving silent thanks that it was not me inside that metal box. As I stood there, I remembered the preachings of these mentally retarded adults and my compassion for a dead man turned to shame, and finally anger, that they dared to ask me to prostitute my profession, ask me to bring dishonor to myself, to my service, and to my country.

"It is difficult enough to understand when the more learned citizenry take the rostrum to rant and rave against our Government, and thereby feed the propaganda mills to the north, but to be subjected to the meaningless chatter of many of these imbecilic sloths, whose idea of bravery is to lead a panty raid, is more than human dignity can bear.

"It has been suggested that they all be drafted and brought to Vietnam. I could not agree less. To put these morons in a uniform is to insult the memory of those who never came back from Guadalcanal, Pork Chop Hill, or, those who did not survive the Brinks BOQ bombing or the VC attack on the Embassy. Instead, clean them up, cut their hair, take away their sweat shirts, and sneakers and bring them to Vietnam to live among the people. Let them expound their theories about the kind, gentle misunderstood VC among the villagers whose homes were destroyed and their meager rice crop stolen. Let them talk about war mongering to the widow of a Vietnamese Army private who earns her rice and fish as a prostitute, or, with the village woman who lost a hand, one finger at a time, to Vietcong terrorists because she dared to stand up for what she believed was right.

"Draft them into the military? Never. Ours is a proud organization, made up of men and women who have ideals and principles, and what's even more important, men and women who have the courage and the will to live up to those beliefs. They take great pride in themselves, in their uniforms and in their Nation, qualities that campus cuties have yet to acquire. Until they do, they will never belong. Their voice will be that of the semieducated half-baked idiot and the fool who will leave behind only a legacy of shame, dishonor and disgrace."

These last comments by Peter E. Gianutson, an American officer serving in Vietnam.

And this is the sermon for this morning.

BERKELEY SPRINGS, W. VA.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Sunday magazine section of the November 21, 1965, Washington, D.C., Star carried an article by Benjamin Ruhe on historic Berkeley Springs, W. Va. The author pointed out the scenic appeal of the springs as well as the therapeutic value of the waters of this spa, which has been termed the first health resort in the American Colonies. A list of its visitors and residents during the early years of its development is reported as "almost amounting to a registry of famous Americans in all walks of life." As examples, George and Martha Washington were devotees of the waters and visited on varied occasions, accompanied by friends and relatives, and

James Madison once came to recover from "a fit of despondency." It is reported that he did indeed recover his good spirits.

So widely known was the Berkeley Springs reputation for gaiety that Francis Asbury, the renowned Methodist evangelist, came to preach in the village in thundering condemnation of the social life, which included gambling, dancing, and sporting games.

A charming remnant of the past is the castle on the hillside overlooking the village square. Now used as a museum, it was once the residence of a wealthy and prominent eastern family.

The castle and the springs themselves are attractions for thousands of visitors annually; however, it is believed that the area's full recreational potentials are only partially known. Recently, a technical assistance project was undertaken by Wheeling College, in Wheeling, W. Va., under a grant from the Area Redevelopment Administration, for the purpose of selecting archeological and historical sites in West Virginia for development of tourist and recreational possibilities. Among those surveyed and strongly recommended for intensive development was Berkeley Springs, with it historical attributes and scenic attractions.

In order that the general public may learn more of the spa, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Benjamin Ruhe's article reprinted in the RECORD.

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

BERKELEY SPRINGS: WEST VIRGINIA'S FAMOUS OLD SPA IS ONCE AGAIN STIRRING TO LIFE

(By Benjamin Ruhe)

Taking the waters at Berkeley Springs, W. Va., has been a way of seeking health and happiness for two centuries. Today, more than 200 years after Lord Fairfax, a sufferer from gout, deeded the mineral springs "to be forever free to the publick for the welfare of suffering humanity," the spa continues to exert its quiet charm on visitors, while its curative waters rehabilitate the sick, the lame, the tired, and the old. A gay health resort in post-Revolutionary War times ("Sadly dissipated," said George Washington), the town continued to grow in favor through most of the 1800's only to decline at the turn of the century under the impact of new medical ideas and changes in American holiday habits. The springs themselves, though, never ceased to pour forth their daily 3 million gallons of 74° alkaline water and now the spa is having a resurgence. Business has increased significantly in the last decade. Supt. Henry Lawyer attributes the swing of the pendulum to a growing recognition that the water has therapeutic effects in the treatment of nervous disorders.

That the water helps arthritics, often magically, has always been obvious. Six thousand people come yearly to drink the waters and bathe in them and many more come just to see the sights. Pleasant, sleepy Berkeley, with its lofty trees, graceful Victorian mansions, its castle on the hill and rambling hotels, is the perfect setting for the outdoor springs and interesting bathhouses. State-run, the spa is open the year around. It is reached from Washington via Interstate 70S to Frederick, west on U.S. 40 to Hancock and left again to Route 522, a total distance of 109 miles. The charge for the baths is nominal and the water itself is free—many people cart it away in jugs. Some may even find true a saying about the aqua vitae of an ancient spa: "Whosoever drinks thereof shall find their wits more quick and themselves of better conceit than before."

A MEDIC IN VIETNAM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, a few months ago, I received a letter from a Connecticut high school teacher, enclosing a letter which he had received from a former student, Robert Tillquist.

At the time the letter was written, Mr. Tillquist was stationed in Vietnam as a member of the Armed Forces. A few days afterward, Robert A. Tillquist was killed in action.

I was deeply moved by this letter which so clearly voiced the young man's patriotic feeling for his country, and which expressed his reasons, and those of other American boys, for risking their lives in a far-off land.

It was Mr. Tillquist's hope that the maximum number of Americans would read his words so that they might realize the importance of supporting the men who are fighting for our ideals.

I would therefore like to share this letter with you, knowing that you will be proud to hear the words of such a fine, young American.

I ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed in the RECORD at this point:

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

(NOTE.—This letter was written by Robert Tillquist, a former student at Wilbur Cross High School who was killed in Vietnam, November 4, 1965, to Mr. Ted Astarita, a member of the faculty at Cross High School. As a favor, I ask that you read this to as many students as possible.)

B COMPANY, 2D BATTALION,
12TH CAVALRY,
1ST CAVALRY DIVISION (AM),
APO San Francisco, Calif., 96490, November 2, 1965.

Hello, remember me? The umbrella kid. I don't know whether an old married (?) (congratulations) man such as yourself can remember back that far. This is to inform you, however, if you haven't been reading the papers lately, that your favorite (huh?) student (past tense) is now in Vietnam. Below I will try and explain the reason I am writing.

Just as other young men are afraid of dying, so am I. This to me was sufficient reason for my concern, for my personal welfare when I was ordered over here with the Airmobile Division by President Johnson. A fear of dying is a great burden to a young man who has not fully tasted all that life has to offer.

So I came over here with many misgivings. I didn't want to come over here, I didn't want to leave the security of my nice comfortable home, or of America. Why should I give up the luxurious life I knew in the States, to come over here and fight, fight for something I didn't really care about?

After only a few weeks here, these and many other questions were answered. Just being here and having contact with these people can tell you many things.

When you see children 6 or 7 years old, with one or more of their limbs brutally amputated. Or orphanages overcrowded with young boys and girls who were forced to watch the massacre of their parents. Or fertile fields that would grow almost any crop, ravaged and destroyed (with the harvest that would have fed the people of the village, laying in the ruins), just to deprive the people of subsistence. When you see this and much more (things to make even the strongest of men cry out in anger, at the outrage of it all) then you understand the reason for your being here.

I came here afraid for my life. Now I would gladly lay down my life for these little—but only in stature—people. They have brave hearts and fight on against a terrible foe. A man who is not proud and willing to help these people, after seeing what they have to fight against, is not much of a man, not much of an American.

The morale of the men—the U.S. forces here—is high. The men want to help these people, and are doing a good job of it. We are like the forces of Lafayette. We too have come to a country fighting for its freedom. And like the men of LaFayette we will be able to go home—when the job is done—knowing that we did the job we came to do.

One of the prime factors in the morale of the troops is the news from home. A staggering blow, to the men fighting for this cause, was the headlines concerning the demonstrations in protest to our Vietnam policy. It might be a blow to the morale of the protesters that the men in Vietnam think that our policy in Vietnam is not strict enough. We think that the Government is being too lenient with the Vietcong.

Being born and raised in Connecticut, I know that the people there are behind our boys here 100 percent. I know that I'm not the most patriotic person from our State, so I know if I feel the way I do that the rest of the people feel even more strongly.

I hope that in writing this I have accomplished my purpose. To instill in you the students of Cross, the school to which my heart belongs, a more accurate knowledge of what one GI of many who think alike, feels about Vietnam.

I close now asking that you remember, it's American boys fighting here. Remember that and the fact that they are fighting for you. Maybe then it will be easier for you to understand what is really going on.

A fellow Crossite,

ROBERT A. TILLQUIST,
A Medic in Vietnam.

WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT TO BE SERVED BY JET TRANSPORT PLANES

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I am pleased to note that the Washington National Airport will be opened to jet service beginning April 24. The Federal Aviation Agency deserves commendation for this decision because it will benefit the millions of passengers who use the National Airport, which is so convenient to downtown Washington, D.C.

Our Nation's Capital deserves the best possible air transportation and in opening National to jet service, the FAA has indicated that they plan to keep this facility at the forefront of important air hubs in the United States. It is now the fourth busiest airport in our country and the introduction of the new, 2- and 3-engine jets will insure increased usefulness in the years ahead.

One reason why National Airport is being opened to smaller jets is that airlines have demonstrated considerable interest in acquiring these comfortable and convenient aircraft. Carriers serving the airport have almost 200 of the small jets in their fleets now and have ordered more than 300. Total cost of these modern planes will exceed $2 billion.

The Administrator of the FAA, William F. McKee, and his associates are to be congratulated for taking this forward-looking step in the strengthening of one of the Nation's most useful assets: air transportation.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON MEETS THE POPULATION CRISIS SQUARELY

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in his state of the Union address Wednesday, the President continued his superlative leadership in the face of the population crisis. He forthrightly announced that the United States of America is ready to help nations trying to control population growth by increasing our research and by earmarking funds to help their efforts.

The President asked us "to give a new and daring direction to our foreign aid program, designed to make a maximum attack on hunger, disease, and ignorance in those countries determined to help themselves—and to help those nations trying to control population growth."

Minutes later in his state of the Union message the President said he would propose the International Health Act of 1966, "to strike at disease by a new effort to bring modern skills and knowledge to the uncared-for suffering of the world—and by wiping out smallpox, malaria, and controlling yellow fever over most of the world in this decade," and "to help countries trying to control population growth, by increasing our research—and by earmarking funds to help their efforts."

The President is properly concerned. Family planning information should be available to all people upon request. And all the people in the United States and in other nations should know such information is available.

Man's right to knowledge is the basis of freedom of thought. That knowledge will be widened by increased research.

President Johnson's concern has been expressed on previous occasions. Clearly he has given a mandate to the various offices of the executive agencies to meet the challenges of the population explosion.

Let us hope with all our hearts that the urgent and important work necessary is to accelerate. It is pertinent to repeat the previous pronouncements by President Johnson in 1965 which concern the population explosion.

In his state of the Union address before Congress on January 4, 1965, he said:

> I will seek new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion in world population and the growing scarcity in world resources.

When the 20th anniversary of the United Nations was observed in San Francisco on June 25, he said:

> Let us in all our lands—including this land—face forthrightly the multiplying problems of our multiplying populations and seek the answers to this most profound challenge to the future of all the world. Let us act on the fact that less than $5 invested in population control is worth $100 invested in economic growth.

When John W. Gardner was sworn in as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in the Rose Garden at the White House on August 18, the President said:

> This administration is seeking new ideas and it is certainly not going to discourage any new solutions to the problems of population growth and distribution.

And when the Second United Nations World Population Conference opened in Belgrade on August 30, the President addressed the following letter to U.N. Secretary General U Thant:

> MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY GENERAL: The U.S. Government recognizes the singular importance of the meeting of the Second United Nations World Population Conference and pledges its full support to your great undertaking.
>
> As I said to the United Nations in San Francisco, we must now begin to face forthrightly the multiplying problems of our multiplying population. Our Government assures your conference of our wholehearted support to the United Nations and its agencies in their efforts to achieve a better world through bringing into balance the world's resources and the world's population.
>
> In extending my best wishes for the success of your conference, it is my fervent hope that your great assemblage of population experts will contribute significantly to the knowledge necessary to solve this transcendent problem. Second only to the search for peace, it is humanity's greatest challenge. This week, the meeting in Belgrade carries with it the hopes of mankind.

In this past session of the 89th Congress the Senate Government Operations Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures has held 15 public hearings on S. 1676, my bill to coordinate and disseminate birth control information upon request. Twelve of my colleagues in this Chamber have joined as cosponsors of this proposed legislation which would make possible the coordination and dissemination upon request of information available on birth control in the Department of State and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. An Assistant Secretary would head an Office for Population Problems in each department. The bill also authorizes the President to call a White House Conference on Population to be preceded by State conferences if the States so desire.

When S. 1676 was introduced on April 1, 1965, joining me as cosponsors were the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG].

Since S. 1676 was introduced the following colleagues have requested that their names be added as cosponsors. They are the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN].

On October 1, 1965, I reported on the progress of hearings on S. 1676. The Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures had ended hearings for the first session of the 89th Congress on September 22. The hearings had brought out the crucial relationship between the dissemination of birth control information as lack of that information relates to proverty, health, educational needs, quality of life, responsible parenthood, broken homes, national economy, natural resources, crime and juvenile delinquency—to name but a few of the immediate findings. The hearings covered many aspects of these vital problems both at home and abroad. Already requests for printed copies of the hearings number approximately 4,000.

Very distinguished witnesses have testified and this session of Congress others will add their contribution to the population dialog when public hearings on S. 1676 resume next week on Wednesday, January 19, at 10 a.m. in room 3302 of the New Senate Office Building.

The hearing witnesses next Wednesday, January 19, will be Nobel Prize laureates representing the 83 who appealed to Pope Paul VI last year to urge him to reconsider the church's position on birth control. Dr. E. L. Tatum, 1958 Nobel Prize winner for medicine and physiology, who now is associated with the Rockefeller Institute, has handled arrangements to assemble the panel.

The other panelists are Dr. Dickenson W. Richards, Jr., physician, 1956 Nobel Prize winner in medicine and physiology; Dr. Albert Szent-Gyorgyi, physician, 1937 Nobel Prize winner in medicine; and Dr. Polykarp Kusch, physicist, 1955 Nobel Prize winner in physics.

These men share President Johnson's concern about the dangers caused or created by the population explosion. They are prepared to do whatever they can to bring to the attention of the world the urgency for solution. Certainly the President has made it abundantly clear that our Government will, if requested, help other nations. Now is the time to disseminate his mandate.

I am encouraged by a news story appearing in the New York Times for January 14, 1966, written by Mr. John W. Finney and datelined Washington. In his article Mr. Finney offers an informal outline of forthcoming requests which the administration will send to the Congress in its new foreign-aid bill. The requests, according to the news item, will include one for "about $10 million to help other countries curb their population growth." Now this is a very modest sum, but it is a start and it shall have my support because we will make no progress with our foreign-aid program until the population explosion is recognized by us and by other nations. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of Mr. Finney's article appear as exhibit 1 at the close of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, earlier this month, on Sunday, January 9, the New York Times magazine section contained an excellent article written by Mr. David E. Lilienthal, chairman of the Development and Resources Corp., and former Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Atomic Energy Commission, entitled "Three Hundred Million Americans Would Be Wrong."

I have excerpted two brief comments by the author. Mr. Lilienthal writes:

But if our resources are mainly spent to survive, to cope with life in a congested America, then where is the enjoyment of living? Our teeming cities are not pleasant places today; imagine them by the middle of the next century when the areas of some might be 100 times larger than they are now.

And:

Even today, most of the Nation's most serious problems are caused largely by the pressures of a too rapidly rising population. In the next generation, the problems may become unmanageable. Take four basic needs: education, water, air, and power.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of Mr. Lilienthal's article be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks as exhibit 2.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the January 9 edition of the New York Times also carried a full-page message addressed to President Lyndon B. Johnson submitted by the Hugh Moore Fund of New York City and headed "Famine Stalks the Earth." The message was signed by 83 individuals who are concerned about the inadequacy of the world's food supply today and tomorrow. The message concludes:

There will be 300 million more mouths to feed in the world 5 years from now—most of them hungry. Hunger brings turmoil—and turmoil, as we have learned, creates the atmosphere in which the Communists seek to conquer the earth.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the message and the names of the persons who have signed it appear at the conclusion of my remarks as exhibit 3.

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

(See exhibit 3.)

EXHIBIT 1

AID BILL TO SPUR POPULATION CURBS—UNITED STATES TAKING LESS CAUTIOUS STAND—TO ASK $10 MILLION

(By John W. Finney)

WASHINGTON, January 13.—The administration will shortly ask Congress in its new foreign aid bill for about $10 million to help other countries curb their population growth.

The amount will more than double American assistance for foreign population control programs and will mark the first time the administration has specifically requested money to support such programs.

A step in the administration's approach to the politically sensitive problem was taken by President Johnson last night in his state of the Union message. In discussing major new directions in the foreign aid program, the President said he would offer proposals "to help countries trying to control population growth by increasing our research and we will earmark funds to help their efforts."

While seemingly a passing reference in a lengthy address, the statement reflected a deliberate yet still cautious effort to involve the Government directly in a global population problem that associates say greatly concerns the President.

MANNER IS CAREFUL

In a careful, step-by-step manner over the last few years so as not to arouse political opposition, the administration has begun offering foreign governments technical and financial assistance to undertake demographic studies and organize population control programs.

A year ago, in the first reference to population control in a state of the Union message, President Johnson said:

"I will seek new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion in world population and growing scarcity in world resources."

Now the President is talking specifically of providing population control assistance and earmarking funds for it.

With as little publicity as possible, the Agency for International Development has been spending small amounts of money for foreign population control programs, largely for demographic studies thus far.

In the fiscal year 1965, the agency spent about $2 million, about half of which went to Latin American countries. In the current fiscal year, the spending is expected to total slightly more than $4 million.

The money has previously come from general purpose funds, enabling the administration to avoid possible political reactions by asking Congress for appropriations for population control. In now proposing specific funds for such a program, the administration is likely to raise an issue on Capitol Hill, where there already are signs the policy will run into opposition.

A QUESTION IS RAISED

One influential Catholic member of the House Appropriations Committee, for example, has been asking how AID was spending money for population control programs.

The President's open declaration, however, is expected by administration officials to have two important psychological effects. One is to encourage AID officials to stand up to opposition on Capitol Hill. The other is to encourage foreign countries to come to the United States for assistance.

After the President's state of the Union message last year, AID informed its foreign missions that the United States was perpared to entertain requests for technical and financial assistance in family planning programs.

Partly because of the lack of publicity, the response has been limited. The only official request has come from Turkey, which wants a $3 million low-interest loan. Informal, preliminary requests have been received from India and Pakistan, and one is expected shortly from Honduras.

Many Government officials believe the Catholic hierarchy in the United States will not openly oppose the program. On the basis of private soundings, officials are convinced the Catholic hierarchy in Latin America will tacitly support many government-sponsored birth control programs.

EXHIBIT 2

THREE HUNDRED MILLION AMERICANS WOULD BE WRONG

(By David E. Lilienthal)

By the year 2000, just one generation away, the population of the United States will probably be about 300 million—100 million higher than it is now and 200 million higher than it was in 1920. Yet, in comparison with many underdeveloped nations, population growth would not seem to be a serious problem in America.

Certainly this vastly increased population will not lack for food. While population growth in Latin America, for example, has brought per capita food production below pre-World War II levels, we in the United States worry about overweight, spend huge sums to restrict farm production and give away enough food to prevent famine in poor nations throughout the world. In contrast to less developed nations, we have enough space, too. Just fly over this country and see the huge, sparsely populated areas that could easily accommodate additional tens of millions.

Great differences in resources, technology and education help explain why Americans regard overpopulation as a menace only to other peoples. It can't happen here, they think. I used to think so, too; I don't any more.

During the past 10 years, much of it spent overseas, I came to the easy conclusion that if we succeeded in tripling or quadrupling food production in hungry nations—and in some areas in which I worked we did just that—the problem of overpopulation could be solved. But gradually I learned I was mistaken to believe that increased food production was the complete answer to the crisis of population abroad. Gradually, I also learned that America's overflowing cornucopia has obscured a deeper crisis developing here: a population of at least 300 million by 2000 will, I now believe, threaten the very quality of life of individual Americans.

An additional 100 million people will undermine our most cherished traditions, erode our public services and impose a rate of taxation that will make current taxes seem tame. The new masses, concentrated (as they will be) in the already strangling urban centers, cannot avoid creating conditions that will make city life almost unbearable. San Francisco, to take a still tolerable example, once was one of my favorite cities—cosmopolitan, comfortable, lovely. Now the high-rise buildings have sprouted like weeds and suburban blight is advancing on the Golden Gate. The value of real estate has increased while people's enjoyment of life declines.

Historically the United States owes much of its vigor and power to population growth. (Only 50 million people rattled around in America in 1880.) Large markets, skilled manpower, huge factories, a country able to spend billions on war, space, and social welfare—all this, plus 75 million passenger cars—is surely a consequence of rising population. But no economy and no physical environment can sustain infinite population growth. There comes a point at which a change in quantity becomes a change in quality—when we can no longer speak of "more of the same." And another 100 million people will, I fear, make just that change in the joy of life in America.

It is probably true that as the population will grow, so will the dollar value of our output. U.S. wealth, measured by gross national product, is now $670 billion; barring a major economic setback, total output will be doubled in about two decades. With GNP climbing at the rate of $40 billion a year, the United States probably can afford to build the schools, housing projects, roads, and other necessities of life for 300 million Americans.

But if our resources are mainly spent merely to survive, to cope with life in a congested America, then where is the enjoyment of living? Our teeming cities are not pleasant places today; imagine them by the middle of the next century when the areas of some might be 100 times larger than they are now. This is the real possibility envisioned by Roger Revelle, director of the newly established Center for Population Studies at the Harvard School of Public Health. And it will be to the cities that tomorrow's millions will flock. Or consider the picture, drawn with characteristic wit, by Economist John Kenneth Galbraith: "It is hard to suppose that penultimate Western man, stalled in the ultimate traffic jam and slowly succumbing to carbon monoxide will be especially enchanted to hear from the last survivor that in the preceding year gross national product went up by a record amount."

Nor does the nightmare consist only of traffic jams and a bumper-to-bumper way of life. As we have seen in the history of the

last 25 years, public services only the Federal Government can provide will continue to expand. Moreover, State governments until now unable (or unwilling) to pay their share of the bills, show signs of awakening to their responsibilities. But bigger government efforts do not produce better results for human beings; they are simply a way of getting a job done when no more feasible methods exist.

Even today most of the Nation's most serious problems are caused largely by the pressures of a too rapidly rising population. In the next generation, the problems may become unmanageable. Take four basic needs: education, water, air, and power.

The quality of education is closely related to the problem of numbers. Within the next 5 years, we are told the number of high school students will rise to 15 million (a 50-percent increase over 1960), forcing hundreds of communities to consider imposing stiff new taxes. Many taxpayers will refuse to accept the added burden and their children will attend even more crowded classes. Farsighted citizens will approve new school bond issues, but the increased financial drain probably will not result in an improved education.

Our standard of democracy entitles everyone to free schooling through high school. But our educational standards are rising. Two-year junior colleges, many of them supported by cities and States, loom as the next step in our system of free, universal education. Along with the surge in enrollment at traditional 4-year colleges and universities, higher education is expected to attract about 12 million students in 1980 (triple the 1960 figure).

Merely building the physical facilities for such huge increases is a formidable prospect. Creating a sympathetic atmosphere for education, and filling the need for qualified teachers is a much more staggering problem. Of course, we may argue for the radical reform of U.S. education. We may plead for overhauling the existing system of teacher training, as James B. Conant has eloquently done. But I see few signs we are about to undertake such vast changes in the machinery of U.S. education; nor does it seem possible, even if the mood for drastic reform was overwhelming, simply to order new procedures, new goals and new solutions and then put them into practice. Good teachers cannot be turned out by fiat. We do not live in a planner's paradise. Ask Robert Moses.

With increased urbanization and industrialization, demands on the water supply will be much greater than most Americans have remotely imagined. The drought in the northeast United States last summer was an indication of shortages even greater to come. And though engineers and scientists can, and will, tap new sources of water and devise ways to purify polluted rivers like the Hudson, the cost will be fantastic—hundreds of billions of dollars. Add to the current strain the pressure of a 50-percent increase in population and the result may well be a chronic water shortage that can hardly be solved at any tolerable price.

Imaginative but impractical water schemes have been proposed, such as one to bring to the United States the almost limitless supply of far northern water, carrying it a thousand miles and more to our own boundaries. Assuming that Canada would agree to the politically prickly diversion of her waters, the cost is estimated in the neighborhood of $100 billion. But it has taken more than a generation of hot dispute and interminable litigation to decide priorities of water among our own sister States of the West. How much greater the difficulties of diverting Canada's water to care for U.S. needs?

As for nuclear-powered desalination plants, quite apart from the cost of constructing the huge installations we would need and the pipelines to carry the water inland, there is the additional problem of safety in disposing of radioactive waste. Technicians may solve the problem, but at what social cost? The conversion of precious open spaces into atomic garbage dumps?

Just as easily accessible water supplies dwindle, air pollution will increase. Air pollution is the result of congestion, industrialization, and the multiplication of automobiles—factors in direct relation to population density in urban areas. Los Angeles is not an industrial city, yet at times its air is hardly fit to breathe. And with the spread of industry in the sprawling cities of the Nation, more and more places will be Los Angelized.

We have long assumed that at least the air we breathe is free. It won't be for much longer as we expand our efforts to purify the atmosphere. In California, for example, an aroused public finally insisted that automobile manufacturers install exhaust filters to trap toxic chemicals. Keeping automobile fumes and industrial poisons out of the air we breathe is going to be an increasingly costly business. By the year 2000 the high cost of breathing will be a real issue, not just a phrase.

Packing too many people into an urban area increases the cost of providing still another essential of everyday living: electric power. Even more serious, such concentrations of people may make absolutely reliable electric service more and more difficult to maintain. I doubt if it was a mere coincidence, for example, that New York City needed 10 hours to restore electricity after the recent Northeast power failure while smaller communities were able to turn on their lights in a much shorter time. Growth is desirable up to a point; then the advantage of size diminishes and the multiplication of complexity multiplies the headaches. And by 1980 we can expect at least a 300-percent increase in the Nation's electrical energy needs. Most of this will flow into urban areas. The present difficulties of maintaining absolutely reliable service to such concentrations of people and industry, and holding down costs, will thus be magnified.

As chairman of TVA and the Atomic Energy Commission, and in my present work in Asia and Latin America, I have become familiar with the problems of producing and distributing electricity on a large scale. Indeed, it was TVA a generation ago that pioneered the concept that the greater the use of electricity the lower the cost per kilowatt-hour. This is still generally true. But for great cities the exact contrary is coming to pass. To distribute electricity in a large, densely populated area such as New York is more costly than in smaller urban markets. Huge generating powerplants produce ever lower generating costs; but to bring this power to the consumer in massive concentrations of population grows more and more expensive. Consequently, the price of this essential of modern life probably will go up in the great cities as population growth continues.

Without realizing it, we are fast approaching what may be called the population barrier beyond which lie unpredictability and, I fear, problems of unmanageable size. Consider, for example, the relationship between population growth and the poor.

The Federal aid to dependent children program has doubled to more than 4 million cases during the last decade, while the costs have soared from about $600 million to more than $1.8 billion. Even more depressing than the numbers of families who cannot survive without welfare assistance is the phenomenon known as the cycle of dependency.

More than 40 percent of parents whose children receive ADC funds themselves had parents who received relief checks. This cycle is sad but not surprising. Poor people tend to have more children than they want or can afford, and the children have less chance to receive the education and training they need to break the pattern. Thus, even the third generation appears on relief rolls in the United States, the most socially mobile nation in the world. In America, reports the National Academy of Sciences in a recent study, "The Growth of U.S. Population," "the burden of unwanted children among impoverished and uneducated mothers * * * is much like that experienced by mothers in underdeveloped countries."

Since the poor cannot contribute their share of the mounting costs of education, medical care, public housing, and similar necessary Government enterprises, the money must be supplied by the rest of the population through taxation. But the most painful loss is not measured in dollars but in human resources. And one measure of the potential loss is the fact that one-fourth of America's children are the offspring of poor parents.

Belatedly, we are helping poor couples who need and want financial and medical help in family planning. The White House Conference on Health in November gave high priority to birth control as part of Federal efforts to halt the cycle of dependency and poverty. Tax-supported activities in 40 States, combined with such large-scale private efforts as Harvard's Center for Population Studies and the $14.5 million grant by the Ford Foundation for basic research by the Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center and the Population Council, herald new progress in a long-neglected field.

We tend to patronize the poor by preaching to them about birth control; though poverty-stricken parents with four, five, or six children are the most publicized aspect of population growth, they are by no means the most important numerical aspect of the problem. As a matter of simple arithmetic, the four-fifths of the Nation's families who earn more than the poverty-line income of $3,000 a year—and who can afford two, three, or four children—produce a greater total of children than the one poor couple out of five which may have six youngsters.

In fact, the latest census information reveals that though poor families may have more children than do better off families, the difference is much smaller than many people believe. According to the National Academy of Sciences analysis, in 1960 married women 40 to 44 years old in families with incomes below $4,000 and above $4,000 differed in the average number of children by less than one. The postwar baby boom, for example, was more pronounced among middle and upper income families than among the poor.

Thus, these relatively well off families are the ones mainly responsible for our rapidly rising population curve. They and their children are the ones who will account for most of the 100 million additional Americans by the end of the century.

How many children a couple should have is a decision only they should make; a government inducement or deterrent—a tax, for example—is morally repugnant and politically impossible. We cannot penalize the poor in order to limit the size of their families while we allow more prosperous parents to have as many children as they want. The large majority of middle- and upper-class parents need no birth control help from government, nor will they welcome outside advice on so personal a matter. Yet it is this group of families who will want to have three, four, or more children for the very natural reason that they like children and can afford to support them. The question is, Can the country support them?

Any notion that the pill or some other scientific device is the sole and complete answer is very dubious. At a symposium on birth control not long ago, Dr. Stephen J. Plank, a professor in the Harvard School of

Public Health, cautioned against "the facile assumption * * * that we may be able to countracept our way to the Great Society." Birth control, he said, is a question of motivation rather than technology alone.

The neglected arithmetic of the population problem facing us is depressing. Look at this table showing the birth and death rates over the past quarter century in the United States:

Year	Births	Rate (per 1,000 population)	Deaths	Rate (per 1,000 population)
1940	2,360,399	17.9	1,417,269	10.8
1945	2,735,456	9.5	1,401,719	10.6
1950	3,554,149	23.6	1,452,454	9.6
1955	4,047,295	24.6	1,528,717	9.3
1960	4,257,850	23.7	1,711,982	9.5
1964	4,027,490	21.0	1,798,051	9.4

Although the birth rate has been declining since the mid-1950's, while the death rate has remained relatively stable, the drop in the birth rate is too little and too late to prevent an oversized population. The surge in the number of births over deaths continues (2.3 million were added to the population in 1964).

Or examine these low and high population projections prepared by the Census Bureau:

	Low	*High*
1970	206,000,000	211,000,000
1985	248,000,000	276,000,000
2010	322,000,000	438,000,000

The high figure would be reached if birth rates returned to the levels of the early 1950's. The low estimate—enormous as it is—is based on the possibility that the rates may decline by 1985 to the comparatively low levels of the early World War II years.

One theoretical way out of the dilemma would be to say that since America can no longer sustain complete "family freedom," some form of compulsory birth control is, regrettably, necessary. It would not be the first time in our history that government intervened to restrain individual impulse in the name of collective welfare. Yet, where children and parents are concerned, I do not believe we can yet advocate the sacrifice of one freedom for the sake of preserving another. Such a "solution" would make no sense at all, theoretically, practically, or ethically.

Government policies and private programs must make plain the kind of life we all face if economically comfortable families reproduce at rates they personally can afford. With equal urgency we must make plain the dangers if poor families have children in numbers they cannot afford.

Obviously, a stationary population—one in which the birth rate matches the death rate—is out of the question for many years to come. It is probably not feasible, nor even desirable. All we can hope to achieve is a slower rise in the size of our population rather than the present steep increase. What is needed is a far more drastic cut in the birth rate—a voluntary curtailment of the right to breed. It is needed, but I have no great conviction that it will happen.

For though scientific ingenuity may be able to solve many of the technological problems we are only beginning to understand people always change more slowly than technology. It is easier, after all, to design a new industrial process than redesign a cultural tradition. Yet that is the order of change we face if we are to preserve life's dignity and quality. Confronted by the crisis of population growth, we must, at present, appeal to private conscience for the sake of the general good.

FECUND FUTURE

At the estimated 1965 U.S. birth rate of 19.5 per 1,000 of population, a woman who reaches the age of 45 will have an average of 3 children. To achieve a stationary population, in which parents only replace themselves, the average number of children would have to drop to about 2.1. If childbearing gradually declined to this level by 1980—a highly unlikely possibility—the U.S. population would then be about 250 million, and by 2020 the population would hit 300 million and remain unchanged thereafter. At that point the birth rate would have declined to 14 per 1,000 and the death rate would have climbed to 14 per 1,000 (because a nongrowing population includes a much higher percentage of the aged).

On the other hand, if present fertility and mortality trends continue, a long-range projection by the National Academy of Sciences foresees that in about 650 years there will be one person per square foot throughout the United States, and in less than 1,500 years the weight of the U.S. population will exceed the mass of the earth—that is, 6,588,000,000,000,000,000,000 tons.

EXHIBIT 3

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Jan. 9, 1966]

FAMINE STALKS THE EARTH—TOO MANY PEOPLE

To President LYNDON B. JOHNSON:

"The world is on the threshold of the biggest famine in history," according to Dr. Raymond Ewell, former adviser to the Government of India. "If present trends continue, it seems likely that famine will reach serious proportions in India, Pakistan, and China in the early 1970's. Latin America will fall in this category by 1980. Such a famine will be of massive proportions, affecting hundreds of millions, possibly billions of persons."

The Director-General of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, Mr. Binay Sen, said recently: "Either we take the fullest measures both to raise productivity and to stabilize population growth, or we face a disaster of unprecedented magnitude. In some of the most heavily populated areas the outbreak of serious famines in the next 5 to 10 years cannot be excluded. Problems of hunger and malnutrition which afflict more than a half of the world's population, apart from the human suffering and human degradation that they involve pose a serious threat to peace."

U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Orville L. Freeman, said: "Problems of staggering proportions face the densely populated underdeveloped countries of the world in their effort to keep food production in pace with population growth. Both land and time are running out for those countries. In the past, increases in food output were achieved by putting new land under cultivation. But now the supply of readily cultivatable land is nearly exhausted in many of those countries, and new land can be brought under cultivation only at high cost."

A generation ago Latin America, Asia and Africa were regions with food surpluses. They exported grain to the industrialized countries, especially to Europe. Now the food flow is reversed and they must import food.

FOOD INTO A BOTTOMLESS PIT

The United States has shipped abroad, since Congress enacted the so-called food-for-peace law in 1954, food products amounting to the gigantic sum of $12 billion, mostly on a giveaway basis.

Our food warehouses that were bursting at the seams a few years ago are now largely down to a normal inventory required for reserves. Congress recently authorized Secretary Freeman to go into the open market and buy dried milk to keep up our lunch program for overseas children.

India receives from the United States more than a half of its wheat at the present rate of 20,000 tons a day. Observers believe that this assistance is the only barrier against large scale famine and open rebellion.

With all this outpouring of American resources we are not making a dent at solving the problem. Even if we were to continue such a program on a vastly stepped up basis, as some suggest, until American farmlands were exhausted, we still could not feed the burgeoning billions of people.

BASIC PROBLEM: SKYROCKETING POPULATION

Everything possible, of course, should be done to increase the food supply, but it is the skyrocketing population that menaces today's world. Latin America, as an example, increased its total production of food over the last 5 years, but with 25 million more people, the average individual had 7 percent less to eat. And in another 5 years at the present rate of increase there will be 35 million more people living south of the Rio Grande.

Mr. President, we applaud your statement to the United Nations last June in which you said "Let us in all our lands—including this land—face forthrightly the multiplying problems of our multiplying populations and seek the answers to this most profound challenge to the future of all the world."

But the fact remains that to date the manpower and resources of the various agencies of the Government committed to meet this transcendent challenge rank below a hundred less important projects.

Every day lost in tackling this matter on a massive scale will compound your problems and those of your successors. For you were right, Mr. President, when you said:

"I do not believe that our island of abundance will be finally secure in a sea of despair and unrest, or in a world where even the oppressed may one day have access to the engines of modern destruction."

There will be 300 million more mouths to feed in the world 5 years from now—most of them hungry. Hunger brings turmoil—and turmoil, as we have learned, creates the atmosphere in which the Communists seek to conquer the earth.

Frank W. Abrams, former chairman, Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey.

Theodore Achilles, former Ambassador to Peru.

Winthrop W. Aldrich, former Ambassador to Court of St. James.

George V. Allen, former Director, U.S. Information Agency.

Jacques Barzun, provost, Columbia University.

Russell H. Bennett, mining engineering.

Walter J. Bergman, chairman, Lily-Tulip Cup Corp.

James Biddle, curator, Metropolitan Museum of Art.

Eugene R. Black.

Dr. Detlev W. Bronk, president, Rockefeller University.

Percival F. Brundage, former Director, Bureau of the Budget.

James Cagney, president, Cagney-Montgomery Productions.

Cass Canfield, chairman, executive committee, Harper & Row.

George Champion, chairman, the Chase Manhattan Bank.

Will L. Clayton, former Under Secretary of State.

Lammot duPont Copeland, president, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.

Dr. Leslie Corsa, Jr., director, Center for Population Planning, University of Michigan.

John Cowles, president, Minneapolis Star and Tribune.

Dr. James A. Crabtree, dean, Graduate School of Public Health, University of Pittsburgh.

Virginius Dabney, editor, Richmond Times-Dispatch.

Dr. William V. D'Antonio, department of sociology, University of Notre Dame.

Donald K. David.

James E. Davis, chairman, Winn-Dixie Stores, Inc.

August Derleth, author.

Gen. William H. Draper, Jr., national chairman, Population Crisis Committee.

Dr. Louis Dupre, department of philosophy and theology, Georgetown University.

Marriner S. Eccles, former head, Federal Reserve System.

Rabbi Maurice Eisendrath, president, Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

Dr. James Faulkner, former medical director, MIT.

Morris Forgash, president, U.S. Freight Co.

Dr. L. H. Foster, president, Tuskegee Institute.

Arthur B. Foye, president, Haskins & Sells Foundation.

Dr. Philip M. Hauser, director, Population Research and Training Center, University of Chicago.

William Randolph Hearst, Jr., chairman, the Hearst Corp.

F. Peavey Heffelfinger, chairman, executive committee, Peavey Co.

H. E. Humphreys, Jr., vice chairman, executive committee, United States Rubber Co.

Fannie Hurst, author.

Henry Ittleson, Jr., chairman, CIT Financial Corp.

Dr. Ancel P. Keys, laboratory of physiological hygiene, University of Minnesota.

Rabbi Edward E. Klein, Stephen Wise Free Synagogue.

Sherman R. Knapp, president, Connecticut Light & Power Co.

Thomas S. Lamont, Morgan Guaranty Trust Co.

Mrs. Albert D. Lasker.

Dr. Chauncey D. Leake, School of Medicine, University of California.

Rt. Rev. Arthur Lichtenberger, former presiding bishop, Episcopal Church.

David E. Lilienthal, former Chairman, Tennessee Valley Authority.

Dr. C. C. Little, director emeritus, Jackson Laboratory.

John L. Loeb, senior partner, Carl M. Loeb, Rhoades & Co.

Dr. Arnaud C. Marts, chairman, Marts & Lundy, Inc.

Mrs. Cordelia Scaife May, chairman, Laurel Foundation.

Mrs. Stanley McCormick.

Ashley Montagu, anthropologist.

Dr. William E. Moran, Jr., dean, School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University.

Dr. Hermann J. Muller, City of Hope; Nobel Prize winner.

Allan Nevins, president, American Academy of Arts & Letters.

Dr. John H. Northrop, research biophysicist, Donner Laboratory; Nobel Prize winner.

John Nuveen, John Nuveen & Co.

Fairfield Osborn, president, New York Zoological Society.

Rt. Rev. James Pike, bishop, the Episcopal Church, California.

Francis T. P. Plimpton, former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations.

Rockefeller Prentice, chairman, American Breeder's Service.

Adm. Arthur W. Radford, former Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Edward V. Rickenbacker, chairman, Eastern Air Lines, Inc.

Dr. John Rock, professor of gynecology emeritus, Harvard University.

Lessing Rosenwald, former chairman, Sears, Roebuck & Co.

Dr. Albert E. Sabin, distinguished service professor, University of Cincinnati.

Adolph W. Schmidt, governor, T. K. Mellon & Sons.

Charles E. Scripps, chairman, Scripps-Howard Newspapers.

Dr. George Cheever Shattuck, Harvard Medical School.

Rt. Rev. Henry Knox Sherrill, former president, World Council of Churches.

Dr. John Crayton Snyder, Henry Pickering Walcott, professor of public health, Harvard.

Dr. Ernest L. Stebbins, dean, School of Public Health, Johns Hopkins.

Leopold Stokowski, music director, American Symphony Orchestra.

Lewis L. Strauss, former secretary of Commerce.

Sidney A. Swensrud, former chairman, Gulf Oil Corp.

Charles P. Taft, former mayor of Cincinnati.

Rev. John L. Thomas, S.J., Cambridge Center for Social Studies.

Dr. Harold C. Urey, professor chemistry-at-large, University of California; Nobel Prize winner.

William H. Vanderbilt, former Governor of Rhode Island.

Mark Van Doren, author.

Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, dean, School of Science, MIT.

Lawrence Wilkinson, executive vice president, Continental Can Co.

Dr. Don M. Yost, California Institute of Technology.

PARENTAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, this past fall I traveled throughout a great many of the counties of West Virginia, participating in various community activities and discussing problems of local, State, and National concern with the citizenry of my State.

While in Madison, W.Va., for the inauguration of the Department of Agriculture food stamp program for Boone County, I noticed an editorial by Luther R. Jones in the Coal Valley News concerning parental responsibility for the rising rate of juvenile delinquency and crime among America's youth. The editorial was in two parts, and I, believing that the editor's views are worthy of note, ask unanimous consent to have the two editorials printed in the RECORD.

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

PARENTS ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR YOUTH

(Article 1)

There is more and more talk about the crimes of young people. J. Edgar Hoover has been saying for quite some time that the number of such crimes are on the increase. And furthermore these hoodlum crimes are on the increase.

There are no crimes the criminal youth of the Nation will not attempt. The problem is generally ignored, because the ones most responsible do not want to take a close look at their handiwork.

Who are responsible?

There is no question about the sources of responsibility, although this responsibility cannot be fixed completely as the failure of parents.

Suppose we try to arrive at some conclusions based on changes which have occurred in the last 50 years (or perhaps 55 to 65 years).

Say in 1910.

Then there were no movies for young people to attend, no cars or highways to take them over the countryside, to stop at roadside beer joints, motels, drive-in theaters, or various and, in toto, countless and nameless attractions that wait for them today.

Oh, what a dull time young people must have had. But we did not. In general, parents provided something for children to do. Of course, school lasted only from 5 to 6 months, which meant that young people had more than half the year out of school.

This editor does not undertake to speak for city life, only for the days and nights of boys and girls of the county. This last I remember.

And this life was on the background of certain facts:

In 1900, the population of the Nation was 76 million and in 1910 92 million against a population of 192 million today; there were no highways and no automobiles; there were no movies, radio or television; there were no world wars; there were no airplanes; and in 1900, the railroad up Guyan and Coal Rivers had not been built.

What did young people do for entertainment and to pass away the time? Why, things were not bad at all.

To start with, as a very pertinent observation—young people of that seemingly distant age did not know what they were missing, so they did not worry about it.

But let us consider the country boy during the months when he went to school. There were other things which had not materialized: buses, for instances, and consolidated schools. And parents did not drive their children to school in automobiles or any other vehicle.

We walked to school, pupils 6 or 7 years old and up. School opened at 9 in the morning and dismissed at 4 in the afternoon. Then we walked back home, from a hundred yards or so to 3 miles or more. Children in my father's family walked to 5 or 6 schools during our earliest school years, about 3 miles to and from school. We started these earliest years of our schooling when my brother, Virgil, was 6, I was 8 and our sister, Gracie, was 10.

This meant that our school day extended approximately from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. After which, there were chores to do:

Two cows, ordinarily, had to be found and driven home.

Cows and hogs had to be fed.

Wood had to be gathered and chopped and brought in for cooking and, in cold months, coal had to be brought in for the fireplace.

Of course, my sister, Gracie, helped her mother in the house. And getting ready for breakfast, doing the morning chores, eating the morning meal, and preparing for school occupied the morning from the time we got up until we headed for school. I can assure you that after some studying perhaps and the day's activities and chores were done, we were ready to go to bed.

But what about other days of the week during school time? I assure you that these days were occupied, especially Saturday. Our father never failed to find something for us to do when necessary.

But—well, we can talk about the leisure time later. What about the almost 7 months in between school terms?

Most parents in the country, and especially ours, had plenty for us to do, in the garden and in the fields. I can assure you that we did not worry about missing a lot of automobiles and night life. We just never worried or longed for a lot of things which we did not know about.

And this continued generally so after we had moved to Bald Knob. Except for a term or two that we went to school to our father at Bothwell, school was closer. And we attended church and Sunday school in the church still standing at Bald Knob.

But, as we very slowly grew toward maturity, we took part in neighborhood social life, participating in bean stringings, apple peelings, molasses making, and frequent visitations. We never missed revivals or Fourth of July celebrations. And we boys could and did devise a lot of things for our own adventures. Snowball and wet cob fights, chestnut gatherings, hottie, five-marble games, tree climbing, singing, wrestling, running,

hunting (night as well as day), rare campouts and story-telling; and at school, roundtown, base, stink base, bull pen, and anthony-over.

Yes, life was different then, and parents almost invariably knew where their children were, what they were doing, and when they would be back home—if they went out on visits or otherwise.

This is sufficient for pointing out the changes which have taken place—that parents have difficulty facing up to. Understanding these changes and adjusting to them is costing society dearly, while the failure of families to adjust for their children's sake is resulting in a harvest of crime and death.

PARENTS ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR YOUTH

(Article 2)

(Correcting an error in last week's editorial. Apple pealings should have been apple peelings—one can speak of pealing of the bells.)

A few ideas might have been gleaned from last week's column here—

The children of yesterdays did not miss the automobile and asphalt highways or roadside joints, movies and drive-in theaters, radio, and TV, or even the sort of literature which can be found for sale—for they cannot miss that which they know nothing about.

Parents generally had little reason to worry about where their children were at night—for they knew.

Most parents taught their children to work.

Life and earning a livelihood was generally much simpler than today.

The situation has changed almost beyond comparison in the half century which has just passed. Children of today are more familiar with the changes, which have come about than are the parents. Many parents are finding it very difficult to keep up with their children, much less to advise and control them.

Even so, parents are responsible for their children. Parents brought them into this world. No matter what happens, they cannot divest themselves of their obligations and responsibilities merely by refusing to acknowledge them or to see them. And they cannot divest themselves of the responsibility for the life that we live and the things that influence and mold the habits of youth.

Let's look at a few of the basic changes which have taken place in our world today—in four generations—thrust from the wagon crawl at 3 miles an hour into jet flight at 600 miles an hour.

While the original intent of legislation which took children out of factory sweatshops was humane and good, our society today to a very dangerous and most regrettable extent has lost the art of teaching the youth the value and habits of work. Many parents find little or nothing for their children to do. While school takes up much of the time of children through grades and high school, what happens to them when school closes at the end of the day and at the end of the week and term?

Many things have happened which make the parents' responsibilities to their children more difficult * * * and there seems not to be any relief in sight.

Suppose we name a few of the things which have occurred—that unquestionably have projected the parents into an age for which so many are in no way prepared.

Population: Doubled and trebled in this century, making it imperative that the children be provided schooling in consolidated schools, and be transported miles from home—to buildings housing from 100 to 1,000 pupils—where they learn more not only from books under guidance of instructors but from associations.

War: Impelled by war and the urgent necessity of survival and the maintenance of a free world, not only have millions of the successive generations of our country's youth been transported to the furthermost reaches of our globe but, like the Roman legions of old, our youth have become the police power of the civilized and semicivilized lands of the earth.

Invention: Again, impelled by war and the urgent necessity of survival, the discoveries in all realms of man's need in the last half century have outdistanced 8,000 years of the rise of civilization.

These discoveries cover such a vast field that in the lifetime of a man 50 years old, he has been thrust from a life of simplicity into a complex world of fantasy that beggars description and the reality he and his forebears had known:

The telegraph, telephone, and phonograph were marvels of the previous centuries, but youth have since seen moving, talking pictures become a common source of entertainment, followed by radio and television—while radar is used to locate submarines or measure the speed of cars and determine the distance to the moon.

The marvels of medicine have made many deadly diseases obsolete; but consider how far we have advanced from turpentine, Sayman's salve, alcohol and iodine, to penicillin and other biotics, and from operations with the knife and scalpel to operations with a laser beam (closely akin to light beams); and consider also the use of an artificial heart to pump blood through the body while a diseased heart is repaired, and the substitution of plastic arteries for worn-out, diseased blood vessels of the human circulatory system.

Consider how this man of 50 has seen the hand shovel and pick by which he earned his livelihood 30 years ago have been displaced by augers that bore 300 feet into the mountain and shovels that move a few tons of material up to 80 tons.

Note how a plant that once was run by numerous foremen and overseers and the employees under them may now be run by a trained man or two at a central control of dials, clocks, recorders, tapes, wires, and computers.

And don't overlook the computers that more and more are being constructed out of hundreds and thousands of parts and fed facts and figures from which they compute, confute, compose, contrive, connote, and conclude a thousand and tens of thousands of answers and conclusions of every sort and degree of complexity; and, even, with the very little interference from human hands and supervision, proceed to operate machinery of precise and intricate production. Consider, too, how such computers will not only change our world but advance our journey to the stars.

Observe that nuclear power unleashed for destruction, electronics, and supersonics are capable of vast unlimited undertakings, which will open up infinite exploration and development for man's use in the submicroscopic world, the lands under the sea, space about the earth, the moon, and worlds beyond.

There is so much more that when we think about it we become confused, intrigued, puzzled, worried, excited, and even very much afraid of where we are going and what is going to happen to us.

In the face of these tremendous changes and the speed with which change is enveloping our lives and thrusting us into the unknown and uncertain future, is it any wonder that many parents lose complete control of their children, especially when they themselves are no longer able to hold down jobs in this complex, industrial age, or to advise their children?

Yet these same parents are nevertheless responsible.

When it takes parents with understanding and will to keep the have-nots among our youth in school—rather than on highways day and night in search of adventure—is it any wonder that so many children become dropouts?

When you think about it this is a most wonderful age of adventure for our youth, but not in a motorcycle gang, or in a used, rebuilt or souped-up car, or robbing or pilfering, or engaged in other criminal activity.

But who is there to convince our wayward and confused youth that the road to a profitable income and adventurous life, and to outstanding, worthy and worthwhile citizenship is by way of education and special training?

Any of us should know that the increase in crimes by juveniles and later of the adults that juveniles make, results chiefly from failure of parents to understand why, and their inability to properly guide and control their children.

But our schools are also failing. How many teachers are qualified to meet the needs of youth seeking adventure? How many are qualified to tell them about the strange and exciting worlds opening up about us for the youth who prepares? Who can sit down with a room full of boys and open up for them an understanding of the strange and exciting worlds in industry, science, electronics, jet travel, space exploration, and a multitude of other interests? Do you believe that many parents or teachers can reveal to the minds of youth accurate and exciting answers and reasons why many of them should study and learn English, mathematics, chemistry, physics, and electronics to enable them to live an adventurous, exciting, and wondrous life, with unlimited opportunity for high-paid income?

THE PENKOVSKY PAPERS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, a famous American who has long been intimately associated with efforts to combat the encroachments of communism in the United States has said that today's headlines remind us there has been no basic change in Communist imperialism and that the danger which world communism presents to the free nations has not abated, but, if anything, has increased.

And he has rhetorically stated the question, "Why is our free society inherently superior to communism?" and answered by pointing out that, among other vital principles, in our American society freedom of speech, the press, and assembly are protected not only in constitutional guarantees but in practice and that media of mass communication are free to praise or criticize without fear of Government control or governmental retaliation. By contrast, under communism, freedom of speech, the press, and assembly are permitted only to the extent that they support official policy, and media of mass communication—such as newspapers, magazines, radio, and television—are strictly controlled by the government.

Late in 1965, an event occurred in Soviet Russia which is a classic example of this cardinal Communist tenet—that freedom of the press is permitted only to the extent that it supports that nation's official policy and the privilege of serving as a member of the press in the U.S.S.R. is strictly controlled by that government. Any so-called violation—failure to sup-

port or cater to the party line—brings swift retaliation.

On November 25, 1965, the Soviet Union ordered the closing of the Moscow Bureau of the Washington, D.C., Post and the expulsion of that newspaper's correspondent, Mr. Stephen S. Rosenfeld, because of the publication by the Washington Post of portions of the Penkovsky papers. It is noteworthy that a number of other newspapers have published or reported in detail on the contents of those papers.

Believing firmly in the right of freedom of speech for all mankind, the right of the press, radio, and television to freely and objectively report news and facts to those interested in learning the facts, and the right of responsible men to express their views and opinions openly and without fear of retaliation, I wish to express strong personal censure of the punitive action by the U.S.S.R. against the free American press.

I wish to point out that the Post, in publishing the Penkovsky papers excerpts, reported fairly critiques which questioned the authenticity of the papers, or portions thereof, so that the reading public might have access to available facts and expressions of views both in support of and in opposition to the contents of the papers. Indeed, as recently as this past Sunday, January 9, the Parade—magazine section—of the Washington Post carried statements which critically appraised the contents of these papers.

I shall not attempt to evaluate the contents of the Penkovsky papers; however, I do wish strongly to affirm the right of American newspapers to publish openly and in an unbiased manner material which throws light on the political structure of one of the world's great powers, believing that wisdom in conduct of our national affairs arises from knowledge of governments, whether free or totalitarian in nature.

I do not personally always agree with editorial policies of various newspapers, but as a citizen of a free nation, I am proud to affirm that right of disagreement and the right to express it openly. I shall continue to defend to the fullest extent in my power the right of the American press to report fairly, objectively, and openly that which is newsworthy.

I desire to encourage those who direct our media of communications to continue to provide such material as reveals the world behind the Iron Curtain to the citizenry of the United States so that judgments may be openly derived based on the widest range of fact and opinion which can be made available. I believe that the entire episode of the publication of portions of the Penkovsky papers by the Washington Post, and the retaliatory action by the Soviet Russian Government, deserves national review.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the collections which I have amassed of Washington Post articles, editorials thereon, and pertinent material from other sources such as the New York Times.

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

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 31, 1965]

WHEN WEST HAD A MAN IN KREMLIN—A RED WAR HERO PREPARED UNITED STATES FOR ITS CONFRONTATION WITH MR. K. ON CUBAN MISSILES

(By Frank Gibney)

On April 12, 1961, at an unobtrusive meeting in Moscow, a high Russian official quietly handed a double-wrapped, double-sealed envelope to an English acquaintance. He asked that it be given to "interested parties" in the West.

Later that same month, the Russian said, he would himself be in London. He wanted to talk to people in the West "to tell them what conditions in the Soviet Union are really like." The time was short, he said, and it was a critical time.

With this action, Col. Oleg Penkovsky, Russian war hero, senior officer in Soviet military intelligence, graduate of the Staff College and the Missile Academy, friend and confidant of Soviet marshals and generals, began his secret career as a volunteer spy for the West.

A SCIENTIFIC COVER

Greville Wynne, the British businessman to whom Penkovsky entrusted his message, knew Penkovsky only in his capacity as an official of the Soviet State Committee for Coordination of Scientific Research, the huge subministry in charge of all Soviet business and technical exchanges with foreigners. He had then little idea of Penkovsky's true function and the importance of his action to the West.

Penkovsky's work as deputy chief of the committee's foreign department was merely a cover for his function as a general staff intelligence officer. And as a former aide and confidant of the chief marshal of Soviet tactical missile forces, Marshal Sergei Varentsov, Penkovsky was privy to the most intimate details of high Russian military and political planning.

For the next 16 months, Penkovsky conducted the most amazing singlehanded campaign of espionage in modern history. He rocked Nikita Khrushchev's policy to its foundations. For 1961 and 1962, the 2 years in which Penkovsky worked for British and United States, when Khrushchev almost threw the world into total war.

In June, 1961, Khrushchev risked war with his decision to force an Allied retreat in Berlin. In August, he put up the Berlin Wall. In September 1961, he resumed nuclear testing, breaking agreements with the United States. His missile buildup of 1962 was climaxed in the Cuban confrontation with the United States, when Krushchev almost threw the world into total war.

Throughout this time, Penkovsky furnished the West with high-priority information on Soviet missile strength, Soviet nuclear capabilities and the Soviet plans for a localized shooting war in Germany. Ultimately, he was a key factor in our ability to identify so swiftly the configurations of Soviet missile installations on Cuban soil. He also prepared American intelligence for Khrushchev's decision to use them.

THREE LONDON VISITS

Three times Penkovsky made his way to London and Paris, ironically using his confidential Soviet intelligence assignments as a cover for his real espionage work with American and British officers. Three times he went back to Moscow to get further information for the West. In October 1962 he was finally detected and arrested by the Soviet secret police, the State Security.

How badly he hurt Moscow's plans for an aggressive breakthrough against the West in those two critical years can be gathered from the public aftermath of his arrest; one chief marshal of the Soviet Union demoted and disgraced; the chief of Soviet military intelligence, Gen. Ivan Serov (the "Hangman of Hungary" in 1956) demoted; some 300 Soviet intelligence officers recalled to Moscow from their foreign posts.

Penkovsky had exposed them all. Soviet military intelligence has not yet recovered from the blow.

The recapitulation of matters covered in Penkovsky's Soviet indictment suggests the extent of his intelligence achievement: "Top secret information; documents of great value; of an economic, political and military nature; Soviet space secrets; material on Soviet troops in the German Democratic Republic; new Soviet war material; command personnel of the antiaircraft defenses; (material on) atomic energy, rocket technology and the exploration of outer space."

The trial of Colonel Penkovsky and his British contact, Greville Wynne, began in Moscow May 7, 1963, and lasted 4 days. It was carefully organized by the Soviet authorities.

Penkovsky and Wynne had been under interrogation in Lubianka Prison for 6 months preceding it. Both prisoners admitted their "guilt." Penkovsky apparently did so in an effort to secure decent treatment for his family.

Wynne was sentenced to a long prison term but was released in 1964 in exchange for the Soviet spy Konon Molody, who had been arrested by the British under the name of Gordon Lonsdale. Penkovsky was sentenced to death. Soviet authorities said he was shot May 16, 1963.

Until now, Penkovsky's remarkable feat was a secret, locked in the intelligence files of three countries. The Penkovsky Papers, excerpts of which begin here today, were smuggled out to the West 2 years ago and translated by Peter Deriabin, himself an escaped Soviet state security officer.

The papers have never before appeared anywhere. They will be published in book form by Doubleday November 19.

The Penkovsky papers comprise a strange, arresting document—partly a day by day account of Penkovsky's personal struggle against the Soviet regime; partly a running fever chart of Khrushchev's drive for aggression in Berlin and Cuba. They were written at great personal risk while Penkovsky was living his double life as a secret agent for the West.

He wrote them because he was not content merely with transmitting his intelligence reports. Colonel Penkovsky was a single-minded zealot who hated the Khrushchev regime because he feared that Khrushchev was leading the world into a nuclear war. He wanted ordinary people in the West, not just intelligence officers, to hear his story and his reasons for breaking with a lifetime of service to the Soviet regime.

In a real sense of the word, for the brief 16 months in which he worked, Oleg Penkovsky was our man in the Kremlin. Without his guidance and information, Washington could not have acted in either Berlin or Cuba with the sureness it did.

Only by reading Penkovsky can Americans finally understand the pressures and tensions that were driving the Soviet leadership to risk war in 1961 and 1962, 2 years when the cold war almost became hot.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 31, 1965]

WHY THE SOVIET COLONEL CHANGED HIS COLORS—THE PENKOVSKY PAPERS

(By Oleg Penkovsky)

My name is Oleg Vladimirovich Penkovsky. I was born April 23, 1919, in the Caucasus, in the city of Ordzhonikidze (formerly Vladikavkaz), in the family of a salaried worker;

Russian by nationality, by profession an officer of military intelligence with the rank of colonel.

I have received higher education. I have been a member of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union since March 1940, I am married; as dependents I have my wife, one daughter and my mother.

I have never been on trial for criminal or political offense. I have been awarded 13 government decorations (5 orders and 8 medals). I am a resident of the city of Moscow and live on Maxim Gorky Embankment, House No. 36, Apartment 59.

I am beginning the notes that follow to explain my thoughts about the system in which I live and my revolt against this system. I am fully aware of what I am setting out to do. I ask that you believe in my sincerity, in my dedication to the real struggle for peace.

I must write hurriedly, hoping that I will some day have the time to elaborate or explain. I am unable to do this all at once—or to write all I know and feel—for the simple physical lack of time and space.

When I write at home, I disturb my family's sleep (our apartment is only two rooms and typing is very noisy). During working hours, I am always busy, running like a madman between the visiting (foreign) delegations and military intelligence headquarters and the offices of my committee.

My evenings are generally occupied; it is part of my job. When I visit my friends in the country, it is worse. Someone may always ask what I am doing. Here at home, at least I have a hiding place in my desk. My family could not find it even if they knew. And they know nothing.

It is a lonely struggle. As I sit here in Moscow in my apartment and write down my thoughts and observations, I can only hope that the persons in whose hands they eventually fall will find them of interest and use them for the truth they say.

WHITE RUSSIAN PARENTAGE

I was born in the thick of the civil war, during which my father was lost. Mother told me that my father saw me for the first and last time when I was only 4 months old.

My father was a lieutenant in the white army. I learned this only recently. My father fought against the Soviets. I still do not think they know the whole truth about him. If the state security forces had known all along that he was in the white army (although I was only a few months old at the time), every door would have been closed to me: for an officer's career, for membership in the party and especially for the intelligence service.

Yet I began my life as a believer in the Soviet system. I was brought up in a Soviet environment and from the very first, when I went at 18 to the Second Kiev Artillery School, I wanted to be a commander in the Soviet Army.

During the war, I commanded a battalion. By the end of the war, I was a lieutenant colonel. After one action, Marshal Konev recommended me for the Military Staff College.

In 1945, I began the 3-year course at the Frunze Military Academy and in 1948 I pinned on my chest the diamond-shaped insigna of a Frunze graduate. At the end of 1949, I was transferred to the Military Diplomatic Academy, the training school for the military intelligence service.

I learned how to conduct military espionage and completed a 3-year course in the English language, which I mastered, I believe, fairly well. In September 1958, after serving as assistant military attaché in Turkey, I was sent to the Dzerbhinsky Military Engineering Academy to attend a 9-month academic course for the study of missile weapons.

DEEDS BELIED WORDS

It was during the struggles of World War II that I first became convinced that it was not the Communist Party which moved and inspired us all to walk the fighting road from Stalingrad to Berlin. There was something else behind us: Russia.

Even more than the war itself, my eyes were opened by my work with the higher authorities and general officers of the Soviet Army. I happened to marry a general's daughter and quickly found myself in a society of the Soviet upper class. I was one of the privileged.

But I soon realized that their praise of the party and communism was only in words. In their private lives, they lie, deceive, scheme against each other, intrigue, inform, cut each other's throats. In pursuit of more money and advancement for themselves, they become informants for the state security on their friends and fellow workers. Their children despise everything Soviet, watch only foreign movie films and look down on ordinary people.

Our communism, which we have been building for 45 years, is a fraud. I myself am a part of this fraud. Some disease or infection is gnawing and eating at our country from within.

The ideals that so many of our fathers and brothers died for have turned out to be nothing more than a bluff and a deceit. I know the army and there are many of us in the officer corps who feel the same way. But they are afraid to unite for action. So we all work separately. Each man here is alone.

GOVERNMENT OF ADVENTURERS

I associate with highly placed, important people: ministers and marshals, general and senior officers, members of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. I praise our leaders, but inside me I wish them death.

Khrushchev's is a government of adventurers covering themselves with the banner of the struggle for peace. But Khrushchev has not renounced war. He is quite prepared to begin a war if circumstances turn favorable to him. This he must not be permitted to do.

In the past, our general staff and our foreign representatives condemned the concept of surprise attack such as Hitler used. Now they have come around to the viewpoint that there is great advantage to the side which makes a sudden massive attack first.

From what I have learned and what I have heard, I know now that the leaders of our Soviet state are the willing provocateurs of an atomic war. At one time or another they may lose their heads entirely and start an atomic war. See what Khrushchev is doing over Berlin?

In Moscow, I have lived a nuclear nightmare. I know the extent of their preparations. I know the poison of the new military doctrine as outlined in the top-secret special collection—the plan to strike first at any cost.

I know the design of the new missiles and their warheads. I am decribing them to my friends in the West. Imagine the horror of a 50-megaton bomb with an explosive force almost twice what one expects. The people of Moscow congratulated themselves on this.

USING THE PEACELOVERS

The Soviet leaders know that the Western world, and especially the Americans, do not wish an atomic war. They try to use the Western desire for peace to their own advantage.

It is necessary somehow to drain the energy and to divert the great material and living strength of the Soviet Union to peaceful purposes—not to bring about a great world conflict. I think it is necessary to have meetings secretly conducted, not summit meeting. Those Khrushchev welcomes. He will use the decisions reached at summit meetings to increase his own prestige.

This you must understand. That is why I write these observations of mine to the people of the United States and Britain. I ask only that you believe the sincerity of my thoughts. Henceforth I am your soldier, pledged to carry out everything which is entrusted to me.

In presenting the above, I want to say that I have not begun work for my new cause with empty hands. I understand perfectly well that to correct words and thoughts, one must add concrete proof confirming these words. I have had and do have now a definite capability for doing this.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 31, 1965]

A KREMLINOLOGIST TRIES TO STRIKE A BALANCE

(By Edward Crankshaw)

(The following is a condensation of the foreword to "The Penkovsky Papers" by the British journalist and expert on Soviet Russia.)

I imagine that the general reader will be most fascinated by Penkovsky's inside account of the workings of the Soviet intelligence system. He may very well be appalled and dismayed by their scope and sheer magnitude. But I think we should try to keep a sense of proportion here.

I am not for a moment suggesting that neither the British nor the American secret services are anything like so heavily staffed as the KGB and GRU. The Russians, not to put too fine a point on it, have always been nuts about espionage and counter-espionage and they have always been hair-raisingly reckless in the expenditure of manpower.

I am quite sure that the material the Russians receive from their agents is not worth anything like the expenditure of manpower, ingenuity and cash which they consider an appropriate price. I am not an expert in these matters, but there is one thing that stands out even to a layman; that is, that some of the most valuable intelligence coups ever achieved by the Russians have fallen into their laps, contributed by oddities like Nunn-May and Fuchs, acting from individual conviction.

Conversely, invaluable information presented to us by Penkovsky was obtained not as a result of the efficiency of our own secret services but as a free gift arising from the idiosyncratic behavior of an individual Russian.

Penkovsky was shocked by the size and magnitude and malevolence of the secret service of which he formed a part. He was also shocked by the behavior of Khrushchev and others. Here, I think, he can be very misleading.

He was brought up as a young Communist and developed into an eager careerist in the regular army, on the lookout for patronage, keen for promotion, cultivating the sort of gifts which enabled him quite naturally and easily to make an extremely useful marriage, one of the privileged new class and enjoying it. It is impossible to decide from his papers the precise point at which the whole thing went sour, and why.

That he took violently against the whole system, for the reasons he gives is entirely understandable; tens of thousands of intelligent Russians—hundreds of thousands, indeed—feel the same way. But this does not lead them to spy on their own country for the benefit of the West.

One thing is very clear—and this should be borne in mind constantly when considering Penkovsky's indictment of Khrushchev as a man actively preparing to launch a nuclear war—and that is that, like so many

defectors from the West, this Soviet army colonel was in some measure unbalanced. (A man who will take it upon himself to betray his government because he is uniquely convinced that he is right and it is wrong is by definition unbalanced, although he may also be a martyr.) And almost certainly, this lack of balance made it impossible for him to distinguish between government intentions and government precautions. Or, like so many others, he confused loose, menacing talk with tight-lipped calculation; contingency planning with purposive strategy.

Having said all this, read Penkovsky also for the light he throws on the Soviet world, which is an illumination rarely vouchsafed foreigners.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 1, 1965]

OUR MAN IN THE KREMLIN—SECRET POLICE, SPYING DOMINATE REGIME AND ALL AGENCIES ABROAD

(By Frank Gibney)

By mid-April 1961, Greville Wynne, the British businessman in whom Colonel Penkovsky confided, had taken Penkovsky's letter to British and American intelligence officers in London. In it, the Soviet General Staff officer described in detail his position in Moscow, together with his motives of volunteering to spy against the Soviet regime.

He promised to arrive in London later that month, in charge of a visiting Soviet delegation of technical and industrial experts. Many of these were in fact intelligence specialists from Penkovsky's own committee, the State Committee for Coordination of Scientific Research, which regulated all contacts and exchanges between foreign and Soviet scientists and businessmen.

Penkovsky's own record and position were quickly checked out in London and Washington—and if Western intelligence had dreamed up the perfect man to penetrate the Kremlin's secrets, it could hardly have done better.

He was then 43 years old. Made a full colonel in the Soviet Army at 31, he had graduated both from the Frunze Military Academy (the Soviet staff college) and the Military-Diplomatic Academy—cover name for the 3-year Soviet military intelligence school. He had served as assistant military attaché in Turkey in 1956, run an area desk in Soviet intelligence headquarters, and helped select and train intelligence officer candidates—one of the most sensitive jobs in the Soviet system.

The colonel was also a veteran artilleryman who had taken the special Soviet Army course in military missilery at the Dzherzhinsky artillery school. He was the former aide and still the confidant of Chief Marshal Varentsov, who commanded the Soviet tactical missile troops.

In almost every respect Penkovsky was wired into the Soviet hierarchy. His great uncle, Valentin Penkovsky was a lieutenant general; his wife was a general's daughter. Penkovsky was on the friendliest of terms with his boss, Gen. Ivan Serov, Khrushchev's secret police expert, who now commanded Military Intelligence. Through Serov and Marshal Varentsov, he had pipelines to the highest levels of the Soviet regime and almost unlimited access to secret files and documents.

Other Soviet officers had defected to the West, over the years, but never anyone this high up in the Kremlin's operating command structure. In his own biography, he gave one big reason for his anger at the Soviet regime. Only a year or two before the state security had discovered that Penkovsky's father had been a White officer in 1919—thus putting a sudden black mark on his record (and probably blocking his promotion to general).

As a professional soldier and general staff officer, also, Penkovsky was increasingly appalled by the network of spies and informers he found throughout his own government—fully 8 years after de-Stalinization has supposedly thawed Soviet society.

In the following excerpt from "The Penkovsky Papers," he writes about the secret police dominance over the Soviet regime:

(By Oleg Penkovsky)

The Soviet Government goes in force for espionage on such a gigantic scale that an outsider has difficulty in fully comprehending it. Daily we expand our already swollen spy apparatus. That is what Khrushchev's "peaceful coexistence" and "struggle for peace" really mean. We are all spies.

Any Soviet citizen who has anything at all to do with the work of foreign countries or who is connected with foreigners in the course of his work, is perforce engaged in intelligence work. There is no institution in the U.S.S.R. that does not have in it an intelligence officer or agent.

Here are some of the Soviet ministers and committees through which we conduct intelligence: Intourist and the International Book Association (almost 100 percent state security); Ministry of Foreign Trade; Council for the Affairs of the Russian Orthodox Church; The Academy of Sciences; Union of the Red Cross; State Committee for Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries. * * * The list is almost endless.

State security officers and agents are everywhere, literally everywhere. I saw fewer of them under Stalin than now. They control our whole army and military intelligence, too. These security police scoundrels even forced my aunt to be an informer. She worked for them the whole time she was a housekeeper in the Afghan and the Italian Embassies in Moscow.

My poor aunt often came to my mother, crying and complaining about the degrading and dishonest things she had to do. She eavesdropped, stole documents, cleaned out waste baskets, wrote reports on diplomats, helped with provocations against them. Many time she complained to me. But this was before I began working for military intelligence. I could give her no advice only sympathy.

Khrushchev himself directly supervises the work of the state security. In this matter he trusts no one else; he controls the state security as first secretary of the Communist Party. It is said that Shelepin, the state security boss, spends more time in Khrushchev's office than in his own headquarters on Dzerzhinsky Square. If it were not for the state security police and General Serov, Khrushchev could never have become the "supreme commander in chief."

SPIES ABROAD

The majority of the personnel in Soviet embassies abroad are military intelligence or state security employees. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Foreign Trade exist as such only in Moscow. Abroad everything is controlled by us. Three out of five Soviet embassy officers are either from state security or military intelligence. Thus, it can be stated without error that 60 percent of Soviet embassy personnel are serving officers in intelligence. In Soviet consulates the figure is almost 100 percent.

In an embassy the state security spies on everyone, including us in military intelligence. Security police watch absolutely everything that goes on: the purchases people make, how they live and whether it accords with their salary, where they go, which doctors they visit, how much drinking they do, their morals. Meanwhile we in military intelligence watch the security police in return. We want to establish which of our own men are connected with them or work as their informants.

A Soviet Ambassador is first of all an employee of the central committee of the party, only secondly of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Often he is himself part of the military intelligence or the state security police. A great many of the Soviet Ambassadors in foreign countries are intelligence officers.

Before my duty in the Embassy in Turkey, I thought that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the embassies were important organizations with authority. Now I know there is only the Central Committee of the Communist Party and the two intelligence organizations.

To process people traveling abroad, there is a special commission for trips abroad under the central committee. It consists entirely of state security officers. Any person, even a tourist, going overseas comes for a conference to the central committee.

When I was leaving, this scoundrel Daluda from the state security poked through my file for 2 hours. What was he looking for? He questioned me about all my relatives, living and dead, about my family life, whether I drink, quarrel with my wife, etc. He also asked me about international problems. This was done to me, an officer of the general staff and the military intelligence.

INDISCRIMINATE ESPIONAGE

We are engaged in espionage against every country in the world. And this includes our friends, the countries of the peoples' democracies. Who knows, some fine day they may become our enemies. Look what happened with China. Months before the break with China became clear, instructions came direct from the central committee to being intensive intelligence activity against China. Quietly, the Chinese section was transferred from the directorate dealing with peoples' democracies to that for neutral or enemy countries in the Far East.

Col. Pavel Demetriyevich Yerzin was formerly the state security resident in Turkey, where I knew him. Later he was promoted to the rank of brigadier general and appointed pro rector of the Patrice Lumumba Friendship University in Moscow.

The entire faculty of this Lumumba Friendship University is made up of state security police—even the people in charge of dormitories. Only a few professors are there as "co-optees," i.e., people who have agreed to work with the state security. The basic task of the Friendship University is to prepare a fifth column for the African countries.

Many of the African students there have already been recruited. They are now working for the Soviet intelligence. They are studying Marxism and Leninism, preparing to become the future leaders of the African countries.

As a first step, after their return from Moscow, they are directed to organize strikes, demonstrations to overthrow governments, etc. At the university they live better than the average Soviet student. Almost everything is paid for.

SPIES IN WASHINGTON

The Soviet strategic intelligence service alone has special "residencies" (i.e. self-contained operative units) on the territory of the United States. One is in Washington, D.C.—"residency" personnel include individual Soviet Embassy secretaries, commercial representatives, and other employees.

There are two "residencies" in New York, one under the cover of the U.N. (The other, the "illegal residency," has direct independent contact with Moscow.)

The Washington "residency" has a great many Soviet operations officers and an insignificant number of agents; these are basically "oldtimers" who were recruited a long time ago.

The New York "residencies" are of greater strength. They have new agents from whose ranks they build up the "illegal residency." Among the agents are many foreigners who reside and work in the United States.

Intelligence officers of legal "residencies" (i.e. officers who have legally entered the United States with an official "cover" position) always use their cover, such as: Tass correspondent, Aeroflot representative, merchant marine, member of a trade mission.

Sometimes, in order to evade FBI surveillance, Soviet intelligence officers stay in the embassy overnight, sleeping on desks, then get up early in the morning to leave the embassy unnoticed. In this way, they manage sometimes to avoid surveillance.

After the Powers affair (the U-2 incident of May 1960) Khrushchev issued an order to all units of the intelligence service, especially those in the United States, to cease their active work temporarily—in order to take no chance of putting into enemy hands any evidence pointing to Soviet espionage against the United States and other countries. In November 1960, this order was rescinded. Intelligence activities began again in full swing. Recent directives have ordered establishment of social contacts with as many Americans as possible.

Ivan Yakovkavich Melekh is a Soviet intelligence officer with the military rank of lieutenant colonel. He knows English very well. At one time he was an instructor of English at the Military Diplomatic Academy, which trains officers for Military Intelligence. After special training, Melekh was sent under the cover of the United Nations secretariat in New York to carry out his intelligence missions. That was in 1955. On October 27, 1960, he was arrested by the Federal Bureau of Investigation on charges of espionage. In April 1961, the U.S. Government dropped its charges on condition that Melekh leave the United States before April 17. This should help us to judge the value of Soviet protests and declarations at the U.N.

FRIEND OF SEROV

The present Chief of Military Intelligence, Gen. Alexander I. Serov, is not the most brilliant of men. He knows how to interrogate people, imprison them, and shoot them. In sophisticated intelligence matters, he is not so skilled. Serov was a Beria man. Beria took a liking to him and pushed him to the top quickly.

Before coming to Military Intelligence, Serov was Chairman of the State Security. After his appointment to Military Intelligence, he remembered my name from my Turkish assignment and became personally interested in my work. Eventually a certain degree of friendship developed between us and I visited him several times at his apartment and his country house. My personal relationship with Serov placed me in the forefront of Military Intelligence officers.

Serov lives on Granovsky Street. Many ministers, members of the Central Committee, and marshals live there. Rudenko, the Chief Prosecutor of the U.S.S.R. lives on the same floor as Serov. When Serov was chairman of the state security, he arrested people and Rudenko signed the death sentence. One would drop into the other's place in the evening for a drink and they together would decide who should be put in jail and who should be shot. Very convenient.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 2, 1965]

OUR MAN IN THE KREMLIN—KHRUSHCHEV'S POLICIES COULD HAVE MEANT WAR

(By Frank Gibney)

On April 20, 1961, at 11 p.m. a trimly dressed foreign gentleman, handsome, red haired, and of medium height, walked without notice through the lobby of the Mount Royal Hotel in London and made his way to an inconspicuous suite upstairs.

The door was quickly opened. Inside the room, Col. Oleg Penkovsky had his first face-to-face meeting with British and American intelligence officers, the "interested parties" in the West whom he had been trying to contact for almost a year.

For hours, Penkovsky talked. He had brought with him from Moscow two packets of handwritten notes and documents, materials taken from Soviet top-secret files. The range of his information was almost encyclopedic—the design of new missiles, names of Soviet undercover intelligence agents in Europe, troop deployments in East Germany.

As the intelligence officers talked with him, they began to grasp not only the breadth of his knowledge about Soviet plans, but the intensity of his conviction that Moscow's dangerous brinkmanship in 1961 could well lead to war.

A lonely idealist, Penkovsky wanted neither money nor immediate asylum. Of the intelligence officers in London he asked only that he be given either British or American citizenship and some employment commensurate with his experience, if circumstances ever compelled him to flee the Soviet Union.

On another floor of the Mount Royal Hotel, Penkovsky had housed members of the 45-man Soviet delegation he headed. The delegation had been sent to London ostensibly to discuss trade prospects, but actually to gather intelligence, of an industrial and military nature. It was a sign of the Communist regime's trust in Penkovsky that he was assigned to lead it.

Throughout this first 2-week visit to London, Penkovsky continued to hold night meetings with the British and American intelligence officers, whom he knew only by their code names, the British intelligence officers called "Grille" and "Miles" and the Americans, "Alexander" and "Oslav."

Since the U-2 surveillance flights had been abandoned in 1960, the West badly needed fresh information on Soviet work in missilery and new rocket technology. As a missile specialist himself, Penkovsky had a wealth of technical background on the state of Soviet missile readiness—and most importantly, plans for missile production and deployment. The configuration of missile sites, the type of troops used, warheads, performance details—all this information Penkovsky possessed, from his own experience and his close association as aide to Marshal Varentsov, the Soviet tactical missile commander. In that London hotel room Penkovsky began the vital flow of information which, barely a year later, enabled the West to understand the seriousness of Khrushchev's threat in Cuba, as well as recognize the exact nature of his missile weapons there.

In the following excerpt from the papers, Penkovsky outlines the real facts behind the Soviet missile effort. These notes represent only a tiny portion of the information Penkovsky revealed in this area. For 16 months he produced a stream of reliable intelligence, technical and strategic, on Khrushchev's missile buildup. His guidance lay behind the quick identification of the Cuba-based missiles in aerial photographs. Also, his reports of Khrushchev's lagging production on long-range missiles explained the reasoning behind the risky shipment of medium-range Soviet missiles to Cuba.

Millions breathed a sigh of relief over President Kennedy's facedown of Khrushchev's Cuban threat in October 1962. But until now only a small group of intelligence experts knew the great contribution made by Colonel Penkovsky to this U.S. victory.

(By Oleg Penkovsky)

Khrushchev is blabbing that we are ready, we have everything. That is so much idle talk. He talks about the Soviet Union's capability to send missiles to every corner of the world, but he has not done anything about it, because he knows that we are actually not ready.

Of course we can send our big missiles in different directions, as far as the United States or Cuba. But we are not yet capable of launching a planned missile attack to destroy definite targets long range. As Marshal Varentsov, who commands the ground missile forces, tells me: "We still have a long way to go before we actually achieve the things about which Khrushchev keeps talking and boasting."

Of course, there have been fine achievements in developing tactical and operational short-range missiles. But it is too early to speak of our strategic missiles as perfected. Many of the big ones are still on the drawing boards, in the prototype stage or undergoing tests. There are altogether not more than a few dozen of these—not the "shower" of missiles with which Khrushchev has been threatening the West.

Only the smaller (IRBM) missiles are in production. The R-12 missile, now being mass produced, has a range of 2,500 kilometers (1,550 miles). Our "cruise" missile has been adopted for use by the submarine fleet as well as ground troops. But our big R-14 missile is only in the development stage. The range of the R-14 with a nuclear warhead is 4,500 kilometers (2,800 miles).

Often a new model missile is still only in the testing stage—in fact the tests may have proved unsuccessful. But there is Khrushchev, already screaming to the entire world about his "achievements" in new types of Soviet weapons.

COSMONAUTS DIE

All the money made available from the military reorganization is put into missile production, and sputnik required the combined efforts of all available Soviet scientists and technical personnel, with the entire technological capacity of the country at their disposal.

Marshal Varentsov warns in private conversations that we do not have enough qualified people in the missile and sputnik programs, that training is inadequate, the quality of production poor. Quantity is inadequate, also. Accidents and all sorts of troubles are daily occurrences. In this connection, there is much talk about shortcomings in the field of electronics.

There have been many cases during the test launchings of missiles when they have hit inhabited areas, railroad tracks, etc., instead of the designated targets, after deviating several hundred kilometers from their prescribed course.

Sometimes Khrushchev's pushing for premature achievement in missiles and sputniks has disastrous results.

Several sputniks were launched into the stratosphere and never heard from again. They took the lives of several specially trained cosmonauts.

The sudden death of Marshal Nedelin, former chief of our missile forces, was another case in point.

Khrushchev had been demanding that his specialists create a missile engine powered by nuclear energy. The laboratory work for such an engine had even been completed prior to the 43d Anniversary of the October Revolution in 1960, and the people involved wanted to give Khrushchev a "present" on this anniversary—a missile powered by nuclear energy.

Present during the tests on this new engine were Marshal Nedelin, many specialists on nuclear equipment, and representatives of several government committees. When the countdown was completed, the missile failed to leave the launching pad. After 15 to 20 minutes had passed, Nedelin came out of the shelter, followed by the others. Suddenly there was an explosion caused by the mixture of the nuclear substance and other components. Over 300 people were killed.

A few people miraculously survived, but all of them were in deep shock. Some of them died soon afterward. What was brought to Moscow were not Nedelin's and other victims' remains, but urns filled with dirt. Yet we all had read in the "truthful" official government statements printed in the newspaper Pravda and Izvestiya only that Nedelin died, "* * * in the line of duty—in an air accident," and we also read about how these bodies were cremated, as well as other details about the funeral.

MORE SPACE FAILURES

This is not the first time that a missile accident took place. There had been others before this, but the government keeps silent about them.

When Khrushchev announced at the beginning of 1960 that the Soviet Union possessed a completely new and terrifying type of ballistic missile, he actually had in mind the order he had issued to invent or prepare this new type of propellant based on nuclear energy. Some of the work in this direction proved quite successful, even after Nedelin's accident, but it is still far from what Khrushchev had in mind. There is a big lag in electronics.

There were more accidents during tests. In this respect my sympathies are with the Americans. If they have an accident, it is all in the papers; everyone knows about it. But in our country everything is kept secret.

For example: There were several unsuccessful launchings of sputniks with men killed prior to Gagarin's flight. Either the missile would explode on the launching pad, or it would go up and never return.

When Gagarin made his flight, it was said officially that there was not a single camera in his sputnik. This was a big lie. There was a whole system of cameras with different lenses for taking pictures and for intersection. The photographic equipment was turned on and off during the flight by the astronaut. But Khrushchev tells everybody that nothing was photographed. Photographic equipment has been installed on all sputniks, but this has been denied in order to prevent the Americans from launching espionage sputniks, or as we call them: "spies in the sky."

Right now we have a certain number of missiles with nuclear warheads capable of reaching the United States or South America; but these are single missiles, not in mass production, and they are far from perfect. Every possible measure is taken to improve the missiles and their production.

Money is saved everywhere and allocated to the building of kindergartens. That is the slang expression we use for missile production. Many different towns have been specially built for these scientists and the technical and engineering personnel. Scientists and engineers not only have been awarded decorations and medals, but some have been awarded the title of Hero of Socialist Labor three or four times.

They have received the Lenin Prize, and other prizes. The work of these people is not publicized and their pictures do not appear in the newspapers.

I have already heard some talk about a woman astronaut being readied for a flight into the stratosphere in a sputnik for propaganda purposes. All the higher commanders think that such a flight will have a strong propaganda effect. The launching is planned for the beginning of 1963.

The vigilance of the Western powers must not be weakened by the shortcomings mentioned above. If at the present time the Soviet ballistic missiles are still far from being perfect, in 2 or 3 years—perhaps even sooner—Khrushchev will have achieved his goal.

In 1961, a firm directive was issued to equip the satellite countries with missile weapons. This was by a special decision of the Central Committee CPSU. Marshal Varentsov made the following comment: "They say we must give our brother Slavs missile weapons. So we give them missiles now, and later they will stick a knife in our back."

In my opinion as a general staff officer, it will take a year or a year and a half for us to be able to equip all the Eastern European countries with missiles. In order to stop this armament of Khrushchev's and his attempts to launch an attack, the Western countries must triple both their efforts at unity and increase their armaments. Only then will Khrushchev realize that he is dealing with a strong adversary.

[From The Washington Post, Nov. 3, 1965]

OUR MAN IN THE KREMLIN—TRICKERY USED BY RUSSIAN INTELLIGENCE AGAINST WEST REVEALED BY PENKOVSKY

(By Frank Gibney)

Col. Oleg Penkovsky, the brilliant Soviet general staff officer who volunteered to spy for the West, was almost the exact opposite of the drab, mousy professional spy, as celebrated in current "realistic" espionage novels. A sociable man who liked good food and good conversation, he had a ready wit and was prone to parlor card tricks.

When he arrived in London, in late April 1961, he was consciously setting out to play an incredibly dangerous game of espionage against his own regime. But he managed to enjoy his stay, at least ostensibly, as thoroughly as any tourist.

The colonel took long walks through the city, visited department stores, restaurants and theaters, generally in the company of Greville Wynne, his British businessman friend. The obvious freedom of the British people delighted him. He told Wynne, again and again, how different it was from the closed society of Moscow.

Personally, he was manifestly relieved for once to be out of the orbit of Soviet secret police surveillance. He even managed some discreet nightclubbing and a few dancing lessons. (Soviet intelligence circles in London, assumed that Penkovsky, a trusted officer, was attempting to "recruit" Wynne as a Soviet agent. So his association with Wynne was not under suspicion.)

Penkovsky also did some guide work of his own, which considerably helped his standing in Soviet military intelligence. Shortly before he left Moscow, General Seroy, the chief of military intelligence, had called him into his office and informed him that his wife and daughter were also flying to London for an unofficial tourist visit. He asked Penkovsky to look after them and give them any help they needed in getting around in a strange city.

Accordingly, the colonel helped Mrs. Serov and her attractive daughter Svetlana make their purchases (with money drawn from local Soviet intelligence funds). He even managed to take Svetlana on a tour of the better London night spots without arousing undue attention.

Beneath this facade of socializing, however, Penkovsky's new work continued in earnest. On the basis of the information he had submitted, the British and American intelligence officers were now convinced that his desire to work with them was genuine.

In their nocturnal meetings, they gave the Soviet colonel a complete short course in clandestine radio communications, as well as a small Minox camera for photographing documents. It was arranged to make contact with him through Wynne or another Western emissary, if he found it impossible to return to Western Europe in the near future. If necessary, instructions would be transmitted to him by radio.

When he finally left London on May 6, Penkovsky carried with him presents for his highly placed Soviet friends, including General Serov, a full report of the trade and technical mission (which Moscow judged a great success) and a complete set of instructions and equipment for getting further espionage information out of his "new friends" in the West.

In the following excerpt from the papers, Penkovsky has some more to say about the real nature of his own Soviet delegation—and the stern ground rules still laid down to cover all Soviet contacts with foreigners.

(By Oleg Penkovsky)

The State Committee for Coordination of Scientific Research Work is like a ministry. Our chairman, Rudnev, enjoys all the privileges of a minister in the U.S.S.R. The committee is in charge of all scientific and technical exchanges with foreigners, both in the Soviet Union and abroad. In fact, it is a large espionage apparatus, which not only collects scientific and technical information, but tries to recruit Western technical specialists.

When I began my work in the committee, I was myself astounded by the number of intelligence officers working there. Eighty or ninety senior intelligence officers work in the foreign relations section alone. When one walks down the halls in our offices, one can see some of them saluting each other in the military manner. They have conspicuous difficulty getting away from military habits, even getting used to their civilian clothes.

The friendly contacts and "services" we provide visiting foreign delegations we might better call "friendly deceit." Often we military intelligence officers cannot understand ourselves why the foreigners believe us. Do they not understand that we show them in the U.S.S.R. only those things which are well known to everybody? If there is something new at a plant which foreigners are about to visit, we simply give orders to its director: "Show them everything, but have shops 1 and 5 closed for repairs." That is all.

On my desk I have a list of pretexts and alternate proposals which we use to keep foreigners out of certain areas of the U.S.S.R.:

1. The plant is under repair.
2. A bridge is closed.
3. There is no airport and the railroad tracks have been damaged by recent frost; therefore, for the time being there are no trains.
4. The local hotel is not ready for guests.
5. All hotels are completely filled with tourists, etc.

Sometimes we take foreign delegates through museums and parks in Moscow until the members are so tired they themselves call off the trip to a factory, preferring to rest. Or, instead of taking the delegation by plane, we put them on a train. As a result, the delegation has enough time to see only one or two installations in which they are interested, instead of five or six. Their visas expire and they have to leave after having seen nothing but vodka and caviar.

RECRUITING TASKS

In Moscow our main task as intelligence officers inside the committee it to recruit agents among the foreigners visiting the U.S.S.R. Of course, this does not often happen. But we collect information by personal conversations, eavesdropping, examining baggage, literally stealing secrets from the visitors' pockets.

I have been assigned to British delegations visiting Moscow. My job is to establish friendly relations with these men, assess their intelligence possibilities, then write a report on each to our intelligence people in London. It will be up to them to collect enough compromising information on these men—family problems, amorous adventures, personal finances, etc.—to secure their recruitment.

We are also to obtain as much scientific and technical information as possible of value to our Soviet industry—everything from cheaper methods of getting fresh water from sea water to the manufacture of artificial fur. Thanks to visits to our country by foreign delegations, we obtain vast quantities of extremely valuable information.

By contrast, all members of Soviet delegations traveling abroad are carefully instructed how to answer questions that might be put to them. I can honestly say that there is nothing new that Western scientists and specialists could learn from the Soviet specialists—or Soviet exhibitions abroad. For example, the exhibits to be shown at our London exhibition in 1961 were first carefully checked by intelligence technicians to make sure there was nothing new which foreign scientists could see or steal. Some exhibits were purposely put together in a distorted way; the cone of the sputnik on display was not built that way, the spheres were of another type.

Trips of Soviet delegations to foreign countries require special preparation. The departure of any delegation requires a separate decree from the Communist Party Central Committee. And no delegation ever goes abroad without some form of state security involvement.

After a Soviet delegation has been formed, we select certain scientists, engineers or other suitable members and instruct them individually on the type of information we need. Take my own 45-man delegation to London. Five of its members were employees of the Communist Central Committee. Ten military intelligence officers left for London at the same time in the guise of delegation members or tourists. There were also three other military intelligence colonels in the delegation, besides myself.

As a rule, Soviet scientists and technicians in missile production work are not allowed to go abroad. But lately, because these scientists must learn something about missile work in the United States, a few have been given permission to travel—provided they have not participated in any missile production work for the last 2 years. Thus, if they defected to the West, their knowledge would not be so fresh.

TOURING INSTRUCTIONS

Our intelligence instructions to traveling Soviet delegates are very specific. How many forms and autobiographies must be filled out before a trip abroad is processed. All of them in four or five copies. I myself had to submit 18 photographs before a single trip. What are they going to do with them? Marinate them? My wife and I worked on them for 2 days, and still could not finish all the forms.

Instructions we give to Soviet travelers stipulate that when traveling by train, you should always be seated with your own sex. Do not drink, do not talk too much and report any incidents on the trip to the consul or Soviet Embassy representatives. Do not carry any confidential materials with you, do not leave your hotel room, do not make any notes, but if this is unavoidable, keep them on your person.

I remember early in 1961 we sent a delegation to the Federal Republic of Germany. An engineer from Leningrad went with this delegation. He was co-opted, i.e., forcibly recruited by military intelligence. He had a notebook for making notes on the information he gathered. He left the notebook in a raincoat, then it disappeared. A search was conducted. We found nothing. The engineer became so upset that when his comrades went out shopping, he hanged himself in his hotel room. He used the cord of an electric iron which he found attached to the light fixture in the ceiling. (The delegation had taken the electric iron with them to save money on pressing.)

The engineer's body was sent to Leningrad by plane. Later, at the enterprise where he worked, it was announced that he was not normal and suffered from constant headaches. That is how things are done in our country.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 4, 1965]

OUR MAN IN THE KREMLIN—UNITED STATES GOT TRUE ACCOUNT OF U-2 PLANE INCIDENT

(By Frank Gibney)

Col. Oleg Penkovsky returned to Moscow on May 6, 1961, from his first visit to London and set about in earnest to gather more information for Western intelligence.

Some of this intelligence turned out to be the first accurate account of two troubling incidents on the Soviet-American policy frontiers—the downing of the U-2 reconnaissance plane in 1960 and the later Soviet attack on another American aircraft off the coast of Siberia.

When he returned to Moscow, he stored his new camera, film, radio receiver and frequency instructions in a secret drawer in the apartment which he and his family occupied on the Maxim Gorky Embankment. But he kept all knowledge of his new espionage role from them.

As far as Vera Penkovsky was concerned, her husband was busy at his normal confidential talks. Her own background as the daughter of a "political" general conditioned her against asking too many questions about his late hours or unexplained absences. The best Vera hoped for was another attaché's assignment abroad, like their 1956 post in Turkey, where she could practice her French and enjoy the better clothes and companionship of a foreign society.

Greville Wynne flew back into Moscow on May 27, to resume business negotiations with Penkovsky's committee on behalf of the British firms he represented. Penkovsky met him with a car at Sheremetevo Airport. On the way into the city, "Alex," as Wynne called him, handed the Englishman a packet of some 20 exposed films and other documents, including his own reports, for delivery to British and American intelligence.

The same evening Penkovsky visited Wynne in his room at the Metropol Hotel. Taking care to keep their conversation innocuous (the room of a foreign visitor like Wynne would probably be wired), Wynne gave Penkovsky a package containing 30 fresh rolls of film and further instructions from the Anglo-American intelligence team in London.

Far from suspecting anything strange in Penkovsky's meetings with Wynne, his superiors in Soviet military intelligence continued to think that he was "developing" a promising British contact. Penkovsky's work with the Soviet delegation in London was so highly regarded, in fact, that his pleased superiors arranged to send him there again in July, to attend the opening of a Soviet Industrial Exhibition. This time he was to travel alone, without any delegation. American and British intelligence could hardly have wished for such a nice arrangement.

One presumes that Western intelligence found intensely valuable not only Penkovsky's estimates of future Soviet plans, but his reconstruction of recent events in Soviet-American relations—most of which served only to underline his warnings about Khrushchev's new policy of aggression.

For Penkovsky the intelligence information he gave was only a means to an end. His real purpose was to alert the American and British people to the danger of Khrushchev's "adventurist" tactics.

(By Oleg Penkovsky)

The American U-2 Pilot Gary Powers was shot down on May 1, 1960. Prior to the Powers flight, other U-2 flights had been made over the Kiev and Kharkov, but Khrushchev kept his mouth shut, because at that time there were no missiles that could be effective at the altitudes where the U-2 aircraft were flying.

When Powers was shot down over Sverdlovsk, it was not a direct hit but rather the shock wave that did it. The aircraft simply fell apart from it. During his descent Powers lost consciousness several times. He was unconscious when they picked him up from the ground; therefore, he was helpless to do anything and did not put up any resistance. On May 1 when this incident happened, I was duty officer at GRU (military intelligence) headquarters. I was the first one to report it to the GRU officials.

At that moment, the KGB did not have an English interpreter. I was supposed to talk to him because I was the only one around who had some understanding of English—I had already reported the incident to some generals. If they had not found a KGB interpreter at the last minute, I would have been the first one to interview Powers.

Ultimately, they called up to say that I was not needed. It seems that the KGB (state security) chief, this young fellow Shelepin, who used to run the Komsomol (he replaced Serov at the KGB), wanted to make the report to Khrushchev personally. So he got an interpreter and picked Powers up himself. But the military had knocked Powers down and Powers was considered to be a military prisoner. He should have been turned over to the General Staff. Nonetheless, the KGB seized him, took him to Dzerzhinskiy Square, and made their own report. He needed medical treatment, because he was still in shock.

NEW ROCKETS

Earlier, when a U-2 flight came over in the direction of Kiev-Kharkov, there had been nothing to shoot with. As soon as the new rockets appeared, Khrushchev gave the order to use them. So they fired at Powers on May 1, 1960. Of course, we had antiaircraft defenses before, but not in quantity, and they were not able to go into action so quickly.

Marshal Biryuzov, then commander-in-chief of missile forces, was reprimanded because he had not correcty estimated the probable direction of the U-2 flights—he misgaged the importance of the targets. His forces wanted to fire when the aircraft from Turkey flew over Kiev, but there was nothing to fire with and the aircraft escaped. Powers would have escaped if he had flown one or one and a half kilometers to the right of his flight path.

On May 5, after Powers was knocked down, Khrushchev ordered a suspension of (secret) agent operations to avoid the risk of being caught by a Western provocation or, possibly, of further material for Western counterpropaganda. There were many protests about dropping scheduled meetings and other contacts, but it had to be done.

The resident in Pakistan decided on his own to pick up material from a dead drop which was already loaded, in order to avoid possible compromise to the agent. For this he was severely reprimanded by his superior at the GRU even though he did the right thing. Thus, despite the damage it did to the agent network, Khrushchev ordered cessation of agent contacts during the period when he was going to capitalize on the Powers incident.

KHRUSHCHEV LIED

Khrushchev followed Powers' investigation and trial with great interest. He personally conducted the propaganda activity connected with the case. He was the first who began to shout about the direct hit, although actually there had been no such thing. Khrushchev wanted to brag about his missiles.

Khrushchev lied when he says that Powers was shot down by the first missile fired. Actually, 14 missiles were fired at his plane. The shock wave produced by the bursts caused his plane to disintegrate. The examination of Powers' plane produced no evidence of a direct hit; nor were there any missile fragments found on it. One of the 14 missiles fired at Powers' plane shot down a Soviet MIG–19 which went up to pursue Powers. Its pilot, a junior lieutenant, perished.

The U.S. aircraft RB–47 shot down on Khrushchev's order (in July 1960) was not flying over Soviet territory; it was flying over neutral waters. Pinpointed by radar, it was shot down by Khrushchev's personal order. When the true facts were reported to Khrushchev, he said: "Well done, boys, keep them from even flying close."

Such is our way of observing international law. Yet Khrushchev was afraid to admit what had actually happened. Lies and deceit are all around us. There is no truth anywhere. I know for a fact that our military leaders had a note prepared with apologies for the incident, but Khrushchev said: "No, let them know that we are strong."

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 5, 1965]

OUR MAN IN THE KREMLIN—PENKOVSKY FED DATA TO KEEP BOSSES HAPPY

(By Frank Gibney)

Between July 15 and August 10, 1961, Col. Oleg Penkovsky played out the second round of his harrowing espionage game in London. He spent part of each day working with Soviet delegates to the trade exhibition, or running through plans for Soviet espionage work in Britain with other Russian intelligence officers in the soundproofed basement room used by the intelligence "president" (i.e., the officer in charge) of the Soviet Embassy at 48 Kensington Gardens.

At night, or during other off-hours, he would meet with the four American and British intelligence officers assigned to him in one of MI–6's safe houses for his real intelligence mission—explaining the documents he had obtained from the secret files in Moscow, exposing further Soviet intelligence missions in the West, elaborating on technical aspects of the Soviet missile program as well as information on Khrushchev's political and diplomatic strategy. Rarely in the history of espionage has any country's high command been so thoroughly penetrated as the Kremlin was during the critical 16 months when Colonel Penkovsky worked for the West.

Since Penkovsky had come to Britain again on a Soviet spying mission, it was necessary for the British and Americans to give him some intelligence material of apparent value to forward to his superiors in Moscow. This was provided. Penkovsky thus kept sending reports to Moscow of ostensibly new information on military as well as political objectives (e.g. "In traveling from London to Sheffield I observed for the second time in the southern outskirts of the city of Stamford a military airfield, on which British air force planes were based. I had the opportunity to study more carefully the indicated objectives"). Such reports kept Penkovsky's superiors in Moscow happy and unsuspecting.

AMAZING COOLNESS

With amazing coolness, the volunteer spy for the West also went on to advance his standing as a loyal Communist Party man with Moscow in other ways. One quiet morning he and Greville Wynne took a trip to see Karl Marx's grave in Highgate Cemetery and discovered it was in a bad state of neglect. Penkovsky wrote a letter of protest directly to the First Secretary of the Central Committee in Moscow. In the letter, Comrade Penkovsky told Comrade Khrushchev that, as a loyal Marxist he found such neglect an appalling reflection on communism and the Soviet Union.

Moscow took swift action. The London Embassy was ordered to set things right immediately and Penkovsky was commended for his socialist vigilance.

All the while new assignments for Penkovsky came from Washington. It was a tense summer in Europe. The continent still shook from Khrushchev's threats to sign a treaty with East Germany and force the Western allies out of Berlin. If anything, the Vienna meeting of Krushchev and President Kennedy had increased the political electricity. It was absolutely vital that the White House and Whitehall have every available piece of information on the extent of Khruschev's military preparations and his political planning. Above all, they needed to know how far Khruschev was prepared to go in pursuit of his German objective.

Some of Penkovsky's sessions with the Anglo-American team lasted as long as 10 hours at a stretch. Now that he had switched his allegiance, his dedication to the West was a single-minded as his youthful allegiance to communism. As a literal sign that he was now your colonel, he asked his contacts to provide him with both a British and an American colonel's uniform. They did so. Pleased as punch, he had his picture taken in both.

As the following excerpt from the Papers indicates, Penkovsky was amazed that both the Western peoples and their governments seemed disposed to accept Khrushchev's boasts at face value. This only made Khrushchev's brinkmanship or adventurism grow more dangerous. A firm Western stand was needed, particularly in the case of Berlin.

(By Oleg Penkovsky)

In my considered opinion, as an officer of the general staff, I do not believe Khrushchev is too anxious for a general war at the present time. But he is preparing earnestly. If the situation is ripe for war he will start it first in order to catch the probable enemy (the United States and Western States) unawares. He would of course like to reach the level of producing missiles by the tens of thousands, launch them like a rainstorm against the West, and, as he calls it, "bury capitalism." In this respect even our marshals and generals consider him to be a provocateur, the one who incites war.

The Western powers must do something to stop him. Today he will not start a war. Today the Soviet Union is not ready for war. Today he is playing with missiles, but this is playing with fire, and one of these days he will start a real slaughter.

Look what happened during the Hungarian events and Suez crisis in 1956. We in Moscow felt as if we were sitting on a powderkeg. Everyone in the general staff was against the "Khrushchev adventure." It was better to lose Hungary, as they said, than to lose everything.

THANKS TO KHRUSHCHEV

But what did the West do? Nothing. It was asleep. This gave Khrushchev confidence, and after Hungary he began to scream: "I was right." After the Hungarian incident he dismissed many generals who had spoken out against him. If the West had slapped Khrushchev down hard then, he would not be in power today and all of Eastern Europe could be free.

Kennedy must carry out a firm and consistent policy in regard to Khrushchev. There is nothing to fear. Khrushchev is not ready for war. He has to be slapped down again and again every time he gets ready to set off on one of his adventures.

Kennedy has just as much right to help the patriots of Cuba as we had when we helped the Hungarians.

This is not just my opinion. Everyone at the general staff said this. It was said in Marshal Varentosv's home, even on the streetcars in Moscow. If the West does not maintain a firm policy, then Khrushchev's position will become stronger, he will think even more about his might and right, and in this case he might strike.

The people are very unhappy with Khrushchev's militant speeches. One can hear this everywhere, listening to conversations. Now, at least, one can breathe a little easier than in Beria's time. So one can hear and say a few things.

On the other hand, the world can be thankful to Khrushchev for his militant words. They forced Kennedy, Macmillan, and De Gaulle to double or triple their military budgets and defense preparedness. If Stalin were alive he would have done all this quietly, but this fool Khrushchev's loudmouthed. He himself forces the Western powers to strengthen their defense weapons and military potential.

The generals on the general staff have no love for Khrushchev. They say that he is working to his own detriment. Why is this bald devil allowed to do as he pleases? He blabs too much about Soviet military successes in order to frighten the West, but the West is not stupid, they are also getting ready. What else can they do?

I believe Marshal Varentosv and Khrushchev's assistant Churayev; it was they who claimed that Khrushchev said, "I will drop a hail of missiles on them."

At the Soviet Embassy in London I saw a short comment on Mr. Kennedy's recent speech. The speech was called "the militant speech of the President of the United States." That is all we say officially. The Tass intercepts, however, contain the entire speech point by point: first, second, third. First, Kennedy's references to the increase in the budget, next, the increase in the strength of the Armed Forces, in connection with the new Army draft, then the new specific categories of naval flyers, etc. If necessary, the increases must be even greater.

But when we speak privately, it is a different story. At our Embassy, I heard many good comments on Kennedy's speech. It was excellent. Everyone criticized Khrushchev, including the military intelligence and the security police "residents": "There is no reason to be surprised." They all said, "Kennedy's speech is the answer to Khrushchev's saber rattling."

WEST MUST PREPARE

The West must be ready. They must be prepared to retaliate with tank and antitank forces, in the event of trouble over Berlin. The troops must be trained as well as possible. The Soviet plan to create a conflict in Berlin is simply a bid to win without a fight, but to be ready for a fight if it comes. When the time for a showdown comes, it is planned to use tanks to close all the roads and thus cut off all routes to East Germany and to Berlin.

The first echelon will consist of East German troops, the second of Soviet troops. As a whole, the plan provides for combined operations by Soviet and East German troops. If the first echelon is defeated, the second echelon advances, and so on. Khrushchev hopes that before events have reached the phase of the second echelon, the West will start negotiations in which East Germany will also participate. This will result in recognition of East Germany.

The Soviet and German troops will participate jointly in this operation because the Germans cannot be trusted to act independently. In the first place, the East German Army is poorly equipped and insufficiently prepared because we are afraid to supply them with everything. The Germans have no love of us, and there is always a chance that in the future they may turn against us, as it happened with the Hungarians.

Volodya Khoroshilov came home on leave. He is chief of the artillery staff of the tank army in Dresden under General Kupin. He was called back to duty, however, 2 weeks

ahead of time. Before his departure, we went to a restaurant for dinner and he spelled it out for me:

"As soon as the treaty with Germany is signed, an alert will be declared immediately, and the troops in East Germany will occupy all the control points and will take over their defense and support. Our troops will stand by on alert, but they will not occupy these routes immediately because this might be considered a provocation. We will simply say, 'Please, Americans, British, and French, go to Berlin, but you must request permission from East Germany.'

"If the Americans, British, and French do not want to confer with the East Germans and try to use force, the Germans will open fire. Of course, the Germans do not have enough strength, and then our tanks will move directly into Berlin."

I heard this from many officers, specifically from General Pozovny, and also from Fedorov and Marshall Varentsov. Varentsov, however, added, "We are taking a risk, a big risk."

IMPORTANCE OF TANKS

In 1961, when Khrushchev decided to resolve the Berlin question, a tank echelon was brought to combat readiness on the border in the U.S.S.R., as well as in Czechoslovakia and Poland. That is the truth.

The NATO countries should give particular attention to antitank weapons. Why? Because East Germany has two tank armies in full readiness; this is in addition to the tank armies which are part of the second echelon located on the territories of the U.S.S.R., Czechoslovakia, and Poland.

Khrushchev personally attached a great deal of importance to tank troops, especially in the fight for Berlin. So much importance is attached to tanks in connection with the Berlin crisis, that controversies have already broken out in the general staff regarding finances. They are afraid that too much money has been allotted for the tank troops and that there will not be enough for missiles, electronics, and other types of equipment.

Khrushchev has lately become confused on the Berlin matter, particularly because he has realized that the West is firm there. He would like to pursue a hard policy and rattle his saber, but our country suffers from a great many shortages and difficulties which must be eliminated before the West is to be frightened further.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 7, 1965]

OUR MAN IN THE KREMLIN—IMMORALITY OF RUSSIAN ELITE DISGUSTED PENKOVSKY

(By Frank Gibney)

Late in the afternoon, one bright September day in 1961, a smiling Russian gentleman stopped to watch three English children playing by a sandbox along Tsvetnoy Boulevard in Moscow.

He handed them a small box of candy, which the children brought obediently to their mother, who was sitting nearby.

The Russian gentleman was Col. Oleg Penkovsky, the English mother Janet Anne Chisholm, wife of a British Embassy attaché.

Concealed in the innocent-looking candy box was a package of exposed film, which Penkovsky urgently wanted to put in the hands of British and American intelligence, in the course of his extraordinary voluntary spy mission for the West.

The bizarre meeting with the children was of course carefully planned. Penkovsky had met Mrs. Chisholm during his second trip to London and he had been drilled in this procedure by his Western intelligence contacts.

A few weeks before, the British businessman, Greville Wynne, Penkovsky's original contact with the West, had arrived again in Moscow to attend the French industrial fair.

In Wynne's room at the Metropol, Penkovsky had turned over the film and several packets of highly classified information from the Kremlin files, as well as a broken Minox camera—he had dropped it during one of his nocturnal photograpy sessions. Wynne had given him a replacement camera and the little box of candy lozenges to use in the contact with Mrs. Chisholm.

RISKY FOR FOREIGNERS

The meeting with Mrs. Chisholm was risky in a city where foreigners are as closely watched as they are in Moscow. Wynne, however, and Penkovsky continued to meet with impunity, because of Penkovsky's official dealings with him. When Penkovsky saw Wynne, he told him that he was about to take a trip to Paris himself with another Soviet trade delegation, for the purpose of attending the Soviet industrial fair there.

As Wynne later recalled, Penkovsky seemed cool, self-possessed and happy in their conversation at that time. He was cheered by the way his intelligence information was registering with London and Washington and buoyed up, against the hazards of his lonely espionage mission, by the thought that he was materially damaging the Moscow regime which he hated so bitterly.

In the following excerpts from the papers, he emphasized his disgust at the immorality of the Kremlin hierarchy.

(By Oleg Penkovsky)

It is interesting to observe our prominent Soviet personages. What a difference there is between them when they are on the speaker's platform and when they are in their family circles with a glass of vodka in their hands.

They become entirely different types. They are very much like the personalities which are portrayed by Gogol in "Deal Souls" and "The Inspector General."

In writing these notes, I have intentionally omitted the subject of moral degradation and drunkenness among the top military personnel—because there are already too many dirty stories on this subject. I know one thing for sure, though: all our generals have mistresses and some have two or more.

Family fights and divorces are a usual occurrence, and nobody tries to keep them secret.

IMMORAL BEHAVIOR

Every month at our party meetings in the GRU we examine three or four cases of so-called immoral behavior and lack of discipline among our officers.

The party committee and the chief political directorate of the GRU examine the cases involving generals and colonels, while those cases involving marshals are examined by the Central Committee CPSU. The Central Committee naturally discusses such matters behind closed doors, in order to conceal from the general public and the rank and file officers the dirt in which our high command personnel is involved.

Besides, marshals are not punished so severely as others. In most cases they are just given a warning.

The explanation for this given by the Central Committee is the same simple answer once given by Stalin:

"A marshal and his services are more valuable than a female sex organ."

Khrushchev has shown special favor to our Minister of Culture, the lady Furtseva. In the anti-party fight against Bulganin and the others in 1957 Furtseva helped him a great deal; she worked day and night dispatching planes, and some say that she herself made some of the flights campaigning for support for Khrushchev. She is powermad, everybody in Moscow calls her "Catherine the Third."

Later Furtseva fell from favor. After the party congress in 1960, Furtseva was ousted from the Presidium of the Central Committee CPSU. As a result of this, her husband Firyubin was unable to go to the United States as the Soviet Ambassador.

OUSTER PLEASED ARMY

The entire Army was happy about the news of Furtseva's ouster from the Presidium.

At one of the Presidium meetings, she had proposed that the additional pay the Soviet army officers get for their respective ranks be discontinued. The answer to her was:

"What is the matter with you? You want to leave them without pants?"

What a fool. And yet there she was, occupying the post of Minister of Culture. How can such a person carry culture to the masses.

Take my friend Brig. Gen. Ivan Vladimirovich Kupin. He is Marshal Varentsov's protege and a distant relative of his; Varentsov's daughter Yelena is married to Kupin's nephew.

Kupin is the commander of artillery and missile troops of the Moscow Military District. Prior to this post, Kupin served in the German Democratic Republic as commander of artillery of the 1st Tank Army.

AMOROUS ESCAPADES

He was in a lot of trouble due to his amorous escapades. While in Germany, he lived with his cipher clerk Zaytseva. After Kupin's departure from Germany, she hanged herself because Kupin had left her pregnant. During the investigation, a photograph of Kupin had been found among her belongings.

Kupin confessed that he had lived with Zaytseva while concealing this fact from his wife; he admitted that he promised Zaytseva to marry her.

When he arrived in Moscow, General Krylov, commander of the Moscow Military District, refused to see him, but, because the decision concerning Kupin's assignment had already been approved by the Central Committee CPSU, the case was hushed up. Varentsov persuaded Krylov to forget the whole thing.

This is the way it goes in our country. As long as the Central Committee approves, as long as one has connections, one can get away with anything, even crimes; but if a similar incident happens to an ordinary officer without any connections, he is punished immediately—either his rank is reduced, or he is discharged from the army entirely.

Look at Krupchinskiy, head of the School for Nurses, and a friend of General Smolikov. They drink together and indulge in sexual orgies with girls attending the school. Krupchinskiy also provides girls for other generals of the general staff.

Khrushchev's son-in-law Adzhubei got himself so deeply involved with some actress that it almost led to divorce. He was given a warning by Khrushchev himself to be more careful in his adventures. Adzhubei is the chief editor of the newspaper Izvestia, and every day he writes articles about Communist morality.

Yet, look at his own behavior. All the other journalists hate him.

Even Satyukov, the editor of Pravda, has slid down to second place after Izvestia. Adzhubei received a Lenin prize for his so-called work about Khrushchev's trip to the United States. This work was compiled and written by the Central Committee. All Adzhubei did was put his signature to it as its editor.

In our own committee in Moscow, Yevgeniy Ilich Levin, secret police (KGB) worker and Gvishiani's deputy, is a drunkard and dissolute man. The stories he tells about the cheap dives he frequents are hardly consonant with what the party tells us about Socialist morality.

After his nightly drunken escapades and amorous adventures, Levin invariably sleeps until noon. Almost every morning Gvishiani looks for him:

"Where is my deputy?" Someone says: "He has not arrived yet. Probably he is at his other office (that is, KGB)." Gvishiani is afraid of Levin. He knows very well that Levin is at home sleeping off his rough night, but he will do nothing.

The relatives of the highly placed do very well in our Socialist society. Almost all of the marshals' sons have finished the Military Diplomatic Academy. All of them would like to be sent abroad to work, but the Government will not let them.

There is a special decree of the Central Committee CPSU forbidding the sons of marshals to go abroad. Many of them tried, but to no avail.

Marshal Sokolovskiy's son was given a 25-year prison term. He belonged to a large group of sons of marshals and ministers—some of our so-called golden youth—who had organized drunken orgies at their country houses outside Moscow.

At one of these orgies, a girl who had just come to Moscow from Leningrad was raped by the gang. She happened to be the niece of some minister.

After she was raped, the girl was placed in a car and taken somewhere behind the Byelorussian Railroad Station, where they dumped her. Because the whole gang was drunk, the driver of the car was driving very poorly. A militiaman noticed this and blocked the car. One of the boys in the car grabbed a pistol and fired a blank shot. The car was stopped.

TWENTY-FIVE-YEAR TERM GIVEN

This happened under Stalin, and he said, "I respect Sokolovskiy very much, but there will be a trial just the same." And so a trial was held, and Sokolovskiy's son was given a 25-year prison term. He stayed in jail only 3 years, however, and then he "became ill," allegedly suffering from an ulcer or something of that sort. He was released.

Marshal Konev's son, Geliy Ivanovich Konev, is a woman-chaser and a drunkard. He also is a member of that same group of sons of marshals and other high officials. He is a motorcycle enthusiast, and he loves to play the horses.

I studied with Geliy at the Military Academy. During that time Geliy had an accident while riding his motorcycle. He hit a man who later died. Papa, however, took care of everything and Geliy was not jailed. He was graduated from the academy in 1953, and is now working in the Information Directorate of the GRU, on the American desk. He knows English well.

Gorkin, chairman of the supreme court, has a son-in-law named Lieutenant Commander Ivanov, a GRU military intelligence employee. (This is the same Ivanov who was connected with the Profumo scandal in England.) He and I studied together at the Military Diplomatic Academy. At present he is the Assistant Naval Attaché in Great Britain. His wife is one of Gorkin's daughters. Ivanov loves going to night clubs in London.

As one can well see, all the sons and relatives of our Soviet leaders and high-level personnel are well taken care of. I have told only about those who work in the GRU. But the same thing may be said about those who are in the Central Committee, the Council of Ministers, the KGB and various other ministries.

All roads are open for them. They are the first ones who get promoted to higher ranks and better jobs. Everything is done by pull, through friends and family connections.

The newspapers scream that a struggle must be waged against such practices. But what happens? They punish some factory director for giving a job to his niece, and he is criticized for it in the newspapers. But we must look higher and see what is going on at the top level. That is where all the big crimes are committed. It is they who set the example for the others to follow.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 8, 1965]

OUR MAN IN THE KREMLIN—SPY'S CHOICE: HOME OR SAFETY

(By Frank Gibney)

Colonel Penkovsky arrived at LeBourget Airport, near Paris, on September 20, 1961. His British friend, Greville Wynne, met him at the airport.

Penkovsky obviously could not have informed Wynne of his exact arrival time without arousing suspicion among his superiors in Moscow. At the request of the British and American intelligence team, Wynne, still Penkovsky's safest contact, had flown to Paris and gone to the airport every day for 2 weeks, watching the arrivals on each flight from Moscow.

From the standpoint of Western intelligence, his vigil was well spent. The brilliant Soviet volunteer spy had brought a huge quantity of exposed film out with him—photographs of secret intelligence documents, technical processes, order of battle information on Soviet dispositions in Germany, and—most important of all—more top-secret details of the Kremlin's missile production and deployment.

As usual, Penkovsky checked in promptly with the Paris "resident" of the Soviet military intelligence and went over details of the Soviet intelligence assignment given him in Moscow as well as his cover job of looking after the Soviet exhibition in Paris.

Three days after his arrival, however, the colonel began the real business of his trip. Wynne drove him to one of the Seine River bridges, where he met the members of the British and American intelligence team who had worked with him in London.

Through the next month he continued his secret conferences with them at various safe apartments in the city. As before in London, Penkovsky gave them a vast store of military and political information, supplementing the documents he had photographed with his own informed analyses of current Soviet plans and military preparations.

He also laid the groundwork for an even more widespread network of communications with Western agents in Moscow which would allow him to continue his secret communications with Washington and London with a minimum of risk.

FRESH AIR

When he was not engaged with either set of intelligence officers, Penkovsky again turned tourist, with his British friend, Greville Wynne, acting as guide. The paintings at the Louvre and the night club extravaganzas at the Lido, Penkovsky viewed with apparently equal interest. Once again, he acted like a man who had suddenly been exposed to a draft of fresh air after long confinement in a closed place.

Without constant Soviet surveillance to worry about, occasionally he lost his normal caution. Once, when he and Wynne stumbled on an emigre Russian restaurant in Paris, Penkovsky could hardly be restrained from staying far into the night, singing and talking Russian with the proprietor—hardly the safe thing for a visiting Soviet intelligence officer to do, especially when he was actually working for the West.

Penkovsky liked London better, however. In Paris, also, he faced what he must have suspected was a final decision: to go back or remain in the West.

The American and British intelligence officers were perfectly willing to have Penkovsky remain then and there, to receive asylum and a job suitable to his talents in Europe or the United States.

The information he had already given on Khrushchev's missile and Berlin offensives was so important that they were concerned about his future personal security.

For days before his departure Oleg Penkovsky debated with himself as he walked the streets of Paris. He had pressing family considerations at home—a pregnant wife, a mother, a teenage daughter? Could he cut them from his life forever? And to leave the familiar world of Russia, much as he hated the Soviet regime, meant a cruel wrench. Yet everything in his immediate surroundings argued that he stay.

He almost did. The plane for Moscow was delayed by fog and the omen did not escape him. For hours he paced the floor of the waiting room at Orly Airport, virtually arguing out loud with himself, as Wynne patiently listened. He hesitated, literally at the customs barrier, but at the last minute he said goodby to Wynne and marched back into a world from which he had long since emigrated in spirit.

Penkovsky explained his decision later in the papers, when he wrote shortly after his return to Moscow: "I feel that for another year or two I must continue in the general staff of the U.S.S.R. in order to reveal all the villainous plans and plottings of our common enemy; i.e., I consider myself as a soldier of the West, so my place during these troubled times is on the frontline. I must remain on this frontline in order to be your eyes and ears, and my opportunities for this are great. God grant only that my modest efforts be useful in the fight for our high ideals for mankind."

The following excerpt from the Penkovsky papers suggests how powerful some of Penkovsky's immediate efforts were. He discusses the extent of the Soviet intelligence network operating out of the Paris embassy. It is now clear that Penkovsky exposed most of the Soviet spy network in Western Europe to United States and British intelligence during the same month when he was a temporary member of Soviet Military Intelligence in Paris.

(By Oleg Penkovsky)

During my trips to England and France during 1961, I was given the mission, just as other military intelligence officers, of collecting information of a military and scientific nature.

As I was in charge of the delegation, I did not participate in "active operational work," as we call it. It established contacts, made acquaintances, collected literature which would be of interest to Soviet intelligence.

In France and England people talked to me freely, invited me to their homes, restaurants and offices. I was astonished by this because at intelligence staff school in Moscow I was taught entirely different things about the French and British "secret police."

After spending some time in those two countries I saw how natural and unaffected the people behaved, as though there were no such thing as the secret police. Even our military intelligence officer in London, Shapovalov, loves England—"Mother England," as he calls it.

While I was in London, I asked about the Cosmonaut Yuri Gargarin's visit to England. Gargarin does not speak English, but he had some excellent translators. Everyone assigned to him was selected from our "neighbors," the secret police. Shapovalov told me that it was uncomfortable to see so many state security police surrounding Gargarin.

While he was in London, he lived in House No. 13, on the second floor (Kensington Palace Gardens). People by the hundreds stood in the streets in order to see him, and one British girl waited 18 hours to catch a glimpse of him. When Gargarin was told about this, he said, "What a fool. It would have been better if she had shared my bed for a couple of hours." Here is the new historical personality for you.

BERLIN CRISIS?

During my second trip to London in July 1961, there were a few representatives of the Central Committee CPSU in my delegation. They had a lengthy conference with Ambassador Soldatov. Later I was told by our

deputy resident, Pavlov and Shapovalov, that they had brought money and special instructions for the British Communist Party.

Khrushchev had personally ordered Soldatov to meet with certain leaders of the British Communist Party in the expectation of obtaining information on the Berlin situation and on the probable reaction of the British Government in case of a Berlin crisis.

Pavlov, Shapovalov and Milovidov also said that a directive had been received from the Central Committee and military intelligence to employ all agents and friendly contacts in England in order to collect information. The Ambassador had a conference with the intelligence residents and gave them instructions from the center.

Shortly after this all the officers in the embassy took off in various directions all over England to gather the needed information. The entire force of operational, strategic, and political intelligence services was mobilized for this.

I cannot understand at all why the Communists are permitted to operate so freely in England and France. Why are they not shown who is boss? Where are the counterintelligence services of the Western countries? What are they doing?

COMMUNIST CONTACTS

Ananyev, our officer in Paris, told me that Soviet intelligence has very close working relations with Communists, especially those who work in the government, Army, and NATO. Ananyev and Prokhorov had both told me that it was very easy to carry on illegal operations in France, especially in Paris.

It is true that if we approach an ordinary Frenchman, and he learns that he is speaking with Russians, he will immediately run and report the contact to the police. But French Communists, generally speaking, readily agree to work for us, asking only directions on how and what to do. They act as spotters and obtain military information.

According to Prokhorov, we could not work so well in France without Communist help. He actually made the statement that we bought France easily, and for a cheap price. "We bought the harlot cheap"—those were the words he used.

Military intelligence has levied a requirement on all residencies, especially those in France, to obtain information on the new models of NATO weapons. They are to use all possible contacts, including all the representatives of the countries of the people's democracies, acquaintances and Communists.

There were many other requirements regarding the collection of information of various sorts, including approximately 20 to 25 items directly concerned with electronics, especially electronic technology as used by missile troops of the American and British Armies. We were also directed to obtain information about certain kinds of small American missiles launched from aircraft, which create various forms of interference in the air and disrupt radar scanning.

All operational intelligence officers were assigned the task of visiting chemical enterprises in France, America, and England in order to learn the process and ingredients of solid fuel for missiles.

Information was desired on heat-resisting steel; there seemed to be some reason to believe that the United States had done some very good work in this field. The GRU considers that the French have an excellent solid fuel for missiles and have made great progress in this direction.

I told the resident in Paris that I would be traveling through France and could select suitable sites for dead drops. The resident replied that they had all the dead drop sites needed. He told me not to waste my time on this.

The resident also said that it was very easy to arrange agent meetings in France, to transmit and receive materials, etc. He even indicated that dead drops were seldom used because it was simple to arrange direct meetings with agents. These are not set up very frequently, however, only when necessary.

At the embassies in Paris and London, Tass intercepts and prints all communications which do not find their way into the Soviet press. This is done for all the Ambassadors, Ministers, and Deputy Ministers. In military intelligence they are read by everyone down to and including the chief of a directorate. This is how they learn about everything that goes on in the world but does not get into their own press.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 9, 1965]

OUR MAN IN THE KREMLIN—DEAD DROPS AND RED SURVEILLANCE

(By Frank Gibney)

Colonel Penkovsky's Paris visit was his last to the West. Although his superiors in military intelligence later made several proposals to send him on foreign assignments, it became clear that the state security police were watching him, for some reason. Penkovsky himself believed that the state security's surveillance arose from the belated discovery that his father had been a White officer in the revolution. He correctly believed that they did not suspect the real truth: that he had volunteered to do espionage for the West.

Back in Moscow, he cooly continued to deliver information to his American and British contacts. He used three standard intelligence methods: (1) Carefully arranged "chance encounters"; (2) meetings at the homes of British or Americans he might normally be expected to visit; (3) the device of the "dead drop," the inconspicuous hiding place where a package can be left for a later pick up, without the need for either party to the transaction to meet face to face.

On October 21, just 2 weeks after his return from Paris, Penkovsky had his first meeting with one of his contacts. At 9 p.m. he was walking near the Balchug Hotel, smoking a cigarette and holding in his hand a package wrapped in white paper. A man walked up to him, wearing an overcoat, unbuttoned, and also smoking a cigarette. "Mr. Alex," he said in English, "I am from your two friends who send you a big, big welcome." The package changed hands. Another hoard of documents and observations on Soviet military preparations was on its way westward.

"Alex," for such was his code name, kept on collecting and transmitting information, without skimping on his normal daily rounds. More than ever, he maintained contacts with his friends in the Army. He exuded confidence.

In December Penkovsky resumed meetings with his Western contacts, but the risks involved grew ever more apparent. On January 5, after he had passed some more film to Mrs. Janet Anne Chisholm, wife of a British Embassy attaché, in an elaborately casual encounter, he noticed a small car violating traffic regulations, had swung around to observe them.

Later that month the same car appeared again at one of his meetings, a small brown sedan with the license plate SHA 61–45, driven by a man in a black overcoat. Penkovsky wrote a letter to a prearranged address in London, advising that no further meetings with Mrs. Chisholm be attempted.

From that time on, Penkovsky relied on the two remaining methods of communication. He either handed over material in the houses of Westerners, to which he was invited in the course of his duties, or relied on the relative anonymity of dead drops which were, of course, the safest way to communicate. But they had their own peculiar suspenses and horrors. In effect, an agent working through dead drops finds himself playing a grown-up game of blindman's buff.

Through the spring of 1962 Penkovsky's existence was bounded by a collection of these inconspicuous hiding places. Drop No. 1 was located in the doorway of No. 5–6 Pushkin Street, behind a radiator painted dark green. Messages to be sent were placed in a matchbox wrapped in light blue paper, bound with cellophane tape and wire, and hung on a certain hook behind the radiator.

When Penkovsky had something to leave there, he was to make a black mark on Post No. 35 on the Kutuzov Prospect. He would then put the materials in the drop, and make two telephone calls to numbers G 3–26–87 and G 3–26–94, each with a set number of rings. And so it went. Such are the complexities of a working intelligence operation.

Through it all, Penkovsky continued to jot down his observations and his own warning to the West. The following excerpt discusses one of the most chilling aspects of Soviet war preparation: unrestricted chemical warfare.

(By Oleg Penkovsky)

It is not enough for Krushchev to prepare for atomic and hydrogen warfare. He is also preparing for chemical warfare. A special 7th Directorate in the general staff is involved in working out methods of chemical and bacteriological warfare.

The Chief Chemical Directorate of the Ministry of Defense is also concerned with the problems of chemical and bacteriological warfare. We also have the Voroshilov Military Academy of Chemical Defense, several military-chemical schools and scientific research institutes and laboratories in the field of chemistry and bacteriology. They are all working on these military projects.

Near Moscow there is a special proving ground for chemical defense. I know a new gas has been invented which is colorless, tasteless, and without odor. The gas is avowed to be very effective and highly toxic. The secret of the gas is not known to me. It has been named "American." Why this name was chosen, I can only guess.

Many places in the country have experimental centers for testing various chemical and bacteriological devices. One such base is in Kaluga. The commanding officer of this base is Nikolay Varentsov, the brother of Marshal Varentsov.

Near the city of Kalinin, on a small island in the Volga, there is a special bacteriological storage place. Here they keep large containers with bacilli of plagues and other contagious diseases. The entire island is surrounded by barbed wire and is very securely guarded. But my readers in the West must not be under any illusions. This is not the only place where there are such containers.

ARTILLERY EQUIPPED

Soviet artillery units all are regularly equipped with chemical warfare shells. They are at the gunsights, and our artillery is routinely trained in their use. And let there be no doubt: If hostilities should erupt, the Soviet Army would use chemical weapons against its opponents. The political decision has already been made and our strategic military planners have developed a doctrine which permits the commander in the field to decide whether to use chemical weapons, and when and where.

I recently read an article entitled "Principles of the Employment of Chemical Missiles" of the top secret military publication "Information Collection of Missile Units and Artillery." It is being distributed this month, August 1961. (This publication is intended to explain the latest in tactical and operational doctrine to the highest ranking officers, i.e., major general and above.)

The article wastes no time and minces no words. It opens with the statement that under modern conditions highly toxic chem-

ical agents are one of the most powerful means of destroying the enemy.

There is no mention made of waiting until the enemy uses chemical weapons; there is no reference to the need for a high-level political decision for the use of such weapons.

From the start to finish the article makes it clear that this decision has been made, that chemical shells and missiles may be considered just ordinary weapons available to the military commander, to be used routinely by him when the situation calls for it. The article specifically states, "The commander of the army (front) makes the decision to use chemical weapons."

The authors add that one of the most important uses for chemical missiles will be the destruction of the enemy's nuclear strike capability. Specific mention is made of the Little John, Honest John, Lacrosse, Corporal, Redstone, and Sergeant units, the width and depth of their dispersed formations under tactical conditions, and their vulnerabilities to the chemical attack. Also American cruise missile and atomic artillery units. The article contains the usual precautions about the necessity to prevent damage to friendly troops, and discussed the operational situations in which chemical weapons could be used to greatest advantage. This is how it concludes:

"The purpose of this article is to present the main fundamental principles of using chemical missiles: Those principles should not, under any circumstances, be considered as firmly established, because they can be defined with greater precision as practical experience is accumulated."

Soviet officers generally consider Americans to be extremely lax in matters of training and discipline for defense against chemical attack. I have heard that American soldiers even boast of throwing away their gas masks and other protective equipment, claiming they have lost them. I can hardly believe this, but even if it is only partly true, it is a training deficiency which must be corrected immediately. Such crucial flaws in an enemy's defensive armor are not overlooked by Soviet planners.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 10, 1965]

OUR MAN IN THE KREMLIN—PENKOVSKY ON LAST ARRIVAL IN MOSCOW KNEW SOVIET NET WAS CLOSING ON HIM

(By Frank Gibney)

"I am under observation," Colonel Penkovsky said, when his British businessman contact, Greville Wynne, arrived in Moscow for what proved to be his last visit before Penkovsky's arrest. It was July 1962.

Penkovsky had continued to produce tremendous quantities of information for American and British intelligence, but by now he was considering means of making his escape.

He still could not be sure what the state security police suspected, but he realized that a net of surveillance was tightening around him.

A less bold or zealous man would have curtailed his activities. But Penkovsky knew the extent of Khrushchev's buildup in missiles, as well as his continued plans for military provocation over Berlin. He sacrificed caution in his effort to get his warning across to Washington and London.

Wynne brought Penkovsky letters from his contacts in the West, which improved his spirits. Western intelligence officers had forged a new passport for Penkovsky to use within the Soviet Union in case surveillance increased to the danger point. He had previously discussed the possibility of leaving Moscow for Leningrad and somehow making a rendezvous with a submarine in the Baltic. However farfetched the plan seemed, he was also thinking of some way to get his family out as well.

On the fourth of July 1962, Penkovsky attended a reception at the U.S. Embassy in Moscow, where he apparently succeeded in turning over information on the Soviet missile buildup to U.S. officers. On July 5, he and Wynne had a last meeting, at dinner, at the Peiping Restaurant in Moscow. There they ran into the most obvious kind of surveillance by the state security.

Penkovsky wrote down this account of the event after it happened. "On approaching the Peiping I noticed surveillance of Wynne. I decided to go away without approaching him. Then I became afraid that he might have some return material for me before his departure from Moscow. I decided to enter the restaurant and to have dinner with Wynne in plain sight of everyone.

"Entering the vestibule I saw that Wynne was surrounded (and that surveillance was either a demonstrative or an inept one). Having seen that there were no free tables, I decided to leave, knowing that Wynne would follow me. I only wanted to find out if he had material for me and then to part with him until morning, having told him that I would see him off. I went 100 to 150 meters beyond into a large, through courtyard with a garden. Wynne followed me, and the two of us immediately saw the two detectives following us. Exchanging a few words, we separated.

"I was very indignant about this insolence, and on the following day, I reported officially to my superiors that state security workers had prevented me from dining with a foreigner whom we respect, have known for a long time, with whom we have relations of mutual trust, with whom I have been working for a long time, etc. I said that our guest felt uncomfortable when he saw that he was being tendered such attention.

"My superiors agreed with me that this was a disgrace, and Levin (the state security representative) was equally indignant about the surveillance. Levin said that the committee and I as its representative, granted the necessary courtesies to Wynne and that we (state security) do not have any claims on him."

Penkovsky's cool-headed bluff bought him time—almost 3 months' worth. He continued to photograph secret documents in the general staff library, relying on his good connections in Soviet military circles to hold off further action by the state security police.

Later, the Moscow press strenuously attempted to play down Penkovsky's influence and associations with Soviet generals and marshals.

Izvestia, for example, called him "a rank and file official whose contacts and acquaintances did not go beyond a limited circle of restaurant habitues, drunkards, and philanderers."

How true this characterization was may be gaged from the papers themselves, a record of which the regime was, of course, ignorant. In the following excerpt, Penkovsky describes one of the many intimate gatherings at which he hobnobbed with the Kremlin hierarchy: Marshal Varenstov's birthday party in September 1961.

(By Oleg Penkovsky)

Marshal Varentsov's birthday party was held at his country home. Many guests were invited, including the minister of defense, Marshal Malinovsky. My whole family, including even my mother, was invited long in advance. Yekaterina Karpovna, Varentsov's wife, asked me to be master of ceremonies (temadan).

On the evening of September 16, 1961, the guests began to arrive: Marshal Malinovsky with his wife; Chruayev, Khrushchev's right-hand man in the Central Committee Bureau for the Russian Republic (R.S.F.S.R.); Lieutenant Ryabchikov; Major General Semenov, and many others.

All the military were in civilian clothes with the exception of Malinovsky, who came wearing his uniform. Some of those invited could not come because they were busy, many of them out of town on business trips. The most important guests, of course, were Malinovsky and Churayev. Both arrived in Chaikas (the largest Soviet luxury car).

Malinovsky presented Varentsov with a large (3-liter) bottle of champagne, Churayev gave him a large wooden carved eagle, someone even gave Sergey Sergeyevich a black dog. The best and the most original presents were those from me and my family.

They were the things I had bought in London. Varentsov openly admitted it by declaring loudly: "My boy has really outdone himself this time." And my presents went from one guest to another. Everyone asked where and how I managed to get such beautiful things. Mrs. Varentsov and my wife quietly explained to the guests about my latest trip to London. The answer was always the same: "Oh, well, that of course explains it."

MOTHER'S QUESTION

At some point, while the party was in full swing, my mother approached Malinovsky and out of a clear sky asked him: "Forgive me, an old woman, Comrade Minister, my dear Rodion Yakovlevich, tell me please will there be a war? This question worries all of us so much."

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 11, 1965]

OUR MAN IN THE KREMLIN—HOW PENKOVSKY WAS SEIZED—AIDED IN FLIGHT OF ENGLISH ASSOCIATE

(By Frank Gibney)

Early in the morning of July 6, 1962, Colonel Penkovsky drove to Sheremetevo airport and met Greville Wynne in the passenger waiting room.

Using his Party card to overawe customs and security personnel, Penkovsky changed Wynne's tickets, rushed him through the departure formalities, and saw him aboard the first westbound plane, an S.A.S. flight headed for Copenhagen.

Coming on the heels of their surveillance at the Peking Restaurant the night before, the hasty departure must inevitably have deepened the suspicions of the state security police. But Penkovsky knew that Wynne was in some danger.

Heedless of his own risk, he wanted at all costs to assure Wynne's safety.

Over the next three months the colonel succeeded in getting several packets of information out to his Western contacts, mostly through the use of "dead drops" and prearranged messages.

On September 5, he brought some film to an American Embassy reception, but he could find no safe opportunity to transfer it.

The next day he tried to establish contact with one of his British sources. That effort, too, proved fruitless. The net had tightened.

On October 22, according to official Soviet record, Col. Oleg Penkovsky was arrested by representatives of the state security, in Moscow, and taken to Lubianka Prison. On November 2, Greville Wynne was kidnaped in Budapest, where he had gone to make preliminary arrangements for a mobile trade exhibition in Eastern Europe. He was flown to Moscow in an aircraft commanded by a state security general and thrown into Lubianka for interrogation.

The "interrogation" of Penkovsky and Wynne was to last fully six months.

What finally betrayed Penkovsky? It was certainly not the result of a long cat-and-mouse game played by an all-seeing state security. Penkovsky's high rank and access to the Kremlin's secrets made him far too dangerous an enemy for the Soviet high command to temporize with, in an effort to learn more about his contacts, sources, etc.

The minute his spying was discovered, it would have to be stopped. So the discovery must have been made just before his arrest.

The state security's original discovery that Penkovsky's father was a White Russian officer—a damaging item in any Soviet file—undoubtedly started an investigation. In the course of the investigation, the state security police noticed Penkovsky's frequent meetings with foreigners.

Even though Penkovsky's position in Intelligence permitted such associations, there must have been a great many dangerous foreign contact reports in his security file.

The expensive gifts he brought back from the West, for high army and party officials, also aroused some suspicion. Wynne still believes that Penkovsky was first suspected of blackmarketeering—not an unusual crime among Soviet officials.

There was another important factor. Through the spring and summer of 1962, as tension with the West was built up by Khrushchev, the state security had been ordered to tighten its surveillance on all foreigners—and Russians who associated with them.

Ironically, the same "collision course for war" which Penkovsky warned about was responsible for the intensified surveillance that brought on his arrest.

At some point the state security searched Penkovsky's apartment. Once the searchers found the secret drawer with Penkovsky's espionage apparatus—cameras, radio and instructions for Western contacts—the colonel's doom was sealed.

Could Penkovsky have saved himself before that time? Probably yes. In July, for instance, after Wynne's return to London, Penkovsky could have sent a message to London announcing that he was breaking off communication, temporarily cut his Western contacts and, above all, destroyed the incriminating materials in his desk drawer.

He did not do this precisely because he thought it necessary, to the very last, to continue his warnings about Khrushchev's political adventurism and its danger to the world.

In the following excerpt from the papers, one of the last he wrote, he discusses the Soviet nuclear menace—and Khrushchev's disregard of any test ban in 1961 and 1962.

(We must remember that Khrushchev agreed to a test ban in 1963, only after the United States faced him down in Cuba.)

(By Oleg Penkovsky)

Many of our nuclear explosions (tests) have been conducted in the central part of the U.S.S.R., mostly in Kazakhstan. Some of the smaller tests were not noticed at all and were not recorded by the Western states.

The large nuclear explosions are reported by Tass and the Soviet press, but nothing is ever said about the smaller ones. At the general staff we sometimes know of tests being conducted on a certain type of nuclear weapon, and we wait to see what Tass will say about this. If Tass keeps silent, then we keep silent, too.

Tests of various new types of nuclear weapons are conducted daily. Nuclear test explosions take place more often than reported by Tass or the Soviet press. All this talk about the Soviet Union advocating the prohibition of nuclear tests is nothing but lies.

Khrushchev will fire anyone who mentions complete suspension of nuclear tests. He is not ready for it.

He will sign an agreement prohibiting nuclear tests only after he becomes convinced that the U.S.S.R. is ahead of the United States in the use of nuclear energy for military purposes. The negotiations could last another 10 years without any results.

There is a shortage of atomic raw materials needed for the atom bombs and missiles with nuclear warheads. Almost all the ore containing uranium comes to the Soviet Union from Czechoslovakia.

Recently some uranium ore deposits have been found in China, but they are very insignificant. Soviet monazite sands and ore deposits are not particularly rich either in elements necessary for atomic energy.

In views of this shortage of atomic raw materials, it is small wonder that our government is so interested in establishing Soviet control in the Congo. The largest uranium ore deposits are in the Congo.

When Lumumba was temporarily in power in the Congo, the Soviets sent 23 planeloads of officers (including generals) there via Egypt and Sudan. The aircraft were of the IL-14 and IL-18 types; heavier types could not land on the Sudanese airfield, and other countries would not give permission for the Soviet aircraft to land for refueling.

A good friend of mine, Maj. Aleksey Guryev, was the first one to fly to the Congo with the Soviet generals. The primary task of this mission was to establish Soviet control over the uranium ore in the Congo.

On September 8, 1961, there was a regular experimental atomic explosion of a 16-megaton bomb. This was the first test explosion of a bomb of such force in the Soviet Union. An R-12 missile was used in this test. The missile was launched from the base at Kapustin Yar. Varentsov was present when the missile was launched.

Later, when a 50-megaton bomb was tested, to everybody's surprise the explosion's actual force equaled that of 80 megatons. Such great force was not expected.

It was believed that some unforeseen chemical changes in the charge must have taken place after it was prepared. It is now thought that such a bomb with a calculated force of 100 megatons may actually produce an explosion equaling that of 150 or 160 megatons.

Why did Khrushchev unexpectedly begin to conduct new nuclear tests?

(The Soviets resumed nuclear testing on September 1, 1961. They continued the practice until the nuclear test-ban treaty of 1963.)

All nuclear tests have had and some still have two phases. The first phase deals with the explosive force in TNT equivalents.

In these tests the bombs were dropped from aircraft or from special masts. The second phase tests nuclear payloads lifted by missiles.

The present tests are almost exclusively on the second phase type. Almost all of them are conducted with missiles.

Why is Khrushchev pushing these nuclear tests? Why is he unwilling to sign the agreement forbidding nuclear weapons tests? Because most of our missiles have not even passed the necessary tests, let alone of missile production, as regards quality and there have been many instances of missiles and satellites exploding in the air or disappearing completely.

But Khrushchev persistently does everything possible to improve missile weapons. He wants to seize the initiative and to show the West that he is ahead in the field of missile production, as regards quality as well as quantity.

Khrushchev and our scientists are still quite far from being able to prove such a superiority; but they are working hard to improve all types of missile weapons.

General Kupin says there are insufficient defense facilities in case of war, particularly as regards defense against radioactive substances.

Although we tell our people working in defense plants that everything is under control and that there is no danger of contamination, they are still afraid.

Many become ill, after working for 6 months or a year. Even our nuclear-powered icebreaker *Lenin* is a floating deathtrap because of its badly designed valves which allow radioactive leakage.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—On August 25, 1962, Colonel Penkovsky added the following personal note to the Papers. It was one of the few entries with a date affixed. It was the last thing ever received from him.)

I have already grown used to the fact that I note periodically some degree of surveillance and control over my movements. The "neighbors" continue to study me. There is some reason for this KGB activity. I confuse and lose myself in guesses and suppositions. I am very far from exaggerating the dangers. Still, I am an optimist and I try to evaluate the situation objectively.

I am not disappointed in my life or my work. The most important thing is that I remain full of strength and desire to continue this work. To tell the truth about the Soviet system—it is the goal of my life. And if I succeed in contributing my little bricks to this great cause, there can be no greater satisfaction.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 12, 1965]

OUR MAN IN THE KREMLIN—PENKOVSKY FATE NEVER IN DOUBT

(By Frank Gibney)

"On May 7, 1963, in Moscow in the Court of Session Hall of the Supreme Court of the U.S.S.R., there began an open trial in the criminal case of the agent of the British and American intelligence services and citizens of the U.S.S.R. O. V. Penkovsky and the subject of Britain and spy go-between, Greville Wynne." (Information release, Military Collegium of the Soviet Supreme Court.)

The trial of Colonel Penkovsky and Greville Wynne lasted all of 4 days, and one of these days was occupied by a closed session. The verdict was never in doubt. Penkovsky was sentenced to death, Wynne to 16 years' imprisonment.

Both defendants confessed their guilt, as agreed on during the long months of brutal state security interrogation. Wynne displayed some obvious reservations, however, and he left little doubt about the extent of his coaching and coercion.

Penkovsky had agreed to the humiliation of a Soviet "show" trial for only one reason: to safeguard the lives of his family.

As Wynne later said, it was clear that he had made a bargain with his state security interrogators. If he played the game, as they ordered it, his wife and children would be spared the imprisonment they might ordinarily have expected, as close relatives of an enemy of the state.

He was probably safe in assuming the bargain would be kept. The Stalinist terror has left such a bad taste in the mouth of all Russians that reprisals against a political prisoner's family are generally unpopular. Penkovsky's wife and children never suspected the dangerous crusade to which he had committed himself. He naturally wanted to spare them the worst of its consequences.

WYNNE FREED IN EXCHANGE

Wynne was released in 1964, in exchange for the Soviet spy Konon Melody, who under the name of Gordon Lonsdale had been passing information to Moscow from London. Although "Lonsdale's" espionage against the British can hardly be compared to the magnitude of Penkovsky's disclosures to the West, he was a professional Soviet intelligence officer and they wanted him back in Moscow.

The very fact that a trial had to be held must have been embarrassing to the Kremlin. But Penkovsky had to have a public trial. Eight British and U.S. diplomats in Moscow had been declared persona non grata for their connections with him. A foreign national, Wynne was directly implicated.

But Penkovsky himself was too big a fish to dismiss with the minimal notice reserved for most such offenses. The wave of transfers and demotions in the Soviet intelligence service and the army, following Penkovsky's

arrest, was too large to avoid explaining. (Some 300 intelligence officers alone were hastily recalled to Moscow.)

Finally Penkovsky's associates in the army were too highly placed to avoid the most public sort of warning.

TRIAL PLANNED 6 MONTHS

For 6 months the prosecution had worked out the details of those 4 days in court. Wynne was interrogated steadily, since the day—November 3, 1962, when he was flown to Moscow after his abduction in Budapest by Soviet and Hungarian security men.

Inside the Lubianka Prison, the state security arranged a meeting with both Penkovsky and Wynne. There Penkovsky begged Wynne to cooperate in a public trial. Wynne agreed to cooperate within limits. After 6 helpless months in a solitary cell of the Lubianka, there was little option left to him. He feared also, that without a public trial, nothing would be known of his fate.

In the pretrial interrogations Penkovsky, who had a rough time of it, made no attempt to disguise his motives and actions. He told his interrogators that he had acted not primarily to help the West, but in the best interests of his own people, the Russians. This was hardly a defense which a Soviet court would permit him to repeat in public. (It is of interest that the final statements of both defendants were made in a closed court session.)

The two defense attorneys assigned to Wynne and Penkovsky went through the motions of talking to their "clients," but only after the interrogators had finished. (Wynne's attorney, who spent most of his time in court agreeing with the prosecution, later presented him with a capitalist-sized bill.)

DEFENDANTS REHEARSED

When the trial was finally staged, both defendants had been rehearsed thoroughly, even to the point of visiting the courtroom in advance. The military court, presided over by Lt. Gen. V. V. Borisoglebskiy, called four witnesses, two of them acquaintances of Penkovsky's, and produced nine experts to certify the equipment found in Penkovsky's apartment, the security nature of the information which he gave, and other things.

In the orderly process of question and answer the whole story of Penkovsky's espionage against the Soviet Union was repeated, from the first meeting with Wynne in Moscow and the confrontation with the British and American intelligence officers in London.

Lt. Gen. A. G. Gornyy, the chief military prosecutor, summarized it at the outset: "* * * the accused Penkovsky is an opportunist, a careerist and a morally decayed person who took the road of treason and betrayal of his country and was employed by imperialist intelligence services.

"By the end of 1960 he attempted to get in touch with the American intelligence service, further exploiting the undeserved trust placed in him and his position as deputy head of the Foreign Department of the State Committee for the Coordination of Scientific Research Work—having, through the nature of his work, the opportunity to meet foreigners visiting the Soviet Union as members of the various scientific and cultural delegations."

NO DOUBT OF GUILT

There was no doubt that Penkovsky had engaged in the most serious sort of espionage. The catalog of material confiscated in his apartment as read off at the Soviet trial would in itself offer ample grounds for an espionage conviction.

"During the search at Penkovsky's apartment, in addition to the already mentioned records with the telephone numbers of the foreign intelligence officers, six message postcards with instructions for them, the report and the exposed rolls of film, the following articles were discovered in a secret hiding place installed in his desk, and were attached to the file as tangible evidence: a forged passport, six cipher pads, three Minox cameras and a description of them, two sheets of specially treated paper for writing secret text, a memorandum with an indication of the frequencies on which Penkovsky received instructional radio transmission from the foreign intelligence services, the draft of a report from Penkovsky to the intelligence headquarters, the article which Penkovsky had received from the foreign intelligence services and which he intended to publish in the Soviet Union, 15 unexposed rolls of film for the Minox camera, and various instruction manuals provided by the foreign intelligence services—the Soniya (Sony) radio receiver which he had received from the foreign intelligence services and which he used to receive enciphered radio messages from the intelligence headquarters, and the typewriter on which Penkovsky typed his reports."

There was no doubt, either, whom Penkovsky had been dealing with. Witness the prosecutor's angry tirade:

"A leading role in this belongs to the Central Intelligence Agency of the United States—the support of the most adventurist circles in the United States. Like a giant octopus it extends its tentacles into all corners of the earth, supports a tremendous number of spies and secret informants, continually organizes plots and murders, provocations and diversions. Modern techniques are put to the service of espionage: from the miniature Minox cameras which you see before you up to space satellites, spies in the sky."

IMPORTANT FACTS HIDDEN

But what the Soviet prosecutors could not do was admit the two most important facts in the whole case: (1) Penkovsky's real identity as a colonel in military intelligence and the real extent of his contacts with the Soviet hierarchy; and (2) Penkovsky's real motive in betraying the Soviet regime.

In the Soviet record, he could be a drunkard, a philanderer, greedy, and a girl chaser—all these motives the prosecution clumsily attempted to adduce. But the Communist system is too brittle and insubstantial to admit that such a highly placed official could revolt against it because he thought the system was bad and wrong.

As a result the trial showed up as a farce. (Even witnesses from military intelligence had to be disguised as officers from the educational branch of the Ministry of Defense.) The Soviet prosecutors left only an agonizing question mark, when they tried to show how such a brilliant and promising officer had gone wrong.

Time and time again Penkovsky's past credentials were certified: a war hero, a brilliant officer (and even more brilliant if one included his real record in intelligence), and a responsible Soviet official.

Then suddenly came the fall in 1960. Despite all the prosecutor's attempts to trace the beginning of careerism, it was, as they depicted it, a fall as abrupt as original sin and about as rationally explainable. An extraordinary gap yawned between the able, hardworking, trusted Soviet official and the cringing specimen of "moral depravity" which General Gornyy presented, in a summation titled "Penkovsky's path from careerism and moral degradation to treachery."

"Penkovsky is dead," the prosecutor told Izvestia and the world, a few days after the trial ended. "The sentence was carried out on May 16, in the second half of the day. When it was announced to him that the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. had denied his petition for mercy and he was to be executed, there was not a trace of the poseur's manner which he had maintained in court. He met death like a despicable coward."

So ended the career of the most extraordinary volunteer spy of this century.

The free world is forever in his debt.

(By Greville Wynne)

(The following description of Oleg Penkovsky was written after Wynne returned from Soviet captivity. Wynne was the last westerner to see Penkovsky alive.)

Oleg Penkovsky was a most extraordinary man. It was an unforgettable experience to accompany him, particularly during his first visits to London and Paris, and to see the tremendous impact of our free society on a decent, and by Soviet standards, sophisticated man, but a man who had been sheltered all his life inside the prison of the Soviet system.

It was the people in the West who impressed him most. He was amazed, for example, to find that the assistants in department stores were clean, neat in dress and well groomed, that nearly all the young ladies there were attractive, smiling and anxious to please.

I had often visited the gloomy GUM department store in Moscow and the drab shops in Gorky street with their drab, surly attendants. So I had some idea of the mental contrast he must have been making.

He was interested in religion. He had indeed been baptized himself by his pious mother. In London one day we were passing the Brompton Oratory. He asked me whether it was a church and whether he could go in to look around.

He was fascinated. "This is good," he said. "Perhaps the religious doctrine is not entirely correct, but at least it gives us a principle to guide our life. At home in the Soviet Union we have nothing. There are no principles—only what the Party tells us."

Wherever we went he was accepted as my friend. This first amazed him, but also pleased him immensely. Such a terrific contrast from the Soviet system where it is still highly dangerous for citizens to mix socially with Westerners.

He was bitter about the Soviet regime. He would weep, quite literally, when he talked about its misdeeds and the sufferings or unhappiness of his friends in the Soviet Union.

At the very end of his Paris trip he worried about going back. He knew he could stay. I shall never forget that day when I picked up Oleg in the early morning for a drive to the airport in thick fog. Then we waited for over 4 hours for the plane to take off. He almost stayed. His face was tense with his decision. Finally he made up his mind, turned to me and said, "Oh Greville, I must go back. I have more work to do."

KNEW HE WAS WATCHED

It was then July 1962, and he knew that the state security was watching him. He was a lonely man in those last months in Moscow. What a burden he carried.

The more I knew him, the more I realized that Penkovsky was an extraordinarily high-minded man. He did what he did because it was the one way he, as an individual, could strike back at a system that had debased his country. I never saw him waiver from this basic decision from the moment we first met.

He had thought things through many months before I first made contact with him. He was willing to put up with the basic deceptions of spying and the tremendous strain of this lonely life, because he believed in a cause. He believed simply that a free society should emerge in the Soviet Union, and that it could only come by toppling the only government he knew. He was a heroic figure.

I shall never forget him.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 14, 1965]

OUR MAN IN THE KREMLIN—SPY LECTURE BROUGHT OUT—PENKOVSKY SMUGGLED TRAINING DATA TO WARN AMERICA

(By Frank Gibney)

(A Soviet Spy's Guidebook to the United States: a top-secret lecture, given to Soviet intelligence officers in Moscow at the Military-Diplomatic Academy, by Lt. Col. I. E. Prikhodko, officially titled: "Characteristics of Agent Communications and of Agent Handling in the U.S.A.").

In the vast amount of intelligence material which Col. Oleg Penkovsky smuggled out of Moscow—Soviet prosecutors at his trial in 1963 themselves admitted he had passed on 5,000 separate photographed items—Penkovsky apparently thought this one item, in particular, should receive the widest distribution.

This training lecture was given in 1961 to acquaint Soviet intelligence officers with some of the problems and opportunities of espionage in the United States.

SERVED IN THE UNITED STATES

Its author, Lt. Col. I. E. Prikhodko, had himself served as an intelligence officer in New York, from 1952 to 1955, under "cover" of a post with the Soviet Mission to the United Nations.

Penkovsky first read it in the course of a briefing session in Moscow while preparing for a mission to the United States, which was later canceled. He sent it along, with the papers, as "a warning to the American people" of the extent to which Soviet espionage has expanded, in fact, formalized, its widespread undercover activities in the United States.

Although the language of the Prikhodko lecture is professorial, its content is hair raising. It is literally a professional working manual for Soviet intelligence officers in the United States, complete with instructions on how to recruit American agents to do their spying work—a most sinister variety of how-to-do-it book.

As his first step, Colonel Prikhodko tries to give his pupils—most of them Soviet intelligence officers of major's or lieutenant colonel's rank—an objective introduction to the strange ways and customs of Americans, regarded in his Soviet classroom as virtually citizens of another world.

COMMUNIST CONTACT

Although Col. Prikhodko was trying to be objective, his guidebook is a weird article with observed reality constantly being confused with the necessity to interpret everything in a Communist context. While the colonel finds the Americans, on the one hand, energetic, enterprising, and open people, resourceful, courageous and industrious, they are at the same time demoralized by bourgeois society and constantly diverted by "monopolists" into spending their time in silly amusements instead of "meditative and deliberative activity."

They have a natural love of freedom and independence, but they are always swayed by money and indifferent to anything not connected with business.

If this clinical Soviet appraisal of Americans is unintentionally funny, it is also frightening. For the Soviet intelligence officers who study lectures like this are the very men the Kremlin relies on to make estimates of American responses to Soviet actions.

THE LECTURE

Agent communications and agent handling involve first and last working with people, as a rule from the bourgeois world. For this work to be successful, it is necessary that Soviet officers know these people well, their characteristics and their personality traits, and the political and economic circumstances which condition their behavior.

In the recruitment of agents, preference should be given to Americans because they are highly trusted both in the United States and in the countries of Europe. It is much easier for an American agent to deliver mail for the "Center" "i.e., intelligence headquarters in Moscow" from the United States to one of the West European countries (a neutral country or an ally of the United States) and mail to our residencies in the United States.

An intelligence officer, however, who does not know the characteristics of the American way of life or who neglects those aspects cannot be trusted to handle and control American agents working for us.

TRAITS STUDIED

The way of life, customs, temper, demeanor, and personality traits of Americans have specific significance. Most Americans are energetic, enterprising, and open people, with a great sense of humor.

They can be described as having business acumen and as being resourceful, courageous, and industrious.

The overall situation and the absolute power of money in the United States arouses just one desire in many people—to make more money.

In describing a person, Americans often use the expression, "He knows how to make money," which means that such a person has a lot of money.

The other side of the question, specifically where the money comes from or how it is "made," is not, as a rule, of interest to anybody.

It can be said that Americans encourage any method of getting rich.

American bourgeois propaganda tries in every way to convince the population that anyone can make money if he is sufficiently resourceful.

Such a one-sided upbringing engenders in some of the people an indifference to everything unconnected with business, profits, and gain. The American love of money can be exploited by paying an agent for his work in order to increase his personal interest in working for us.

Payments must be prompt and equitable. This disciplines the agent and improves the Soviet officer's authority.

To encourage an agent, monthly payments are increased or bonuses, awards, or valuable gifts are given.

Thus, for example, agent B, who was on a monthly salary, reduced his production appreciably. His attendance at meetings and visits to dead drops were irregular. Despite rebukes by the intelligence officer, the agent's work did not improve.

The intelligence officer decided that he would have to use material inducement. With the Center's permission he began to pay the agent only for those months during which the agent actually worked and performed his operational activities.

Soon B realized that further backsliding would result only in the loss of all his extra income. He began to perform his tasks more efficiently.

An American's circle of interests is often rather small. Many Americans do not read books. Their main interest lies in advertisements, sports news, and cartoons; on the front pages they only glance at the large sensational headlines.

Generally speaking, bourgeois society demoralizes people.

Every American family tries to save money for a rainy day; therefore a certain amount is set aside from each pay check.

Wall Street does everything possible to keep Americans from devoting their free time to meditation and deliberation. Movies, cheap concerts, boxing, parks, horse races, baseball, football, restaurants—all these are used to divert the masses from the realities around them.

In general, an American's wants consist of having his own automobile, a comfortable apartment, and a good time. Most Americans, both men and women, smoke.

CONCERNED OVER CLOTHES

Americans are very concerned about clothes and outward appearances. They try always to have a clean suit, well pressed with a good crease in the trousers, a clean shirt, and shoes well polished. They send their suits regularly to the cleaner and their shirts to the laundry, both of which are everywhere in the United States. It is customary to change white shirts and socks daily.

It should be noted, therefore, than an intelligence officer who has an outwardly slovenly appearance will not command respect from an American agent.

In American clothing, light colors predominate. Americans like loose-fitting shoes, as a rule one or two sizes larger than necessary.

In his free time, when not at work, and especially during the summer, the American wears sports clothes: light trousers, short-sleeved shirts, no necktie. Sunglasses are in common use.

Outside the office an American's behavior is free and relaxed. Many Americans like to keep their hands in their pockets and chew gum.

Americans listen to the weather forecast and, if bad weather is predicted, they take an umbrella and raincoat; Americans do not wear rubbers. Both men and women use umbrellas. Thus, before going to a meeting, an intelligence officer should listen to the weather forecast and, if necessary, take an umbrella or a raincoat.

TIME SPENT IN BARS

Americans like to spend their time in bars. Many bars have no tables. Customers sit on high round stools next to the bar. As a rule, bars do not provide snacks or hot dishes. One can order only drinks: whisky, gin, beer, etc.

In order not to attract undue attention, the intelligence officer must know how to order sufficiently well. It is not enough, for example, to ask, "Give me a glass of beer." It is also necessary to name the brand of beer, "Schlitz," "Rheingold," etc. For the customers' amusement, most proprietors install a television set in a corner above the bar. Customers often sit over a single glass of beer for several hours watching television programs.

American drugstores, especially in large cities, have almost become department stores. Therefore they are never without customers. Drugstores can be used to hold short meetings with agents, as well as for other agent activities, e.g., signaling, clandestine phone calls.

Even American movie theaters are distinctive. Most movie theaters in large cities are open from 12 noon to 1 a.m. Moviegoers enter as soon as they get their tickets, and they may take any unoccupied seat. Films are shown continuously. Americans are not content with only a single feature. Therefore, movie theater proprietors show two films, one after the other, which last 3 to 4 hours.

Intelligence officers can make extensive use of movie theaters when organizing agent communications by spending a certain amount of time in them before a meeting. The fact is that there are few people in most movie theaters, especially on weekdays during working hours.

GOLF COURSE MEETINGS

Golf is the most popular sport among the well to do in the United States. Agent meetings can be held at golf courses as easily as in other athletic clubs. During the week there are very few people at the golf courses. On weekdays the intelligence officer and his

agent can arrive at the golf course (preferably at different times, 20 to 30 minutes apart), each can begin to play alone, and at a previously designated time can meet at, let us say, the 16th hole or at some other hole (there is a total of 18 holes).

Saturdays and Sundays are less suitable days for holding agent meetings at golf courses because on these days many players gather, tournaments are held, and single play is not permitted. Golf courses are found on the edges of wooded areas or parks in broken terrain where there are many hidden areas. These hidden areas are the best places for holding meetings. In some cases, meetings can be held in clubhouse restaurants.

To hold successful meetings at a golf course, one should learn the conditions there ahead of time. A basic requirement is to know the game and how to play it. Therefore students should learn this game while still here in Moscow at the academy.

Golf club membership is rather expensive, however. Also, not all clubs are equally accessible to our intelligence officers. It is even difficult for local residents, to say nothing of foreigners, to get into some golf clubs, if they do not have a certain position in society.

With club memberships so difficult to obtain it is advisable to use public golf courses.

The technical knowledge of the average American is rather high. In his everyday life he makes wide use of machines, equipment, and instruments. Therefore the training of an American agent in operational technology is all the easier.

Yet it should be emphasized that the national characteristics of American agents are such that they are often careless in their operations. Americans make poor conspirators. They therefore need extremely careful briefing.

When necessary, the intelligence officer must brief the agent on how to smuggle material out of an installation, how to return it undetected, and how to reproduce the material at home or at work. It is very important that our American agents know how to develop proper and plausible cover stories for their extra income and for their periodic absences.

The Soviet intelligence officer can skillfully put to use such American traits as efficiency, resourcefulness, boldness, and perseverance. These will help an American agent to carry out operational tasks and to exploit his operational capabilities fully.

Americans, to a larger degree than representatives of many other peoples, have a natural love of freedom and independence, and do not like discipline. The officer must respect this characteristic and not resort to open pressure on the agent.

Realizing that the majority of Americans are open, straightforward, and happy people with a great sense of humor, the intelligence officer can prepare for and conduct a conversation with an agent that is not dull but lively and witty.

When preparing for a meeting he must try to anticipate the agent's questions, prepare good answers to them, and at the meeting to answer the agent in such a manner that the agent will feel that the intelligence officer is being frank with him.

Americans, like other people, are patriots. They are proud of their country's achievements; they honor their national heroes, and value their cultural monuments.

Therefore the intelligence officer must be careful not to indiscriminately criticize things American, but must remember that an unfortunate statement, for example, about some popular U.S. President (George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, Thomas Jefferson) might offend the agent. A negative result might also come from an officer's underrating American culture.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 15, 1965]

OUR MAN IN THE KREMLIN—HOW RUSSIAN AGENTS COMMUNICATE WITH SPIES IN THE UNITED STATES

(By Frank Gibney)

One of the most significant documents which Col. Oleg Penkovsky managed to smuggle out of Moscow to the West was the top-secret lecture given by Lt. Col. I. E. Prikhodko to a select audience of Soviet intelligence officers in Moscow, in 1961.

Titled "Characteristics of Agent Communications and Agent Handling in the United States," the lecture is nothing less than a detailed instruction manual for the use of Soviet spies and their American agents, in spying on U.S. secrets.

Probably never in the history of espionage has a document like this ever been surfaced to public view.

In yesterday's excerpt from the Prikhodko lecture, the Soviet "American expert," who had once done spying work in New York under cover of his nominal work as a Soviet U.N. delegation member, gave his Moscow listeners an outline of American national characteristics, with special reference to the virtues and defects of Americans in espionage work.

The following excerpt goes into the details of how Soviet intelligence spies in the United States, the signals Soviet officers use, the places they like to meet their agents, the methods they use to avoid surveillance and detection by the FBI.

THE LECTURE

Under modern conditions, when the U.S.A., as the principal imperialist power, is preparing to unleash a surprise war with the mass employment of nuclear/missile weapons, the basic task of our strategic agent intelligence is to give early warning of U.S. preparations for an armed attack against the U.S.S.R. and other socialist countries.

In view of the probable nature of a future war, an important task is the systematic collection of the most complete data on the following questions:

1. The locations of U.S. missile bases, depots for nuclear weapons, plants producing atomic weapons and missiles of various designations, scientific research institutes, and laboratories developing and perfecting weapons of mass destruction.

2. Information as to the nature and results of scientific research work in the field of creating new models of nuclear and missile weapons and improving existing ones.

3. The status of antiaircraft defense, including the entire radar detection and warning system.

4. The plans of U.S. military commanders on the use of nuclear/missile weapons.

5. U.S. military preparations in the various theaters of operations.

If the imperialists unleash a war, the United States will be the target of a crushing retaliatory strike causing damage to all the most important political and economic centers of that country. The most important tack of intelligence is the prompt reporting of objectives in the United States against which we plan to carry out the first strikes.

Soviet intelligence, therefore, should adopt timely measures to guarantee the security of its intelligence net. To achieve this it is necessary to disperse our operating "residences" and to move some valuable single agents some distance outside the limits of large cities. As for agent nets engaged in collecting intelligence on atomic and missile bases, they should preferably consist of individual sources equipped with radio having direct communications with the "Center" in Moscow.

MEETING VULNERABLE

A meeting between intelligence officer and agent is one of the most vulnerable means of communications. Therefore, in organizing meetings, our intelligence officers must anticipate everything in order to guarantee security.

In the United States where the counterintelligence effort of the Federal Bureau of Investigation is highly developed, planning and preparation for a meeting are of the greatest importance. In planning a meeting one should give the greatest consideration to the characteristics of the American people and of the country, which we have already mentioned, the working and family situation of the agent, his capabilities, etc.

Meetings should be varied as to time of day, days of the week, and dates of the month. For example, meetings should not be held on the fifth day of each month, on Wednesday of every week, or consistently at 8 p.m., because such consistency in the activities of an intelligence officer makes the work of American counterintelligence easier.

Under present working conditions in the United States, one should start for a meeting not later than 2 to 3 hours before the scheduled time, and establish a good "cover" story for the meeting.

For example: An intelligence officer in the United States had a Sunday meeting scheduled for the latter part of the day. After breakfast he took his family for a walk in the park. He usually took such a walk every Sunday. On the way, he invited a friend.

The two families chose some benches in the park and talked and glanced through newspapers and magazines which they had bought at a stand while the children played nearby. They all visited the zoo together, and they also looked at some monuments.

While passing a movie theater, they looked at the advertising display and decided to see the new film. They all went inside. The intelligence officer, who had a meeting scheduled with an agent, quickly departed through a side door and left for the meeting site along a previously selected route. The meeting was successful. Toward evening the intelligence officer and his family returned home after a restful Sunday.

RENDEZVOUS AT NIGHT

Most meetings are held in the evening, however. As a rule, the agent does not work in the evening and does not have to ask permission of his boss to leave. In addition, evenings provide the greatest security. It is not recommended, however, to hold meetings in a park, because, unlike Europeans, Americans visit parks only during the day.

At the approach of darkness nobody uses the parks. At that time of the day only criminal elements and persons who are mentally ill can be found in the parks. In the press one can find special warnings concerning the danger in going to parks in the evening. It is not unusual for the newspapers to publish detailed accounts of rapes and murders which were committed in the parks during the night.

In choosing a meeting place, it is necessary of course to consider the character of the country as a whole and, above all, the characteristics of the area. As a whole, conditions in the cities of New York and Washington, for example, are favorable for the organization of agent communications.

The existence of a subway in New York helps in locating different places in the city. It should be borne in mind, however, that the subway system there is quite complicated and it should be studied carefully before planning to use it for operational purposes.

In New York it is easy to establish a cover story for going downtown either during the day or at night, because New York has many public places. Skillful use of transportation facilities makes it possible to make a good check for the detection of surveillance. Finally, an intelligence officer who speaks

with an accent in New York is quite acceptable since a large segment of the city's population speaks with an accent.

On the other hand the organization and utilization of agent communications in Washington are full of difficulties because of the city's small size, its limited number of public places, no subways, and an inadequate public transportation system, especially in the suburbs.

NEW YORK PROBLEMS

Differences exist not only among the sections and cities of the United States, but also among different sections of cities, often within the very same borough or area.

For example, let us take Manhattan, which is the business area of New York. Negro Harlem is unsuitable for the organization of agent communications in Manhattan. It is located north of Central Park, and the Chinese quarter, located downtown, is also difficult for agents. Extreme squalor distinguishes the Chinese quarter. A properly dressed person will stand out sharply there.

As for Negro Harlem, white people cross it only by automobile. A white person is unsafe there, because the Negroes regard every white person who comes there as a curiosity seeker who came to view them much as people go to the zoo to view the animals in cages.

We do not recommend that meetings be held in the area between 42d and 34th Streets. This is the busiest part of midtown and therefore has the widest coverage by the police and by counterintelligence.

Likewise, it is unadvisable to hold meetings in the vicinity of the U.N. Building (along the shore of the East River, between 42d and 48th Streets), near buildings of the permanent representations of various countries to the U.N. and, above all, the delegations to the U.N. of representations of Socialist countries (the representation of the U.S.S.R. to the United Nations is located at 680 Park Avenue), nor in the vicinity of large banks, jewelry stores, etc.

WASHINGTON DETAILS

In Washington, meetings should not be held in the central part of the city, where congressional buildings, the White House, departmental buildings, and other governmental offices, large banks, stores, and restaurants are located. Neither should they be held on the main streets of the city or in areas where foreign embassies and, especially, the embassies of the U.S.S.R. and other countries of the Socialist camp are located. Meetings should also not be held in areas near military objectives or in the Negro district.

Generally, an operation can be compromised through the improper selection of a meeting site. For example, an intelligence officer, who did not know the city well, once selected a meeting place with an agent on a street corner in the evening. A large bank stood on this corner.

The intelligence officer arrive for the meeting exactly at the appointed time. The agent was late. The intelligence officer was there for less than 2 minutes when a policeman approached, asked him what he was doing there, and requested him to move along. The intelligence officer had to leave quickly. In addition, two plainclothesmen followed him until he entered a subway station. The meeting was not held.

New York and Washington have numerous restaurants, many of them representing different nationalities. Each restaurant has its own distinctive characteristics. One may specialize in steaks (the most expensive steaks are sirloin and T-bone steak) another is seafood; some restaurants have orchestras, others have not. Before selecting a certain restaurant as a meeting site, one should learn everything about the restaurant; the system of service, the type of customers, whether it has a bad reputation with the police, etc.

It is the practice in all restaurants to tip the waitress 10 percent of the amount shown on the check.

Depending on the nature of the agent operation, the officer and agent may sit at the same table and hold the meeting during dinner. Or they may sit at separate tables, keeping only visual contact, for the purpose of exchanging prearranged signals.

AVOID THE PRESS

American stores periodically hold sales of their merchandise at lowered prices. At the beginning of the sale a large number of people usually gather at the store. In their efforts to advertise the sale, the proprietors invite newspaper photographers to the opening of the sale. To avoid being caught by the photographer's lens, our intelligence officers and members of their families should not visit the store during the beginning of the sale.

In New York there are no ticket collectors on the subway. The ticket office does not sell tickets but only metal tokens which cost 15 cents. In passing through the revolving gate at the entrance, the passenger inserts the token in a special slot.

An intelligence officer should always have several tokens with him, especially on the day of a meeting, so as not to waste any time in buying them at the subway entrance.

It is hard to imagine how agent communications would be conducted in New York without using the subway, which, despite its complexity, facilitates one's orientation in the city. It also affords a convenient place to check on the existence or absence of surveillance. In some cases, inadequate knowledge of the subway system has forced officers to cancel meetings with their agents.

Buses also operate without conductors. The driver allows the entrance and departure of passengers, makes change, and hands out transfers (at the request of the passenger). He gives change for bills but only up to $5. Thus the intelligence officer must always be certain that he has small change or $1 bills.

A taxi can be stopped anywhere; this is done merely by waving the hand or by loudly shouting. "Taxi" when an empty one passes.

The driver writes in his log the place a fare entered the taxi, the place he got out, and the time. Therefore, an intelligence officer must never take a taxi directly to the meeting place.

There are many companies in the United States which rent cars. Use of rented cars in the organization of agent communications is recommended, because this has a number of advantages. For instance, an intelligence officer can drive to the city in his own car, check for surveillance, and then leave it in a suitable area or in a parking lot. He can then complete his job in a rented car. This makes the work of the American counterintelligence service more difficult.

USE OF DEAD DROPS

Dead drops (i.e., hiding places where material can be left for prearranged pickups) are extensively used for communication within agent nets, or with individual agents.

Stationary dead drops are selected or specially prepared in parks and squares, in trees, in the ground, in fences, in benches, in monuments, in public buildings, and beyond populated places such as forests, fields, seashores, riverbanks, etc.

In selecting and preparing a "dead drop" in a park, one must bear in mind that a number of American parks (for example, Central Park in New York) have many squirrels which can destroy the "dead drop" (especially in hollow trees) and carry off our material.

The United States has up to 2,000 daily newspapers with a circulation of about 57 million and more than 7,000 magazines. Both newspapers and magazines give considerable space to advertisements and all kinds of announcements. Newspaper companies receive sizable profits from advertisements and announcements and therefore accept them very readily.

Advertisements published in American newspapers differ greatly in content and in length. The most common ones deal with the sale and rental of living quarters, the sale of personal effects, employment opportunities, announcements of weddings, divorces, births, and deaths, the loss of valuables and pets, etc. Below are several samples of advertisements which could be used in intelligence work. (Following samples appear in English.)

"POSITION WANTED

"Housework: Mature Colombian maid speaking a little English will give considerable care to children or invalid lady; do efficient general housework, $25–$30 per week. Exeter 4–0482, 7–10 p.m.

"DOMESTIC EMPLOYMENT

"Chauffeur, white—wanted. Age 35, married. 12 years experience. Intelligent, alert, neat. Fordham 4–7457 before noon."

"PUBLIC NOTICES AND COMMERCIAL NOTICES

"My wife, Jane Smith Doe, has left my bed and board. I am no longer responsible for her debts. John Doe, 17 Leslie Lane, Dobbs Ferry, N.Y."

One can see from these examples that many advertisements can be adapted quite easily to the transmittal of information. Among the code words which can be used are: the names or description of a lost article; a description of the circumstances; the place and time it was lost; the size of the reward for returning the valuable or pet; etc.

Illegal residences have a greater opportunity to make use of the press in arranging agent communications. Residences under cover may use the press on a lesser scale, primarily to transmit information or signals from agent to intelligence officer. On the whole, the United States presents favorable conditions for the use of the press for intelligence work.

A sum of money is paid to place an advertisement or some kind of announcement in the press. The text of these advertisements will contain a prearranged coded secret message.

A thorough study of the specific features of the country enables one to select the most natural signals. For example one of our intelligence officers called an agent for an introductory meeting by sending the newspaper Washington Daily News to his apartment. The intelligence officer went to the city, made a careful check, and then called the newspaper office from a public telephone and asked them to start delivery on the next day to the address he gave them (the agent's address). A week after delivery started, the agent appeared at the prearranged meeting place.

Radio communications provide the most rapid means for transmitting orders and instruction from the center.

Because of our distance from the United States, should the need arise, we can set up radio relay stations which can be located on ships, submarines, and aircraft. We also must not exclude the possibility that in the not too distant future we can install a radio station on an earth satellite.

In certain special situations, we might consider the possibility of getting a courier to the American mainland by submarine. It must be remembered, however, that the United States shore defenses are stronger than those of other countries of the American continent. Therefore one should not always attempt to land an agent directly in the United States. At times it is possible to send mail to a third country (for example, Mexico) and then deliver it overland to the

United States. Mail sent in this manner can be placed in the center's dead drops.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 12, 1965]

WEST'S SPIES ACTIVE, WYNNE HINTS

(By Flora Lewis)

NEW YORK, November 11.—The Englishman who was freed from a Moscow jail in exchange for Soviet Spy Gordon Lonsdale today indicated that there are top Western spies now functioning in the Soviet Union.

Greville Wynne, who served as contact for Western intelligence with Soviet State Security Col. Oleg Penkovsky, appeared at a press conference here to help launch the "Penkovsky Papers." The book, now being serialized in the Washington Post, is said to be Penkovsky's memoirs smuggled to the West before the writer was convicted of spying and executed in Russia.

Wynne was arrested in Hungary 10 days after Penkovsky was arrested in Moscow. The Englishman was taken to Russia immediately, tried, sentenced to 8 years in prison but sent home after 18 months in return for Lonsdale.

He spoke with ardent admiration for Penkovsky, whose main aim in providing valuable information to the West was "to prevent a war," Wynne said.

"There are other people like him," he said, "But, of course, you don't hear about them until they get caught."

Penkovsky "was in the holy of holies and he blew it sky high," Wynne said, describing his late friend's importance. "They (the Russians) haven't recovered yet and they won't for a long time." Wynne said he did not believe that Russians were aware of his own real role in the espionage link despite his prison interrogation and learned the story only when he came back and made public disclosures. He is writing his own book about the affair.

Lonsdale, now back in Russia has also published a book about his activities in the West. Wynne said this extraordinary change in Soviet policy against discussing Moscow's intelligence activities was almost certainly provoked by word that the "Penkovsky Papers" would be published.

Lonsdale's book naturally puts Soviet espionage in a good light while the "Penkovsky Papers" does exactly the opposite.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 12, 1965]

PENKOVSKY'S FELLOW SPY HAILS HIS SERVICE TO WEST

(By Max Frankel)

Oleg V. Penkovsky's service to the capitalist world—considerable while he lived and still unfinished in death—reached a pecuniary culmination here yesterday.

The mysterious forces of espionage and the obvious forces of commerce joined to promote a book that purports to be the secret journal of Colonel Penkovsky, the West's best-placed Moscow spy in memory. Thus they produced yet another extraordinary chapter in an extraordinary but slippery tale.

With an expression of regret that the executed colonel was unfortunately "not with us," the publishers of the book, Doubleday & Co., presented the next best pitchman, Greville Wynne, just 19 months out of a Soviet jail for his contact work with Penkovsky in 1961 and 1962.

Mr. Wynne, whose dark hair and curled mustache make him look a little like the actor Terry-Thomas in repose, showed a certain flair for dramatic narrative but, so as not to spoil his own, as yet unwritten book, held back most of his own story of 7 years of business journeys in Communist Europe.

PENKOVSKY'S FEAT PRAISED

He was happy, however, to have flown the Atlantic to help drum up business for the Penkovsky papers, to be published Friday, because, he said, he wished to call attention to a courageous man, to his warning that the West must show strength to the Soviet Union and to the importance of their joint venture in espionage.

"If it hadn't been for Penkovsky, you would have had more than a blackout in this fine city," Mr. Wynne remarked. "Penkovsky saved a war, in my opinion."

The evidence for this judgment could not be drawn from Mr. Wynne or Frank Gibney, the papers' editor, except for vague suggestions that Penkovsky passed along very important information during a time of crisis in Germany and Cuba. The judgment greatly exceeds even the most generous appreciation of Penkovsky ever heard in Washington.

At a news conference in the Doubleday offices, Mr. Wynne also hinted that he had gone to Moscow with the express purpose of appraising Penkovsky after the colonel had twice tried to make contact with Western intelligence. Soviet efforts to recruit Mr. Wynne for espionage and Western efforts to make their contacts appear like a back-market conspiracy, at worst, also figured somehow in the story, Mr. Wynne suggested, but he kept plugging his own book whenever the interview threatened to become interesting.

Neither Mr. Wynne nor Mr. Gibney said enough to dispel the widespread doubts about the origin of the Penkovsky journal. It is said to have been smuggled out of Moscow just before the colonel's arrest October 22, 1962. Mr. Wynne said that, in more than 50 meetings with Penkovsky, the colonel never mentioned the secret diary by which he allegedly wanted one day to reveal and justify his treason to the world.

The book, called "The Penkovsky Papers," says nothing more about how it came to be published. "Penkovskiy" is a more literal rendering a final double vowel in Russion under a transliteration system preferred by the U.S. Government, including the Central Intelligence Agency.

Without necessarily questioning that Penkovsky was the author of most of the book's anti-Soviet information, speculation and gossip, many Soviet specialists in Washington doubt that he actually duplicated many of his reports to the West in a secret diary. Some officials believe that British and American intelligence services created the memoir from the record of their three interrogations of Penkovsky in London and Paris during his 16-month career as a spy.

The CIA is known to have checked the book for security, and, according to Mr. Gibney, "took out a few things, I assume." Mr. Gibney said he had obtained the papers already translated from Peter Deriabin, a defector from Soviet intelligence, whose present job and whereabouts are secret.

Mr. Gibney would not describe the original manuscript except to say that it consisted of several hundred pages, mostly typewritten, plus pictures of Penkovsky and photocopies of personal documents, including his Communist Party membership card, which appear in the book.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 14, 1965]

SOVIET FOREIGN MINISTRY PROTESTS PUBLICATION OF PENKOVSKY PAPERS

The Soviet Foreign Ministry yesterday called in Stephen S. Rosenfeld, Moscow correspondent of the Washington Post, and protested this newspaper's publication of the Penkovsky Papers.

F. M. Simonov, deputy head of the Ministry's press department, read the following statement to Rosenfeld:

"The Washington Post began on October 31 the publication of so-called Penkovsky Papers. The claimed author is allegedly Penkovsky, who was condemned for espionage and high treason in 1963 for American and British intelligence services.

"The papers are a falsified story, a mixture of anti-Soviet inventions and slander which are put into the mouth of a demasked spy, provocatory claims whose purpose is to denigrate the Soviet Union, poison the international atmosphere, and make difficult a search for ways to improve relations between states.

"Publication of the Penkovsky Papers cannot be understood otherwise than as an intentional act in the spirit of the worst traditions of the cold war, which cannot but inflict damage on Soviet-American relations.

"The press department of the Foreign Ministry is authorized to invite the attention of the editorial board of the Washington Post to the provocative character of this publication. It is clear that responsibility for this is shared by anybody who has anything to do with the publication of the Penkovsky Papers.

"We expect that measures will be taken so that no articles and materials of such kind will be published in the Washington Post in the future."

In answer to a question, Simonov added: "We shall pay attention not only to the continued publication (of the Penkovsky Papers) but to comments and articles in connection with it. We do not want to foretell events, but if publication continues we reserve the right for ourselves to take necessary measures."

The Washington Post on October 31 commenced publication of a syndicated version of "The Penkovsky Papers" distributed by Publishers Syndicate (The New York Herald Tribune-Chicago Sun Times). The final installment will appear as scheduled on Monday, November 15.

The excerpts from the papers have created much controversy among Soviet experts. The papers have been credited by Edward Crankshaw, writer on Soviet affairs for the London Observer, as being the authentic narrative and comment of one of the West's major intelligence sources. They are criticized for defects in translation and attacked as part forgery by Victor Zorza of the Manchester Guardian.

The first article of Zorza's critique of the papers will be printed in the Washington Post on Monday, as previously scheduled, and the second article on Tuesday.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 14, 1965]

THE PENKOVSKY PAPERS

On Monday, the Washington Post will print, as scheduled, the concluding installment of syndicated excerpts from the book the "Penkovsky Papers." They have aroused a great deal of discussion among American and British experts on Soviet affairs with competent opinion divided as to the form in which the papers were released and as to the extent to which they were wholly in the words of Penkovsky. No one has challenged the essential point that Penkovsky was for a time a spectacularly successful intelligence source of the West.

It would not be conceivable that responsible newspapers in this country would suppress notice of a book of this significance in history or of such consequence in foreign affairs. The Washington Post, as one of the newspapers which have published excerpts from the papers, has unsuccessfully solicited criticism and comment on them from the Soviet Embassy and will publish Monday a critique by Victor Zorza of the Manchester Guardian, who doubts that the papers originated in the form in which they are presented in the book and who suspects the intrusion of material not originating with Penkovsky. No doubt this will long remain an interesting subject of conjecture and speculation, and the Washington Post will try to present opposing views as they appear.

The readers of this newspaper should know that the Washington Post's Moscow correspondent was summoned to the Soviet Foreign Ministry at 5 o'clock on Saturday afternoon and told that "we expect that measures will be taken so that no articles and materials of such kind will be published in the Washington Post in the future." He was further told that "if publication continues we reserve the right for ourselves to take necessary measures."

What those measures are we cannot know. They will not cause the Washington Post to alter its intent regarding this series of articles or any subsequent publication. We refuse to accept the inadmissible suggestion that this newspaper must not print material which the Soviet Government may find inacceptable.

It will fulfill its responsibilities as it sees them, whatever "necessary measures" of intimidation and censorship Moscow undertakes to prevent it. Newspapers in the United States, the Soviet Government should know by this time, are not to be told by governments, either foreign or domestic, what they must print or must not print.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 14, 1965]

CRANKSHAW ON PENKOVSKY

In his foreword to "The Penkovsky Papers" which you published with the first installment on October 21, Edward Crankshaw makes one peculiar assertion, namely that Col. Oleg Penkovsky was "in some measure unbalanced." He supports this contention with another sweeping assertion that "a man who will take it upon himself to betray his Government because he is uniquely convinced that he is right and it is wrong is by definition unbalanced."

Having thus laid a foundation for his argument, Mr. Crankshaw implies that Penkovsky's indictment of Khrushchev as a man actively preparing to launch a nuclear war is false because the presumably mentally disordered colonel of the Soviet military intelligence could not possibly "distinguish between government intentions and government precautions" and that he almost certainly "confused loose, menacing talk with tight-lipped calculation; contingency planning with purposive strategy."

The so far published summaries by Frank Gibney and excerpts from the book fail to give the faintest evidence that Oleg Penkovsky was in any way mentally unbalanced. Mr. Crankshaw's contention that anyone who betrays his Government because he is convinced that his Government is wrong "is by definition unbalanced" is ridiculous on the face of it. Whatever the British Kremlinologist might think of Benedict Arnold, the participants in the July 20, 1944, anti-Hitler plot, the Rosenbergs, Alger Hiss, Burgess and MacLean, Igor Gouzenko and the host of others, these men were not mentally sick either in the legal or clinical sense.

Another point is that Mr. Crankshaw—who does not for a moment question the authenticity of "The Penkovsky Papers"—presumes to know actual intentions of the Kremlin leadership better than a Soviet officer who directly and on a high level participated in the development of his Government's strategic moves.

In fact, the reason for Mr. Crankshaw's warning not to trust Penkovsky is transparent to those familiar with the tenor of his many writings: Penkovsky's revelations run contrary to that line of thought which Mr. Crankshaw represents and which stubbornly insists that the Soviet Government under Khrushchev genuinely wished to become friendly with the West.

With all due respect for Mr. Crankshaw's concern in preserving his reputation as a Soviet expert, one cannot escape the conclusion that the technique he chose to employ to that end—that of discrediting Penkovsky's testimony by implying that the man was essentially insane—serves no good purpose. It does not mean that "The Penkovsky Papers" should be accepted uncritically. But it does mean that any serious critical analysis of them must be based on a much more solid foundation than that laid by Edward Crankshaw.

K. L. LONDON,
V. PETROV,
Institute for Sino-Soviet Studies, the George Washington University.
WASHINGTON.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 15, 1965]

A COMMUNICATION FROM PRESS DEPARTMENT OF THE SOVIET EMBASSY

Recently the Washington Post and some other American newspapers have started publishing the so-called Penkovsky Papers. The authorship of these papers is attributed to the person of Penkovskiy—the man who in May of 1963 was convicted in the U.S.S.R. of treason and espionage on behalf of the United States and British intelligence services.

In fact, the so-called Penkovsky Papers is nothing but a crude forgery cooked up 2 years after Penkovskiy's conviction by those whom the exposed spy served.

The authors of the papers stuffed them with stereotyped anti-Soviet insinuations. Using Penkovsky's name, they ascribe to the Soviet Union such concepts as, for instance, the concept of preventive war, which in reality is hatched by certain quarters in the West. The authors of the papers apparently assume that any sort of slander might be put into the traitor's mouth and that they could easily get away with that.

The provocative cooking entitled "The Penkovsky Papers" no doubt deserves serious analysis. This is not the first case of publishing slanderous stuff about the U.S.S.R. and it has the only purpose—to smear the Soviet Union, to poison international atmosphere, to hinder the search for ways of improving relations between nations.

The publication of the "Penkovsky Papers" is to be regarded as nothing but a premeditated act in the worst traditions of the cold war. Such actions cannot but damage the interests of the development of friendly relations between the American and the Soviet peoples. And if those who are directly or indirectly associated with the publication of the papers pretend that they do not understand it, they only reveal the insincerity of their statements about their desire to improve relations between the U.S.S.R. and the United States.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 15, 1965]

ON SEVERAL FRONTS—PENKOVSKY DISPUTE CONTINUES TO BOIL

The Washington Post today concludes publication of the "Penkovsky Papers" around which has swirled much controversy as to their source and authenticity.

The Soviet Union on Saturday protested the publication. In addition, a letter to the editor of the Washington Post from the Soviet Embassy, printed today on page A21, calls the papers "a crude forgery cooked up 2 years after Penkovsky's conviction by those whom the exposed spy served."

The Washington Post also is printing, on page A22, the first of two articles by Victor Zorza, Soviet affairs expert of the Manchester Guardian, analyzing the papers. He writes that "the book itself contains the evidence showing certain parts of it to be a forgery even though other sections of the book are evidently made up of intelligence information provided by Penkovsky long before his arrest."

Last month Zorza had written Vladimir E. Semichastny, chairman of the Soviet State Security Committee, asking for evidence to support the charge that the papers were forgeries. On Saturday an official from the Soviet Embassy in London asked to meet Zorza and declared that the book is "a fabrication from beginning to end."

Zorza said the official gave only one piece of evidence—an inconsistency of dates. At one point Penkovsky had said that recruitment of Communist Party members in the West for work with Soviet intelligence had resumed in 1956–57. At another point it said this occurred in 1960.

Officials at the Central Intelligence Agency, whose agents dealt with and interrogated Penkovsky before his arrest, say that they read the papers only to determine whether their publication would compromise intelligence sources. They refuse to pass judgment for the press on authenticity.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 15, 1965]

PENKOVSKY PAPERS STIR SOVIET PROTEST

WASHINGTON, November 14.—The Soviet Embassy, through its press department, issued a statement tonight attacking the Penkovsky papers.

The statement was handed to several news bureaus here. It was in the form of a communication to the editor of the Washington Post, which the Embassy noted, along with other U.S. newspapers had been publishing the so-called Penkovsky papers.

The statement said that authorship of the papers was attributed to "the person of Penkovsky—the man who in May of 1963 was convicted in the U.S.S.R. of treason and espionage on behalf of the United States and British intelligence services." Col. Oleg V. Penkovsky was arrested in October 1962 and was executed after conviction.

The Soviet Embassy statement also said:

"In fact, the so-called Penkovsky papers is nothing but a crude forgery cooked up, 2 years after Penkovsky's conviction, by those whom the exposed spy had served. * * *

"This is not the first case of publishing slanderous stuff about the U.S.S.R. and it has the only purpose—to smear the Soviet Union, to poison the international atmosphere, to hinder the search for ways of improving relations between nations.

"The publication of the Penkovsky papers is to be regarded as nothing but a premeditated act in the worst traditions of the cold war. Such actions cannot but damage the interests of the development of friendly relations between the American and the Soviet peoples."

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 15, 1965]

SOVIET EXPERT THINKS PENKOVSKY PAPERS ARE A FORGERY

(By Victor Zorza)

LONDON.—"Their authenticity," say the introduction to the "Penkovsky Papers," the memoirs of the Anglo-American spy in Russia, "is beyond question." It is not.

Indeed, the book itself contains the evidence showing certain parts of it to be a forgery, even though other sections of the book are evidently made up of intelligence information provided by Penkovsky before his arrest.

But the book does not, in fact, claim to be made up of Penkovsky's intelligence reports to the West. On the contrary, it is said to be quite distinct from them, and to consist of notes, sketches and comments accumulated by him during his spying career in 1961–62 and smuggled out of the Soviet Union only in the autumn of 1962, at the time of his arrest. It is said that Penkovsky hoped that they might eventually be published to clarify his motives and to clear his name beyond question. It is curious that a work with so noble a purpose should include so much purely military and political intelligence.

THE LOWDOWN

Much of the book seems calculated to show the Soviet system in the worst possible light,

but this would be consistent with Penkovsky's attempt to justify his defection. It is even possible to stretch this interpretation to explain the "lowdown"—and it really is low—on the sexual mores, the drunkenness and cupidity of some of the people he knew in the higher ranks of the political, military and intelligence quarters. "I have absolutely no intention of defaming the marshals and generals," he says, after giving some particularly choice details.

He adds that he had "intentionally omitted the subject of moral degradation and drunkenness"—which he had not. "I know one thing for sure, though: all our generals have mistresses, and some have two or more." All? For sure?

It is conceivable that Western intelligence organizations might have been interested in the peccadilloes of members of the Soviet General Staff, just as Soviet intelligence would be interested in their Western opposite numbers, and that Penkovsky thought it right to supply this information. But he would hardly write it all down for posterity.

INTELLIGENCE FEAT

The introduction says that the extent and ingenuity of Penkovsky's work add up perhaps to the most extraordinary intelligence feat of this century. If there is no Soviet spy now working at an even higher level in the West, then this claim may well be valid. Much of the intelligence information reproduced in the book is obviously genuine.

Western government experts revealed their knowledge of it some time ago in the course of discussion about Soviet affairs. Penkovsky's information about the ignominious failure of Khrushchev's "secret weapon," which blew up on the launching pad, enabled the Western leaders to treat Soviet threats and boasts with composure. Penkovsky's information about Khrushchev's plans during the German crisis of 1961 enabled the West to make the dispositions which warded off the Soviet threat to Berlin.

Penkovsky sent reports on the bickering over the building up of the Soviet missile force, favored by Khrushchev, and the maintenance of adequate conventional forces, favored by the marshals.

DISPUTE IN KREMLIN

This gave Western intelligence analysts the clues that helped them to study between the lines of the Soviet press the most important political dispute that raged in the Soviet leadership in recent years—on the allocation of resources between civilian and military needs, within the military field itself.

This contributed greatly to the Western governments' understanding of the factors that caused the fall of Khrushchev, even though this occurred some 2 years after Penkovsky's arrest.

For some months before the Cuban missile crisis, Penkovsky and his Western masters knew that he was being watched by Soviet counterintelligence. He could therefore neither acquire nor send any intelligence on what was to prove the most fateful confrontation between East and West, and suggestions that he was asked to report on Soviet operations in Cuba just before the crisis would appear to be without foundation. Yet paradoxically, his contribution was probably decisive.

He had sent out, earlier, details of the deployment pattern of Soviet missiles. This enabled U.S. air reconnaissance experts to identify the missile sites at an early stage of construction. The early warning made it possible for President Kennedy to make in secret the preparations that played so major a part in his later management of the crisis, and in compelling Khrushchev to withdraw.

LACK OF TIME

The most important part of the information he sent out consisted of some 5,000 photographs of documents, sketches, etc., taken with a miniature camera. Yet we are asked to believe that this highly professional and valuable spy added to the great risks he was already running by keeping a detailed account of his activities and views, virtually every page of which contained enough secret information to send him straight to the firing squad.

In the foreword we are told that "throughout the period during which Penkovsky was turning over information to the West, he sat up night after night composing a journal." Yet in a passage that has the ring of truth Penkovsky himself makes it clear that this is just what he could not do. He has to write hurriedly, he says, "for the simple lack of time and space."

When he writes at night in his two-room flat he disturbs his family's sleep: typing is very noisy. During the day he is always busy, "running like a madman," in a typically Russian phrase, between the offices of his two employers, the Committee for the Coordination of Scientific Research, and the Military Intelligence Headquarters. His evenings are generally occupied, nor can he write while visiting his friends in the country. "Someone may always ask what I am doing." At home, at least, "I have a hiding place in my desk." On his own showing, he is hardly likely to have produced in these circumstances the manuscript of what is now a sizable book.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY QUESTIONED

The description of his domestic circumstances comes from Penkovsky's autobiographical outline, of a kind that any intelligence service would require from a prospective spy, so that it could check his credentials before employing him.

Penkovsky passed a paper of this kind to an American Embassy official in Moscow, together with an offer of his service, but this was not taken up because it was thought that he had been put up to it by Soviet counterintelligence. Only 6 months later, when he made another approach to the British, was his offer accepted.

But even the autobiography is not wholly genuine. The description of Penkovsky's own war service is woven into a three-page potted history of the war in Russia. A man of Penkovsky's intelligence would not have thought it necessary to waste his time on supplying this kind of "background."

A Western compiler of the Penkovsky papers, on the other hand, might have thought it useful to provide the wide readership of the book with a historical sketch that would have made Penkovsky's war career more meaningful.

KHRUSHCHEV IN UKRAINE

However, it is not safe to sketch in the background without being familiar with the details of which it is composed. Penkovsky spent the last 2 years before the war in a military school and then in an artillery unit in the Ukraine, to which he was posted as a political officer.

On one occasion the unit was visited by a number of Soviet military leaders, whom Penkovsky recognized, but there was one person "whom I had never seen before." He was told later that this was a certain N. S. Khrushchev. Yet for the past 2 years Khrushchev had been the first secretary of the Ukrainian Party, carrying out a ruthless and bloody purge, feared and hated by all—the virtual master of the Ukraine, the "Little Stalin," with his picture frequently displayed in public places and in the newspapers which would have been obligatory reading for an aspiring political officer.

No doubt the account of the incident was inserted into the papers to make them appear more authentic, but the result, as happens so often when enthusiasm outruns good judgment, is the opposite of what was intended.

There is much tedious repetition which is hardly accounted for by the explanation that the papers are arranged with little attempt at order and none at literary style. That this is so is painfully obvious, but it still does not explain why the book should contain several accounts of Khrushchev's intended strategy for the Berlin confrontation, all more or less the same, and two of them separated by only one page—a curious waste of time and space by one so short of both.

Nor can these be the written reports sent out by Penkovsky at the time, re-edited, and put together in a book. He was clearly much too intelligent and efficient a spy to waste his efforts on writing down laboriously, in minute detail, and repetitively, the views, impressions and facts which would have sufficed in much shorter outline.

Yet sometimes the book arouses the reader's curiosity, only to frustrate it with lack of detail. The introduction makes for Penkovsky the claim that among the "thousands of pieces of information" swept up by him was "the exact planned dimensions of the Berlin wall."

RESPONSE TO WALL

If true this is very important, for it may cause trouble between Washington and London on the one hand, and Berlin on the other—something that the compilers of the book can hardly have intended.

It has always been assumed that the slow and fumbling nature of the Western response to the wall was due in large measure to the lack of any warning. Even so, the West German Government has not wholly forgiven its allies for the indecision they displayed at that time.

But had Penkovsky told them? In the text, he is made to say that "I learned about the Berlin wall 4 days before the Soviet Government actually closed it off." Yet the account of his travels given in the book, and the record of his trial, makes it clear that "4 days before" that date Penkovsky was still in London, on one of those extended duty trips on which he took time off from shepherding Soviet delegations—the official reasons for his visits to the West—to spend long hours with the special Anglo-American team of four intelligence officers who used every available minute to milk him of any information he might have.

UNLIKELY ANSWERS

In the extremely unlikely event that he had learned about the Berlin wall while still in London, would he have gone back to Moscow and reported later to his masters that he had known about the wall 4 days in advance? Why would he do that—to show them after the event how well-informed he was?

Or, it the book is a genuine collection of notes he kept in Moscow, would he simply have made a bald statement of fact like that, almost conversationally, and then gone on with his discussion of Khrushchev's tactics on Berlin? Neither explanation seems credible, and no other offers itself. The only logical answer is that the words attributed to Penkovsky were written by someone else—unless this was a remark he made in one of his subsequent conversations with a member of the Anglo-American team, who took it down, filed it, and it was then seen and used by the compiler of the papers.

Indeed, the style of the memoirs is often discursive, verbose, almost conversational—the very opposite of what one would expect from a man writing in Penkovsky's difficult circumstances. At one point, when discussing Soviet military maneuvers, he is made to ask, "What is the point of these exercises"—and then proceeds to give a detailed reply.

Would he really write like that, whether in an intelligence report or in his memoirs? Or was it perhaps, a question put to Penkovsky by one of his interrogators, and then, inadvertently, allowed to remain in the edited

transcript of the conversation that might have formed the basis of this passage in the book?

The conversational origin of a number of passages is betrayed in similar ways, thus giving the lie to the claim that the book is made up of Penkovsky's written notes. This, however, does not mean that the book as a whole may be regarded as a genuine edited transcript of Penkovsky's conversations with Western intelligence officers. There are many other passages, and sometimes whole sections, which betray the alien hand—or tongue.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 16, 1965]

SOVIET EXPERT DOUBTS VALIDITY OF CONTROVERSIAL PAPERS—USAGE IN PENKOVSKY SAID TO PROVE FORGERY

(By Victor Zorza)

LONDON.—So far as can be established, the Russian manuscript of Penkovsky's memoirs just does not exist.

When news of the imminent publication of the Penkovsky Papers was reported in the world press, the American publishers of the book were inundated with requests for permission to serialize the story in newspapers and to publish it in foreign languages.

Among these requests was one from a small Russian emigre publishing house in West Germany. All it could offer was $250. This was accepted without any haggling, since all the proceeds from the book are to go to the Penkovsky Foundation, formed in the United States for this purpose.

That the American publishers had accepted the book for publication in good faith is shown by their willingness to procure the Russian text for the emigre publishing house. But after several weeks and repeated requests to the Penkovsky Foundation, the Russian text has not been made available, and it looks as if it never will be.

On Monday, the Russian emigre publisher made a telephone call from Frankfurt to Doubleday, the New York publishers, to get the final answer which had been promised for the beginning of this week. He was told by R. E. Banker, for Doubleday, that they were still unable to provide a Russian text. However, they were prepared to let the Russian publisher go ahead—if he was prepared to retranslate the Penkovsky text from English back into Russian. As for the Russian "original," Banker said, they had twice asked the State Department about it, but were still not able to provide it.

STRANGE PHRASES

The English text is peppered with words and phrases that no man with Penkovsky's Soviet background would use. He is made to refer repeatedly to Soviet Russians or to Soviets in describing his countrymen. These terms would sound as strange in Russian as United States Americans or British Englishman would sound in ordinary English usage.

These are not mistakes in translation, but they arise from ignorance of Soviet terminology. The stock Soviet phrase for the kind of political deviation for which Marshal Zhukov, the Defense Minister, was purged in 1957, is "Bonapartist tendencies." Yet Penkovsky is made to report Khrushchev as saying that Marshal Zhukov was displaying Napoleonic characteristics. No translator would depart so far from the original. But if the remark was inserted in English by someone writing sometime after he had read an account of the Zhukov affair, a faulty memory for phrases might have easily led him to use the associated but, incorrect, term.

Penkovsky is made to illustrate the change in Sino-Soviet relations by remarking that the phrase "great China" has now been replaced in official terminology by unadorned "China." However, the official usage was never "great China"—it was "the great Chinese people."

Penkovsky is made to refer to a high party official as an "R.S.F.S.R. Communist Party leader"—a phrase that would never be used by a Soviet official, who would know that the R.S.F.S.R.—the initials of the Russian Republic—has no Communist Party distinct from the Soviet Party. One of the chapters begins with a reference by Penkovsky to his recent trip to "Europe"—although a Russian returning to Moscow would speak of a visit to the "West." But the reference to a trip to "Europe" would have come naturally to an American compiler of the papers.

Among Penkovsky's many unlikely digressions, his excursion into the history of the party appears particularly improbable—and factually wrong. He provides a long list of party leaders over the years who, as successive editions of the party history went to press, were purged and described variously as enemies of the people, traitors, and imperialist hirelings. This is an exercise beloved by anti-Communist propagandists, and figures in many of their tracts. But a true professional would never make the mistake of listing Marshal Zhukov as "Khrushchev's enemy"—a phrase that would never be used in an official Soviet textbook. Penkovsky would certainly have known it to be wrong.

MEANINGLESS TITLES

In listing the official functions of high Soviet officers, he often describes them as "deputies of the Supreme Soviet"—a meaningless dignity on which the good spy that he was would not waste his breath. However, a Western compiler might well have taken these and other details from any good reference book, just to fill out the picture for the inexpert reader.

Penkovsky is made to show his indignation at Khrushchev's recklessness in 1961 in testing a 50-megaton bomb which he describes as having a yield of 80 and, elsewhere, of 100 megatons—although the accurate measurements taken by Western experts have put it at under 60 megatons. Similarly, he reports that several Soviet launches of manned sputniks took the lives of their crews. In fact, all Russian launchings have been monitored by Western radio and radar tracking devices which would have revealed beyond any doubt, through the nature of the communications passing between the satellite and the base, the presence of a human being aboard. Western experts have repeatedly dismissed this particular rumor.

CONFUSION OVER EVENTS

The report attributed to Penkovsky that Marshal Chuikov, the commander in chief of the ground forces, was dismissed from this post in 1961 and appointed chief of civil defense is wrong. It is true that he got the civil defense job at that time, but he continued as the commander of the ground forces—and the Soviet military press referred to him repeatedly as such.

It was only in 1964 that he lost this post, nearly 2 years after Penkovsky's arrest. It would appear that someone compiling the "papers" more recently has confused the two events and dates, making Penkovsky report something that occurred after he was executed in 1963. Similar confusion is evident in Penkovsky's references to the removal by Khrushchev in 1957 of the antiparty group of Molotov, Malenkov, and Bulganin—although Bulganin remained Prime Minister until 1958, without at first being charged with membership in the group.

Virtually the whole section on the Soviet military doctrine appears to have been written by a Western pen. It is here that the references to "Soviets" and "Soviet Russians" are most obtrusive. Penkovsky is made to explain that he had sent out the full text of the "special collection" on military doctrine to the West—and at the same time to go on for pages on end, giving long quotations from it.

Would Penkovsky really have bothered to write out long passages from a publication which he had photographed and dispatched to his Western masters? This whole section, and a number of others in the book, is accompanied by repeated warnings from Penkovsky about the Soviet determination to acquire a first-strike posture, and to launch a surprise nuclear attack on the West.

The chapter on strategy is made the main vehicle for the message, and the long quotations from the "Special Collection" are designed to give it an air of authority. But the impression is false, for General Gastilovich, on whose contribution the compiler relies to drive the first strike lesson home, was strongly contradicted by equally authoritative contributors to the "Special Collection." But the Penkovsky Papers give no hint of this.

UNDOUBTED FORGERY

General Kurochkin, a respected Soviet strategist, went so far as to describe some of the more extreme views as anti-Marxist. This is the chapter that can be described without any hesitation as forged. The compiler of the book adds insult to injury by making Penkovsky say that "I am sorry that I cannot copy here the entire 'Special Collection' "—or is it, perhaps, a private joke inserted for the entertainment of the compiler's colleagues? The use—or misuse—of the "Special Collection" in this way is a great pity. Its publication in full would have added greatly to the understanding of Soviet strategy among students in the West. But there is now reason to fear that the account given in the papers will prevent the full publication which would inevitably show up the imbalance of the Penkovsky book.

It may be that some of the errors pinpointed in this article are not necessarily evidence of forgery, but the cumulative weight of the evidence is too great to support any other interpretation.

WORK OF CIA

The book could have been compiled only by the Central Intelligence Agency. No other organization in the West, apart from British Intelligence, and certainly no individual, could have had access to the information of which the book is made up. British Intelligence officers did at one time entertain the idea of building Penkovsky up posthumously as something of a hero, but permission to proceed was withheld.

The CIA has been repeatedly stung and provoked by the attempts of the Disinformation Department of the Soviet intelligence organization to discredit its activities throughout the world. The "Penkovsky Papers" are the CIA's answer. But in psychological warfare of this kind the intelligence agencies of the democratic countries suffer from the grave disadvantage that in attempting to damage the adversary they must also deceive their own public. It is the function of a free press to uncover such deception. Some of my best friends are in the CIA, but if they want their psychological warfare efforts to remain undiscovered, they must do better than this.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 17, 1965]

GIBNEY DEFENDS PENKOVSKY PAPERS

On two separate occasions the Soviet Government has attacked the authorship and the authenticity of "The Penkovsky Papers." Both the Soviet Foreign Ministry and the press department of the Soviet Embassy in Washington have commented predictably.

Such terms as "anti-Soviet invention and slander," "provocative character," and "crude forgery" are commonplace in most efforts of the Soviet regime to discredit anyone who disagrees with it. It is typical of this approach that the Washington Post and other newspapers running the papers were

threatened by unspecified forms of Soviet retaliation, if publication continued.

Actually, there is no better evidence of the papers' honesty, accuracy and authenticity than this loud, almost unprecedented protest from Moscow. As I said in the introduction to the papers, the continuing power of state security apparatus over Soviet citizens is the greatest problem in the way of any real rapprochement between the West and the Russians.

Penkovsky felt this strongly himself, as the papers reveal. The sharp protest of the Moscow leadership suggests that his arrow struck home.

A further charge of "forgery"—or partial forgery, if I interpret his article correctly—was made by Victor Zorza, of the Manchester Guardian. His comment relies on conjectures about what Penkovsky would or should have done. It abounds in phrases like "would hardly write," "it is curious that," "it is conceivable that," or "he is hardly likely to have produced."

This is understandable. I am sure that if Mr. Zorza had been in Colonel Penkovsky's shoes, he would have behaved differently; and if a panel of Western Soviet experts had written the papers for Penkovsky, they would have undoubtedly written them differently. The fact is that Colonel Penkovsky was very much his own man. He was a zealot and an individualist who lived with risk and whose desire to have his views known drove him to take even more risks.

Mr. Zorza does have one point of factual criticism, which he interpreted incorrectly, however. He asserts that the acocunt of Colonel Penkovsky's movements which I gave in my introduction to the papers and "the record of his trial" show that he was in London on August 9, 1961, the day he found out about the proposed erection of the Berlin wall. Mr. Zorza understandably questions why Penkovsky did not warn his Western contacts then about the building of the wall, since he had free access to them in London. From this he somehow concludes that "The Penkovsky Papers" are not genuine.

I owe him and other readers an apology for this confusion. In the process of editing, I incorrectly gave the date for Penkovsky's arrival in Moscow at that time as August 10, 1961. Actually, it was August 8—and I have since asked the publisher to correct this error in subsequent editions.

If Mr. Zorza rereads the October 1963 transcript of Penkovsky's Soviet trial—one of the principal sources of this book—he will discover that the correct date was August 8. Hence, Penkovsky was in Moscow at the time he found out about the Berlin wall—and unable to communicate immediately with the West.

Mr. Zorza points out that Penkovsky's writings were often discursive, verbose, almost conversational. I am sure any expert on Russian-English translation would have his own pet way of rendering them into English—just as Mr. Deriabin, the translator, and I have ours. But this discursiveness hardly detracts from their authenticity.

On the contrary, I deliberately held all editing down to an absolute minimum. Neither Mr. Deriabin nor I felt we had the right to add any literary or factual embellishments to the words of a brave man, who wanted to get his own language out to the world.

FRANK GIBNEY.

NEW YORK CITY.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Nov. 18, 1965]

HIS GREATEST SERVICE—PENKOVSKY UNMASKED THREE SOVIET SPIES IN WEST

(By Don Cook)

PARIS, November 17.—Whatever the value of the spy papers of Col. Oleg Penkovsky, or even their validity, which is being questioned by some experts on Soviet affairs, his greatest service to the West was the unmasking of key Russian agents in Paris, London, and Stockholm.

The three most important espionage cases in the West in the last 5 years were all broken by counterintelligence services on the basis of information passed to Britain and the United States by Penkovsky. The cases involved:

Georges Paques, a senior French civil servant who spied for the Russians in the Ministry of National Defense and later in NATO headquarters in Paris. He was caught and sentenced to life imprisonment in July of 1964.

Col. Stig Wennerstrom of the Swedish Army, who spied for the Russians in the Swedish Defense Ministry and also while serving as Swedish military attaché in Washington. He was caught and sentenced to life imprisonment in July 1963, at about the same time that Penkovsky went on trial in Moscow with his British contact, Greville Wynne.

William J. C. Vassall, a senior clerk in the British Admiralty, who had been recruited by the Russians through homosexual blackmail during a tour of duty in Moscow. He was apprehended and sentenced to 18 years in prison in September 1962.

Penkovsky did not finger these Russian agents directly. But he did pass to the British and American intelligence services information that enabled them to trap the three spies.

A Penkovsky speciality was sending the identity numbers on Western documents that were reaching the Russians. The identity numbers were sufficient to start the counterintelligence search for the spies in the West who were passing the documents to Soviet intelligence.

In the case of the British Admiralty documents and the Swedish Defense Ministry documents, the work of isolating Vassall and Wennerstrom went fairly rapidly. But the apprehension of Georges Paques was more complicated and took more time.

Partly this was because many hundreds of documents had to be sifted and checked. Partly it was because the French counterintelligence services, which are highly effective, do not as a rule respond very swiftly to information provided from American or British sources.

In the end, the break in the Paques case came as a result of the assiduous espionage the Frenchman had done. Paques served from 1958 to 1962 in the private office of French Defense Minister Pierre Messmer. He later became chief press officer at NATO with a "cosmic top secret" clearance, NATO's highest security classification.

Among the document identity numbers Penkovsky sent to the West was one with a very unusual and limited classification. It was a French NATO standing group document—in other words, a French position paper prepared for the NATO military standing group in Washington. When the French checked on the document, they discovered that it was the draft of a French position that eventually was altered and renumbered before it was actually submitted to the standing group.

The document, therefore, had received very limited circulation. It had been prepared in Washington by the French element on the standing group and sent to Paris for clearance at the Ministry of Defense. Only six persons signed for it at the Ministry when it was discussed, altered and sent back to Washington. One of these was Georges Paques.

Had Paques limited his activities to general Ministry of Defense documents or NATO documents, with much wider circulation, it might have taken months to narrow the search. But in the brief period of approximately 36 hours in which that particular French standing group document was in Paris for clearance, he took it home, photographed it and returned it to its proper place next day.

When the French identified the document on the basis of the number transmitted from Moscow to the British and Americans by Penkovsky, they immediately put a 24-hour tail on each of the six who had signed for it—including the Minister of Defense. In about 10 days, Paques was seen in contact with a member of the Soviet Embassy staff in Paris whom the French knew to be a KGB agent.

His arrest followed swiftly, and he confessed promptly. At his trial, he testified in words reminiscent of some of the Penkovsky papers that he spied for Russia because he felt that it would help preserve peace if the Russians were fully informed of NATO plans.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 19, 1965]

PENKOVSKY PAPERS DEFENDED

As the translator of "The Penkovsky Papers," I would like to make some comments on Victor Zorza's review. I do not want to get involved in polemics with Mr. Zorza, whose previous work I have admired. I know, better than anyone, that the papers are genuine, but I also know that there is no way to prove this to the satisfaction of those determined to degrade Penkovsky's legacy as the Soviets sought to degrade Penkovsky.

I find it surprising that Mr. Zorza has made up his mind that "the Russian manuscript of the Penkovsky memoirs just does not exist" simply because I do not wish to release it in its original form. The published format is as true to Penkovsky's notes as it could be, even though Mr. Gibney and I inevitably had to translate, select, and edit them for publication. I will not, however, reveal how the papers came to me.

Let me cite details from Mr. Zorza's critique. He says that "the English text is prepared with words and phrases no man with Penkovsky's Soviet background would use," i.e. he cites the terms "Soviet Russians" or "Soviets" in describing his countrymen. Mr. Zorza's quotes are in English, thus they are my translations. But Penkovsky clearly distinguished between the Russian people and the Soviet regime. In the papers, Penkovsky used a variety of terms: "Soviet citizens," "the Soviet people," "Russians," etc. In translating I used the term "Soviet Russian" or "Soviet" for purposes of simplicity and consistency.

Penkovsky referred to Marshal Zhukov's removal because of his "Napoleonic characteristics." Mr. Zorza thinks that this should read "Bonapartist tendencies" and concludes that "no translator would depart so far from the original." The exact Russian term used by Penkovsky was "Khrushchev ego ubral za napoleonovskiye zamashki." Colonel Penkovsky evidently knew Bonaparte's first name and preferred to use the term "napoleonovskiye zamashki."

Mr. Zorza also finds fault with the expression "Great China." Obviously, Penkovsky was not writing an editorial for Pravda. "Velikiy Kitay" was what he wrote and that's how I translated it.

In Mr. Zorza's opinion no Soviet official would refer to a high party official as an RSFSR Communist Party leader. Colonel Penkovsky was well aware that there is no separate Communist Party of the RSFSR. The Russian original of the line on page 207 is, however, "tak nazyvayemyy partiynyy vozhd RSFSR."

With regard to Penkovsky's statement that several Soviet cosmonauts had lost their lives, I can only repeat that I merely translated what Penkovsky wrote—that some of them lost their lives.

About Marshal Chuykov: Mr. Zorza is correct in saying that Penkovsky was in error when he wrote that Chuykov was relieved

of his duties when he took over the civilian defense command. However, I have simply translated what he wrote.

With regard to the antiparty group: again I simply translated what Penkovsky wrote. It is the Kremlinologist who is concerned with precision in the matter of dates of ousters; for Penkovsky, as for most Soviet citizens, it was apparently of little importance that Bulganin managed to hang on until 1958.

Mr. Zorza shows a lack of knowledge of the everyday Soviet language when he claims that a "Russian returning to Moscow would speak of a visit to the West, not to Europe." Penkovsky wrote "Yevropa" which means "Europe." Soviet intelligence officers do not normally talk of their travels to European countries as to "the West"; they refer to "Yevropa" or the country which they visited.

As far as the 50–80–100 megaton bomb is concerned, Penkovsky was apparently not in a position to measure the bomb's yield as accurately as Western experts or Mr. Zorza. If Western experts wrote "The Penkovsky Papers," as Mr. Zorza seems to believe, why did they not use the correct figures?

PETER DERIABIN.

New York City.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 21, 1965]

PENKOVSKY'S SPY-CATCHING ROLE DENIED

Reports that Col. Oleg Penkovsky supplied materials that led to the detection and arrest of the Swedish master spy, Col. Stig Wennerstrom, are flatly denied by sources close to the case.

Wennerstrom reportedly first came under suspicion in 1959—2 years before Penkovsky started assisting the West.

The Swedish officer had served as air attaché in Moscow and Washington before returning to the Defense Ministry and Foreign Ministry in Stockholm.

Arrested in June 1963, he was sentenced last year to life imprisonment. He could be released after 10 years and it is understood that he, too, is writing his memoirs.

PENKOVSKY PROTEST

In another development, the State Department disclosed yesterday that it has received a protest from the Soviet Union about publication of papers attributed to Penkovsky. He became a spy for the West in 1961 and was later caught and executed.

The Penkovsky papers were serialized in newspapers, including the Washington Post and are now out in book form.

A State Department spokesman said that Soviet Ambassador Anatoly F. Dobrynin expressed concern last Monday in a talk with Russian affairs expert Llewellyn E. Thompson.

Later, the spokesman said, Thompson replied that the Government "had no responsibility in the matter."

CIA CONCOCTION

In the first report on the Penkovsky papers in the Russian press, the Communist Party newspaper Pravda referred to them yesterday as "another anti-Soviet concoction of the American Central Intelligence Agency and apparently of its British associates."

While not further explaining what was in the papers, Pravda said that "this fabrication does not deserve analysis."

A Moscow dispatch from the Washington Post's Stephen Rosenfeld said the bulk of the article was devoted to unflattering reflections on the character of Greville Wynne, the British businessman convicted with Penkovsky and later exchanged for Gordon Lonsdale, a Soviet spy caught in England.

Last week, a news story from Paris linked the work of Penkovsky with the uncovering of three Westerners spying for the Soviet Union. These were listed as:

Wennerstrom; George Paques, a senior French civil servant who worked in NATO, and William J. C. Vassall, a British Admiralty clerk. Other sources have denied that information furnished by Penkovsky led to the apprehension of any of the three.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 20, 1965]

PENKOVSKY BOOK SCORED BY SOVIET—ANTI-RUSSIAN PAPERS CALLED CONCOCTION OF CIA

Moscow, November 20.—Soviet authorities, apparently embarrassed by the publication in the West of "The Penkovsky Papers," are strongly denouncing the controversial book as a forgery of the Central Intelligence Agency of the United States.

The papers, published this month in London and New York, are a compilation of anti-Soviet information, speculation, and gossip purported to have been supplied to Western intelligence agencies by Oleg V. Penkovsky, who was executed by the Russians in 1963 as a spy for the West.

Pravda, the Communist Party newspaper, described the volume today as the "latest anti-Soviet concoction of the CIA and evidently its British associates."

In an article by V. Golubov, the newspaper said the book "does not deserve analysis," and added: "It has been compiled so crudely that self-respecting British newspapers at very first glance could not but expose its authors."

Pravda went on to quote from British press comment that cast doubt on the authenticity of the alleged memoir.

DERIABIN CITED

Soviet sources have suggested privately that the book, even if based in part on intelligence supplied by Penkovsky to the West, was embroidered with information already in the hands of Western agencies.

It was noted that a Soviet defector, Peter S. Deriabin, was identified as the translator of material from the Russian-language original that allegedly was used in the volume.

Mr. Deriabin, a former official in the Okhrana, the secret service responsible for guarding Soviet leaders, has refused to make the Russian manuscript public and has declined to say how it came into his possession.

In testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, made public in March 1959, Mr. Deriabin gave a detailed view of what he described as the high living of Soviet leaders. A large amount of material on the private lives of the Kremlin leaders is also contained in "The Penkovsky Papers."

According to reports from Washington, the CIA said its representatives had read the book to guard against "security violations," but the Agency disclaimed responsibility for publication and refused to vouch for the papers' accuracy.

WYNNE IS DENOUNCED

The Soviet denunciations of "The Penkovsky Papers" have also been directed against Greville M. Wynne, a British businessman who was Penkovsky's codefendant at a partly public trial in Moscow 2 years ago. Wynne allegedly was Penkovsky's principal Western contact.

Wynne was sentenced to 8 years in jail but was released in April 1964 in exchange for Gordon A. Lonsdale, who had been convicted as a Soviet spy in Britain. Pravda alluded to the exchange today by saying Wynne had been freed under certain circumstances.

Lonsdale's purported memoirs, titled "Spy," were published last month in London.

Pravda assailed Wynne for promoting "The Penkovsky Papers" by holding widely publicized news conferences in London and New York.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 21, 1965]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS: HOW JAMES BOND GOT STARTED

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

PARIS.—"Any fiction spy story you have ever read pales in comparison with Oleg Penkovsky's dramatic account of his extraordinary personal adventure," says the advertisement of an American best seller. Simultaneously, English readers are offered memoirs called "Spy" by a Soviet agent known in London as Gordon Lonsdale until his arrest for espionage and really named Konon Trofimovitch Molody. Molody-Lonsdale was subsequently exchanged for Greville Wynne, a British associate of Penkovsky imprisoned in the U.S.S.R. Wynne has not yet published a book.

A CIA PRODUCT?

Victor Zorza, the (Manchester) Guardian's Kremlinologist, believes "The Penkovsky Papers" are not wholly genuine. He contends no Russian text has been produced and the English version is peppered with words and phrases no man with Penkovsky's Soviet background would use. Zorza adduces errors in dates and facts, asserting much of Penkovsky's memoir must have been written "by a Western pen." He concludes: "The book could have been compiled only by the Central Intelligence Agency."

The genesis of Penkovsky's papers seems valid but whether part of the work is fake cannot be judged. Whatever its origin, the work provides juicy reading and embarrasses Moscow just as Lonsdale's possibly spurious work embarrasses Washington. Penkovsky was undoubtedly an efficient Western agent in the Soviet hierarchy where his boss was Kosygin's son-in-law. After Penkovsky's arrest in 1962, almost 300 Soviet intelligence officers were recalled as intelligence networks were overhauled.

SPIES, FORGERIES, AND FAKES

The period since World War II has been gaudy with spies, forgeries, and fakes. Indeed some spies have been widely publicized—like Col. Rudolf Abel, traded for U–2 Pilot Gary Powers; Lonsdale; Ivan Egorov, a Soviet official in the U.N.; Giuseppe Martelli, an Italian who spied for Moscow in hollow-heeled shoes; Burgess, Maclean, and Philby, who skipped to Russia when their cover wore thin.

Yet intelligence services don't limit themselves to ferreting out secrets; they calumniate each other whenever possible. Moscow's KGB has its disinformation section with a subsidiary branch in East Germany that disseminates false papers. Some of these have included crude documents bearing U.S. Cabinet or CIA signatures.

Four years ago the CIA claimed it had uncovered 32 such forgeries in 4 years. British counterintelligence is equally alert. Some documents are sold and others merely given to naive newspapers.

The befuddled public derives particular entertainment from the cold war's fake literary productions. Among these Prof. Paul W. Blackstock of the University of South Carolina lists: the purported diary of Maxim Litvinov, late Soviet Foreign Minister; the strategic thesis of Marshal Bulganin; memoirs of General Vlassov, who organized an army of Russian prisoners for Hitler and was later hanged; and two volumes of fascinating recollections by a nonexistent nephew of Stalin, Budu Svanidze.

Excellent works in this category—including those of Litvinov and "Svanidze"—were apparently manufactured in Paris by the literary artel of a refugee Soviet diplomat named Grigori Bessedovsky. In 1929 Bessedovsky, then counselor at the Russian Embassy in Paris, sought political asylum.

WRITTEN FOR IDIOTS

According to Blackstock, Bessedovsky, a gentleman of talent and imagination, once wrote a fellow emigré from Poland: "Sir, I write books for idiots. Do you imagine that anyone in the West would read what you call my apocryphal works if, in quoting Kaganovich, Zhukov, Mikoyan or Bulganin, I

tried to be faithful to the manner, sense and form of their speeches?

"But when I portray Stalin or Molotov in pajamas, when I tell the dirtiest possible stories about them—never mind whether they are true or invented—rest assured that not only all intellectuals will read me, but also the most important capitalist statesman, on his way to a peace conference, will pick up my book before going to sleep in his pullman. Allah has given money to the stupid in order that the intelligent can live easily."

Facts, fiction, half-truths and distortions are mixed together in the strange game played by competing intelligence services and ambitious entrepreneurs. When an American military attaché in Moscow lost his diary, Russian security officials published it with falsified inserts such as: "War. As soon as possible. Now.

SOME EXPERTS FOOLED

Among amateur factories, Bessedovsky's ranks high. He fooled some of the most pretentious Kremlinologists. Even General Bedell Smith, former U.S. Ambassador to Moscow and CIA boss, was persuaded to write an "introductory note" for the highly suspect Litvinov "memoirs."

Penkovsky and Molody may be genuine authors but, at any rate, the late Ian Fleming had many unannounced anonymous cold war competitors. Like Fleming's works, they are pleasant bedside reading.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 23, 1965]

AROUND THE WORLD: WIFE OF PENKOVSKY IS REPORTED TO DOUBT HE AUTHORED PAPERS

Moscow.—The wife of Col. Oleg Penkovsky was reported yesterday as saying she did not believe her husband, executed in 1963 for spying for the West, could have authored "The Penkovsky Papers." The papers, serialized by the Washington Post, have been denounced by Soviet news media as CIA forgeries.

Mrs. Vera Penkovsky told Viktor Louis, a Soviet citizen who works for a London daily newspaper, that her husband was lazy about writing, never kept a diary, and typed laboriously with one finger. Mrs. Penkovsky still lives in the apartment she shared with her husband and works as a French-language translator. Her 65-year-old mother-in-law and her two daughters live with her.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 26, 1965]

ANTI-SOVIET CAMPAIGN CHARGED—RUSSIA EXPELS POST CORRESPONDENT OVER "PENKOVSKY PAPERS" SERIES

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

The Soviet Union yesterday ordered the closing of the Moscow bureau of the Washington Post and the expulsion of this newspaper's correspondent, Stephen S. Rosenfeld, because of the publication of "The Penkovsky Papers."

Rosenfeld, 33, was given 7 days to leave with his wife, Barbara, and their two children, David, 16 months old, and Rebecca, born in Moscow 3 months ago. He opened the Washington Post's bureau there on November 12, 1964.

Rosenfeld was called to the Foreign Ministry's press department at noon and was read a statement charging that the Washington Post had engaged in "an anti-Soviet campaign" around "The Penkovsky Papers" and that it had refused to halt their publication after a warning on November 13.

Oleg Penkovsky was a Soviet colonel executed by his government for serving as a spy for the West. The papers, serialized to newspapers from a just published book, purport to be his diary smuggled out of the Soviet Union. There has been considerable controversy as to the paper's authenticity but the value of Penkovsky's work for the West was acknowledged at his trial.

An editorial in the Washington Post today states that Rosenfeld's expulsion is a deplorable exercise of arbitrary power and an attempt by the Soviet Government "to impose on the press of other countries, by treating the correspondents from these countries as virtual hostages, a control and dictation to which no reputable newspaper can submit."

The editorial also terms "a remarkable hallucination" the charge that the newspaper had launched a "campaign" against the Soviet Union, adding that it "will not be plunged" into any "campaign of denigration" because of the expulsion.

Rosenfeld is the third American correspondent to be expelled from Russia this year. American officials view the action as part of the hardening Soviet attitude toward the United States over the war in Vietnam, an attitude not unrelated to the bitter Chinese Communist charges that Moscow has not acted firmly enough on the Communist side in that conflict.

It also was felt here that one chapter of "The Penkovsky Papers," commenting unfavorably on personal habits of high Soviet officials and officers, was particularly offensive to Moscow, which has always been highly sensitive about such criticism.

The most recent correspondent expelled this year was Sam Jaffe, of the American Broadcasting Co., who was ordered out in September because of a report by ABC's Washington diplomatic correspondent on possible changes in the Kremlin. Adam Clymer of the Baltimore Sun was expelled last February after being accused of striking a Soviet policeman during a demonstration by Asian students in Moscow outside the U.S. Embassy protesting American policy in Vietnam.

A Newsweek correspondent was expelled in 1962, a National Broadcasting Co. reporter was ordered out in 1963 and Time magazine's Moscow bureau was closed in 1964. Newsweek and NBC have since been allowed to reopen their bureaus.

Here is the chronology of the current case:

The Washington Post began publication of the Penkovsky Papers on October 31. The last of 14 installments ran on November 15. On November 2 it was reported to this newspaper that Soviet Embassy officials were saying the papers were a forgery. A Washington Post representative called on Embassy Counselor Alexander I. Zinchuk, by appointment, the following day to ask any proof of the accusation. Zinchuk was told that the Washington Post would publish any such proof. His reply was that he would look into it and he asked and was told how long the series would run.

On November 5, at the Embassy's national day party, a representative of the newspaper was told by another Soviet official that he expected "a strong reaction" to the publication very shortly. He was told that the Washington Post would publish the reaction.

The reaction did not come until November 13. On that day Rosenfeld was called to the Foreign Ministry's press department in Moscow. F. M. Simonov, a department deputy, read him a statement describing the "Penkovsky Papers" as a falsified story, a mixture of anti-Soviet inventions and slander and stating that their publication "cannot be considered otherwise than as an intentional act in the spirit of the worst traditions of the cold war."

Simonov said the press department was "authorized to invite the attention of the editorial board of the Washington Post to the provocative character of this publication," adding that "we expect that measures will be taken so that no articles and materials of such a kind will be published in the Washington Post in the future."

Simonov added to this threat by saying that "if publication continues we reserve the right for ourselves to take necessary measures." The text of the complaint was published in the Washington Post the next day.

The same day it commented editorially that it would complete publication of the papers, adding that "we refuse to accept the inadmissible suggestion that this newspaper must not print material which the Soviet Government may find unacceptable."

On November 15 the newspaper published a communication from the Embassy's press department condemning the papers as a forgery and a scar on the Soviet Union. It also published, as previously scheduled, the first of two articles by Victor Zorza, Soviet specialist of the Manchester Guardian, analyzing the papers. He questioned their authenticity and suggested they had been written in part by the Central Intelligence Agency.

On November 18, Rosenfeld was told by a Soviet friend in Moscow that a decision had been taken to expel him. He also was told that the Central Committee of the Communist Party had given the Foreign Ministry permission to threaten Rosenfeld with expulsion unless the Washington Post ceased publication of the papers.

UNDER PARTY PRESSURE

After the newspaper ran the two concluding articles, the Central Committee was reported to have asked the Foreign Ministry why it had not expelled Rosenfeld. The informant said that the Ministry would have liked to forget the affair but that it was under Communist Party pressure and so agreed to the expulsion.

It was reported here in Washington to the Post that the Embassy had recommended expulsion. Soviet Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin formally protested publication of the papers to the State Department, and in London the Soviet Ambassador called at the Foreign Office to complain about publication of the Penkovsky Papers in Britain. The London Observer serialized the papers as did more than 30 papers in the United States and elsewhere.

Then yesterday Rosenfeld was again called to the Soviet Foreign Ministry's press department to be read the following statement by deputy chief Pyatisnev:

"On November 13 you were asked to the press department and the attention of the editorial board of the Washington Post was invited to the provocative character of the publication of the anti-Soviet entitled the so-called Penkovsky Papers.

"In our statement we pointed out that these so-called papers were a coarse fraud, a mixture of provocative invention and anti-Soviet slander. Publication of these notes in the Washington Post cannot be considered other than as premeditated action in the worst traditions of the cold war, which cannot but harm Soviet-American relations.

DEMAND REJECTED

"In a statement the press department expressed the hope that measures would be taken so that no such articles and materials of this kind would appear in this newspaper in the future. Despite that * * * the Washington Post continued to publish the notes and other material which popularized this fraud.

"Considering such a position of the editorial board of your newspaper, which continued an anti-Soviet campaign around the so-called Penkovsky Papers, the press department is authorized to state that your future stay in the Soviet Union as correspondent of the Washington Post is undesirable and it is proposed that you leave the territory of the Soviet Union."

Pyatisnev, after reading the prepared statement, told Rosenfeld that "we would like to add that this measure is not directed against you personally but was made necessary by actions of the editorial board of your newspaper."

Rosenfeld asked how much time he had to leave. Pyatisnev inquired as to how much time he would need. When Rosenfeld suggested 2 or 3 weeks, Pyatisnev replied that he could have 5 to 7 days. They agreed on 7.

Tass, the Soviet news agency, then made public the action. It included the statement that the papers "are an obvious forgery, fabricated by the U.S. intelligence service which the exposed spy had served."

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 26, 1965]

PENKOVSKY REGRETS

The decision of the Government of the Soviet Union to close the Moscow Bureau of the Washington Post and to expel this newspaper's correspondent in reprisal for the publication of the Penkovsky Papers is a deplorable exercise of arbitrary power.

It is to be regretted on many counts. Chiefly it is to be regretted because it indicates that the short-lived relaxation following the death of Stalin has indeed proved to be a reversible process. Instead of loosening the rigorous and inhibiting control of its own writers, the Soviet Government now attempts to impose upon the press of other countries, by treating correspondents from these countries as virtual hostages, a control and dictation to which no reputable newspaper can submit.

This decision also is to be regretted because it will diminish the access of the readers of the Washington Post and of other newspapers in which Stephen Rosenfeld's objective accounts have appeared, of his lucid reporting. (It is to be noted that the Soviet Government has specifically declared Mr. Rosenfeld in no way to blame for this act of reprisal against the Washington Post.)

The Soviet action also is to be regretted because this drastic course seems to be premised upon the erroneous notion that the Washington Post has launched a campaign against the Soviet Union. That is a remarkable hallucination, but probably one that is inevitable in rulers who have grown so accustomed to utter immunity to internal criticism that any reproach appears to them to take on the aspects of deliberate persecution.

The Washington Post published excerpts from the Penkovsky Papers, which were distributed to it as a conventional syndicated newspaper feature, just as did more than 30 other newspapers. The publishing company (Doubleday) that produced the book is a responsible firm. The editor of the papers (Frank Gibney) is a man of sound reputation. We have no reason to believe, and no one has produced evidence to show, that the published matter did not represent the views and opinions of Penkovsky.

In conformity with the best prevailing American newspaper practice, the Washington Post also published attacks on the views of Penkovsky and on the authenticity of the papers, including the criticisms by the Soviet Embassy in Washington. It proposes to deal in the same way with interesting and significant material about the Soviet Union that may come to hand in the future, but it is not in the midst of any campaign of denigration aimed at the Soviet Union and will not be plunged into one by this misguided effort at press coercion by Soviet officials.

The Soviet Government's action, also, is to be regretted, because it is bound to result in future interruptions and obstructions to a flow of information between the two countries that already is frighteningly disproportionate to their need to know more of each other. American newspapers inclined to establish correspondents in the Soviet Union will be made hesitant by the knowledge that the Communist government there not only asserts the right to obstruct, censor, and punish the correspondent for acts of his own, but also reserves the right to take reprisal against him for publications in which he is not at all involved.

There also will be a strong impulse in many governmental quarters in the United States to imitate the reactionary notions of press freedom that possessed the Soviet Government. We hope that this impulse will be resisted, because not a single Soviet correspondent would remain in America if the United States embraced this theory of reprisal in order to punish Soviet publications for the ceaseless flow of libel and slander about this country that is daily fare in the Soviet press.

Many as are the regrets over this incident, the Washington Post, for all the inconveniences and unhappy consequences, cannot regret its refusal to bow to the demands of the Soviet Government that it suspend publication of the installments of the Penkovsky papers still unpublished when Soviet officials first threatened reprisal. No free and responsible newspaper in this country could submit to such imperious dictation by any government.

The repressive policies of the Soviet Union are not going to alter the principles of the free press in this country; but we hope that, in time, the survival of the Government of the United States, despite the continuous and unrelenting criticisms by the press, may persuade the Soviet Union to abandon its paranoiac and lunatic apprehension that every unfriendly printed word is an assault upon the foundation of the regime. Perhaps, on that happy day, the Washington Post will be able again to establish a bureau in Moscow. Until then it will cheerfully rely upon the excellent services that previously provided it with coverage of the Soviet Union.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 26, 1965]

MOSCOW EXPELS A U.S. REPORTER—RETALIATES FOR WASHINGTON POST'S PENKOVSKY SERIES

Moscow, November 25.—The Soviet Union today ordered the expulsion of the Washington Post's Moscow correspondent in retaliation for the newspaper's refusal to cease publication of the purported memoirs of Oleg V. Penkovsky, a convicted Soviet spy.

The Foreign Ministry accused the editorial board of the Post of conducting an anti-Soviet campaign in publishing the Penkovsky Papers, a "premeditated action in the worst traditions of the cold war which cannot but harm Soviet-American relations."

Stephen Rosenfeld, correspondent here since the Washington Post opened its bureau a year ago, was summoned to the Foreign Ministry to receive the expulsion order. He was given 7 days to leave the country.

The U.S. Embassy expressed regret at the Soviet move. A spokesman said no official protest was planned since such representations were not considered likely to reverse the decision.

THIRD EXPULSION THIS YEAR

Mr. Rosenfeld is the third American correspondent to be expelled this year. The representative of the Baltimore Sun, Adam Clymer, was ordered to leave in February. He was charged with having struck a policeman during an anti-American student demonstration.

In September, Sam Jaffe, the American Broadcasting Co.'s correspondent, was expelled because of a news report originating in the network's Washington bureau that a shakeup in the Kremlin leadership was imminent.

As in Mr. Jaffe's case, the Foreign Ministry made it clear that the action against Mr. Rosenfeld was not directed against the correspondent personally for anything he had reported under a Moscow dateline.

It was rather a punitive action—apparently the most direct one open to the Soviet Government—aimed at the newspaper.

"The Penkovsky Papers," published as a book in London and New York this month, are random notes critical of the leadership of former Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev. They allegedly disclose details of the operations of Soviet intelligence organizations.

The publishers described the material as the informal comments of Mr. Penkovsky, smuggled out of the Soviet Union shortly before he was convicted as a spy for the West and shot in 1963. The name is spelled in the book with a literal rendering of the Russian final vowel.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 3, 1965]

PENKOVSKY REACTION

I share your regrets over the obtuseness of the Soviet authorities in matters pertaining to freedom of the press. Obviously, you are under no obligation to show a correct point of view and are even perfectly at liberty to print anything that fills the empty spaces between chuck roast ads. However, it is regrettable that the expulsion of your able and amiable Moscow correspondent should have resulted from the publication of so unworthy material as "The Penkovsky Papers."

At best, the papers are worthless as a source of insight into Soviet intentions; at worst, they tend to arouse the suspicions of the Soviet authorities that the timing of the publication was "not accidental."

The issue is not really the authenticity of the papers (although I personally consider them, on the internal evidence of the text, a rather substandard forgery or a doctored version of oral remarks by Penkovsky recorded on tape by his London contacts).

The business of spies is to forward factual information and leave analysis to others. As Edward Crankshaw so ably pointed out in the remarks which you used as a scanty fig-leaf for the papers, Penkovsky confused capabilities with intentions, a cardinal sin in intelligence analysis. The papers also confuse contingency reasoning with evidence of planning. It is interesting and important to know that there exists somewhere in Moscow a staff paper arguing the merits of surprise attack or preventive war or bacteriological warfare. Such contingency papers are produced by the dozens in Washington and elsewhere and they are the legitimate province of strategic military thinking. But it is the business of political analysts to assign to them the exact weight they deserve.

The publication of the papers comes at a time when the Soviet Union is in an extremely delicate position with respect to the outside world, pressured by the Chinese as virtually a lackey of Wall Street and at the same time charged with responsibility for real or imaginary disturbances in places far removed from Moscow's influence. It takes little to generate in the minds of the Soviet leaders the notion that someone was trying deliberately to complicate still further the otherwise delicate relations between the U.S.S.R. and the United States.

It would, of course, be of help if the Soviet leaders or their advisers knew more about the free-wheeling habits of the American publishing industry. At the very least, the customary delay between the acceptance of a manuscript and its actual appearance in print should seriously impair the "curious timing" theory. On the other hand, once the editors of the Washington Post have digested their indignation, they might take some time to ponder this friendly suggestion: The publication of drivel, while admittedly a matter of right—is not the best way of discharging the precious responsibilities of a free press.

SAMUEL L. SHARP,
Professor of International Relations, American University.

WASHINGTON.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 4, 1965]

EXPELLED NEWSMAN BACK IN THE UNITED STATES

NEW YORK, December 3.—Stephen S. Rosenfeld, expelled Moscow correspondent of the Washington Post, said on his arrival today at Kennedy Airport that the Russians apparently regard foreign correspondents as "hostages" for the performances of the organization they represent.

If a newspaper or a network does something the Russians don't like "the correspondent is the hostage and out he goes," Rosenfeld said, adding:

"It's a silly idea and they (the Russians) don't seem to learn. They don't have a free press themselves and by using foreign correspondents as hostages they attempt to control the foreign press, but of course they can't."

Rosenfeld was given 7 days to leave Russia after he was asked to have his newspaper halt the publication of the last 2 installments of a series of 14 from "The Penkovsky Papers," reputedly the notes of Col. Oleg Penkovsky, a Soviet intelligence officer executed for spying for the West.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 26, 1965]

PENKOVSKY'S ROLE: A BRITISH REVIEW

(The Times literary supplement)

Not so long ago "banned in Boston" used to be one of the most valuable puffs a book could earn. "Protested against in Downing Street" is less promising in one respect, but Messrs. Collins (British publishers of the Penkovsky papers) must be profoundly grateful for the publicity which the Soviet Government has given to a book which, by reason of a rather scrappy composition and alien subject, might otherwise not have received the attention it richly deserves.

But for the opportune diplomatic intervention many people might have remained under the impression, which was pretty general at the time of the trial in May 1963, that Penkovsky was a mere accessory to the case against the British businessman, Greville Wynne, framed to justify the latter's kidnaping in Hungary. This book reveals the real seriousness of the affair. The trial and conviction of Penkovsky was to the Soviet Establishment as damaging a blow as was the Hiss case to America. The repercussions were of seismic intensity.

It is precisely because Penkovsky was so highly placed that these papers are of such interest * * *. From a material point of view Penkovsky was thoroughly well off and to all appearances an efficient and convinced member of the ruling class when he voluntarily got in touch with British Intelligence and during a short run of 16 months handed over to them more than 5,000 items of information of political, military and economic matters (the figures come from the indictment at this trial) * * *. What were his motives?

At the trial he was made out to be a dissolute playboy. The usual antisemitic overtones were also brought in. The importance of his position was minimized, though scarcely consistently with the details of the indictment, and this is still the official line. From the Communist point of view it is difficult to see why this should be found necessary: after all, nothing in the history of treachery can equal the record of the Russian ruling class since the revolution, if the official version is to be believed.

Why should it be surprising that a colonel should be in touch for 16 months with British Intelligence when the faithful are still required to believe that Beria, a marshal of the Soviet Union, was a paid employee of the same service for 36 years, from 1917 to 1953? Perhaps it is the difference between truth and official truth that calls for concealment on the Government's part; and his realization of the same difference clearly inspired Penkovsky to make sure the reason for his action were recorded.

His first motive was revulsion against the organization of Soviet society. The disillusioned aristocrat is a well-known phenomenon in all regimes based on privilege. Penkovsky thought it shocking that while he was being entertained by his friend Marshal Varentsov at a table collapsing with food, "salmon, fish in aspic, sprats, cheese, 10 different kinds of sausage, over 50 bottles of vodka and cognac, champagne, cakes, pastry, ice cream and so on," people in Voronezh were queueing for horsemeat. He was scandalized by the behavior of some of his fellow aristocrats, their dissolute private lives, their immunity from the law.

His second motive was fear of nuclear war. He evidently hated and distrusted Khrushchev—there may have been something personal in this—and seriously believed that he was an adventurer. After the removal of Zhukov, for whom many Russian officers had a high respect, it appeared to Penkovsky that Khrushchev was surrounded only by military yes-men. He reproduces extracts from theoretical military studies which show a dangerous indifference to the possibility of world destruction.

It may well be, as Mr. Edward Crankshaw says in a sympathetic and entertaining foreword, that Penkovsky confused contingency planning with purposeful strategy, but he was close to the source of danger, and he believed it real.

The book is made up partly of documents attributed to Penkovsky himself and partly of a connecting narrative. American editing and adaptation have been responsible for attracting some attacks on the authenticity of the former, unjustified except possibly in matters of detail; certain verbal infelicities may be attributable to the same cause. Some have also found it inconceivable that Penkovsky could have committed so much to paper; but it is clear from the evidence of the book and of the trial that he was madly reckless, and his record of success shows him skilled at directing material in bulk to the correct address. As a whole, what is presented here has the stamp of genuineness.

[From Parade Magazine section, the Washington Post, Jan. 9, 1966]

Question. In "The Penkovsky Papers," allegedly the diary of a Russian agent who defected, there is a statement to the effect that Yekaterina Furtseva, the Soviet Minister of Culture, was Khrushchev's mistress. Is there any truth to that statement? Is there any truth to the book? Penkovsky must have been a stupid secret agent to keep a diary.—Allen James, New York, N.Y.

Answer. Penkovsky probably never kept a diary. Intelligence agents suggest that the book consists of transcribed reports from tape recordings he made for British Intelligence and the CIA. Khrushchev and Furtseva were close friends, but she was never his mistress.

THE UNPRECEDENTED SUPPORT FOR A WAR AGAINST WANT

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, at the opening of this session of Congress I am gratified to report to the Senate the remarkably widespread support expressed during the congressional recess for revision and expansion of our food-for-peace effort into an international food program that will close the world food gap. Many thoughtful people see such a program, as I do, as an opportunity to reduce hunger in the world while opening up new production and income benefits to the American farmer and our economy as a whole.

Before I report further concerning the reaction which has been pouring into my office concerning this proposal for the last few months, I should like to digress for a moment to congratulate President Johnson on what I regard as a superb state of the Union message. It was a message of peace and progress for our country.

I was especially pleased with the President's call for a "maximum attack," as he called it, on hunger and disease and ignorance in the world.

The President's vigorous espousal of a "worldwide attack" on human hunger and misery has my strong support. I believe that is the kind of war that most Americans want our Nation to wage. It is the kind of war that will win unanimous and enthusiastic support across this land.

Near the end of the previous session of Congress, on September 23, 1965, I addressed the Senate in regard to my proposed International Food and Nutrition Act, embodied in S. 2157, describing a war against want on this planet as "the most important war."

Since that time I have had a very large, steady volume of mail from all over the United States, and from foreign lands, about it, or requesting copies of the bill. The demand and the interest has not diminished over a period now of nearly 4 months.

It has been a very gratifying experience, for I have a deep personal belief that we must do our utmost to end starvation and malnutrition on this planet, and that growing population makes it urgent that we start at once to balance population and food supplies. Letters, resolutions, articles, and editorial endorsements reflect an unprecedented degree of support for a stepped-up war against hunger.

Support for a world food program comes from all of the major farm organizations, the National Farmers Union, the Grange, the American Farm Bureau Federation, and the National Farmers Organization. I mention them first because Members of Congress are aware that agreement among them is rare indeed. They will differ on some of the details of an international effort, but they are agreed on the basic proposition that America should use more of her productive capacity and her highly advanced knowledge of food production to help to end malnutrition on this planet.

Our major church organizations have given strong support. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the cooperatives, our labor organizations are affirmative and favorable.

Groups representing women as professional people, as voters, as consumers, as mothers, and as citizens are in the army of supporters of our expanded world food effort.

The university community, engineers, doctors, bankers, agri-business, merchants, industrialists, and labor leaders have all assured me of their support.

Unquestionably, the extensive national press coverage of the subject which has occurred, including several United Press

and Associated Press articles, major treatment in the news magazines and farm papers, radio and TV, as well as many favorable editorials, has stimulated the unusually extensive mail and the endorsements which have come to my attention.

It is reported that the President has before him an administrative interagency task force report on world food policy which may lead soon to recommendations by the President to the Congress when he feels it appropriate. Administration officials have shown a growing support for U.S. food assistance on helping the developing countries make their own agriculture most productive, and on improving the nutritional quality of foods we supply other nations.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD a few significant newspaper and magazine articles, and editorials—a cross section of the materials which my office has received in recent weeks—for the information of the Members. I have selected about a dozen articles which have had national impact, and a dozen editorials more or less at random from among the many which have been sent to me.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a list of sponsors of a new World Food Crisis Committee. The nine-page list of people who offered to serve as sponsors of the committee prior to the organizational meeting on December 9, indicates the breadth of support for an adequate world food effort by our country. I understand that many more have gone on the list since the December 9 meeting here in Washington.

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

SPONSORS OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE WORLD FOOD CRISIS THROUGH DECEMBER 7, 1965

R. L. Clodius, vice president, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.

Pat DuBois, president, First State Bank, Sauk Centre, Minn.

Clifford R. Hope, Box 1093, Garden City, Kans.

Rev. Lonzinas Jankus, executive director, United Lithuanian Relief, 105 Grand Street, Brooklyn, N.Y.

Carl J. Megel, American Federation of Teachers, 1343 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

William E. Moran, Jr., dean, School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.

Jacob S. Potofsky, general president Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, 15 Union Square, New York, N.Y.

Arthur Rosenstock, president, American Newspaper Guild of D.C., 390 East 153d Street, New York, N.Y.

H. A. Schneider, general secretary and treasurer, American Federation of Grain Millers, 4949 Olson Memorial Highway, Minneapolis, Minn.

Alvin Shapiro, executive vice president, American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Paul H. Tidwell, manager, Meriwether-Lewis Electric Co-op, 114 North Central Avenue, Centerville, Tenn.

Jerry Voorhis, Cooperative League of U.S.A., 59 East Van Buren, Chicago, Ill.

Harold Russell, chairman, the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, Washington, D.C.

Brooks Hays, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J.

Dr. Grace A. Goldsmith, professor of medicine, Tulane University School of Medicine, 1430 Tulane Avenue, New Orleans, La.

Edmund G. Brown, Governor of California, Sacramento, Calif.

C. C. Murray, dean and coordinator, College of Agriculture, University of Georgia, Athens, Ga.

Edward F. Snyder, Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 2d Street NE., Washington, D.C.

A. A. Spielman, dean and director, College of Agriculture, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Mass.

Oliver S. Willham, president, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Okla.

Glen Leet, executive director, Save the Children Federation, Boston Post Road, Norwalk, Conn.

Flemmie P. Kittrell, Department of Home Economics, Howard University, Washington, D.C.

E. W. Aiton, director, Extension Service, University of Maryland, College Park, Md.

N. C. Brady, director of research, New York State Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.

F. P. Longeway, Jr., executive director, National Fisheries Institute, 1614 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Louis McLean, secretary, Velsicol Chemical Corporation, 341 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.

Mrs. Olya Margolin, National Council of Jewish Women, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 924, Washington, D.C.

Karl F. Rolvaag, Governor of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minn.

Parke C. Brinkley, president, National Agriculture Chemicals Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Robert L. Bull, director, Food Business Institute, University of Delaware.

Marion S. Monk, president, The National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, Batchelor, La.

Rev. Frederick A. McGuire, C.M., executive secretary-Mission Secretariat, 1212 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Mr. and Mrs. Hubert W. Baker, president, Soybean Growers of America, P.O. Box 276, Mount Zion, Ill.

Jack R. Smith, president, Rice Millers' Association, 1048 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

J. P. Gaines, executive vice president, Rice Millers' Association, 1048 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Teymuraz K. Bagration, Tolstoy Foundation, Inc., 989 Eighth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

Frank Beck, Tippecanoe Press, 14 West Hendricks, Shelbyville, Ind.

R. C. Bacote, Box 191, Moucks Corner, S.C.

Hayes Beall, 103 West Greenfield, Avenue, Lombard, Ill.

Norman J. Baugher, 1451 Dundee Avenue, Elgin, Ill.

Charles F. Brannan, (former Secretary of Agriculture), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.

Homer L. Brinkley, 6551 Brooks Place, Falls Church, Va.

Mrs. Maurice H. Brown, 612 North 18th Street, Box 3348, Waco, Tex.

Mrs. Sidney Burkland, McVille, N. Dak.

Jacob Clayman, administrative director, Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Howard A. Cowden, 908 Commerce Trust Building, Kansas City, Mo.

Edwin Christianson, 1275 University Avenue, St. Paul, Minn.

W. L. Davis, Route 1, Box 66, Kress, Tex.

Elmer Ellis, president, Missouri State University, Columbia, Mo.

Judson, Fiebiger, 820 Locust Street, Des Moines, Iowa

O. Henry Engendorff, commissioner of agriculture, Department of Agriculture, State of Wyoming, Cheyenne, Wyo.

Arthur S. Flemming, president, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oreg.

Mrs. Daisy S. George, 952 East 223d Street, Bronx, N.Y.

Mrs. Velma Good, 608 7th Avenue, North, Great Falls, Mont.

J. Peter Grace, 7 Hanover Square, New York, N.Y.

Harold K. Hill, 414 Franklin Avenue, Madison, Wis.

Mrs. Robert C. Hoagland, 907 Waynoka, Hastings, Nebr.

Clyde T. Jarvis, Montana Farmers Union News, Post Office Box 2447, Great Falls, Mont.

R. L. Johansen, 1667 North Snillers Avenue, St. Paul, Minn.

Frank W. Johnson, Route 1, Box 27, Emmett, N. Dak.

Mrs. William C. Johnston, Jr., 3065 University Terrace NW., Washington, D.C.

Harold E. Jones, Director, Extension Division—Umberger Hall, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kans.

Marvin Jones, U.S. Court of Claims, Washington, D.C.

Robert E. Jones, Unitarian Universalist Association, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

Mrs. Frank Lassey, Cartwright, N. Dak.

Benson, Y. Landis, 124 Bramball Road, Dearsdale, N.Y.

Arthur S. Link, Papers of Woodrow Wilson, Princeton University, Princeton, N.J.

C. J. McCormick, Rural Route 4, Vincennes, Ind.

Wiley F. Martin, Center Star Route 4, Russellville, Ky.

Robert N. Mason, Rocky Mountain Farmers Union, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.

William E. Morgan, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colo.

Harry R. Poole, 2800 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill.

H. Wayne Pritchard, Executive Secretary, Soil Conservation Society of America, 7516 NE. Ankeng Road, Ankeng, Iowa.

Ben H. Radcliffe, P.O. Box 1388, Huron, S. Dak.

William V. Rawlings, Capron, Va.

Walter P. Reuther, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

Prof. John E. Ross, 101 Agriculture Hall, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.

P. W. Seitz, P.O. Box 2927, Fort Wayne, Ind.

J. S. Thisttethwaite, R.D. No. 1, Jefferson, Pa.

Granville Turner, Route 2, Toney, Ala.

Jessie S. Tuttle, Castle Dale, Utah.

Bishop W. J. Walls, A.M.E. Zion Church, 4736 South Parkway, Chicago, Ill.

Everett White, State senator, Russellville, Ky.

Leland Wilson, Church of the Brethren, 1451 Dundee Avenue, Elgin, Ill.

William C. Wise, Esq., 615 Perpetual Building, Washington, D.C.

George A. Zeigler, 310 Upper College Terrace, Frederick, Md.

Oscar W. Zetter, 2818 Bosworth Lane, Bowie, Md.

Jack Beidler, legislative director, Industrial Union Department AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Henry T. Blewer, 476 Exchange Street, Rochester, N.Y.

Leonard Kenfield, 819 19th Street, South, Great Falls, Mont.

Pat J. Nash, Co-operative Marketing Association, 740 Board of Trade Building, Kansas City, Mo.

Barney Hopkins, 716 Lothrop, Detroit, Mich.

Rabbi Richard G. Hirsch, 2027 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Rabbi Israel Miller, 2619 Davidson Avenue, Bronx, N.Y.

J. Elliott Corbett, Methodist Church, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE., Washington, D.C.

Lucian W. Hills, R.D. No. 1, Wayland, N.Y.

Phil Campbell, commissioner, Department of Agriculture, Capitol Square, Atlanta, Ga.

Reverend William Crittenden, DD., LL.D., Bishop of Erie, Ward Diocesan House, 329 West Sixth Street, Erie, Pa.

James Milholland, Jr., president, Home State Farm Publications, Inc., 9800 Detroit Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.

M. D. Mobley, executive secretary, American Vocational Association, Inc., 1025 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

John Perryman, executive director, American School Food Service Association, Post Office Box 10095, Denver, Colo.

James D. Taylor, executive secretary, South Dakota Association of Cooperatives, Post Office Box 102, Huron, S. Dak.

J. C. Turner, president, Greater Washington Central Labor Council, AFL–CIO, 1311 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Kenneth W. Fitzgerald, editor, Oregon-Washington Farmers Union, Box 94, Tolovana Park, Salem, Oreg.

Norman E. Olsen, Canton, S. Dak.

J. J. Sugden, chairman, New York ASCS State Committee, Four Chimneys Farm on Seneca Lake, Himrod, N.Y.

Dallas K. Ferry, executive director, 910 South Wakefield, U.S. Poultry & Egg Producers Association, Arlington, Va.

Edison W. Osborne, Cornwall Farm, Peach Bottom, Pa.

Maurice O'Reilly, Barnum, Iowa.

Lenard C. Pound, chairman, Indiana Street ASC Committee—USDA, Room 110, 311 West Washington Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

John M. Lumley, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

George Harada, Post Office Box 55, Holualoa, Hawaii.

Floyd Andre, Farmhouse on Campus, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa.

Floyd Black, 503 New England Building, Topeka, Kans.

Paul B. Hastings, Rural Delivery 3, Box 130, Georgetown, Del.

Moe Hoffman, 1627 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Robert G. Houghtlin, National Soybean Processors Association, 141 West Jackson, Chicago, Ill.

Hans O. Jensen, 1711 M Street, Aurora, Nebr.

Phillip E. Jones, U.S. Beet Sugar Association, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

Lloyd Kontny, Julesburg, Colo.

Norman H. Muck, Rocky Ford Limestone Co., Rural Route No. 1, Lincoln, Ill.

Edward F. Snyder, Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

Mrs. George L. Bell, 4706 Essex Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.

H. Ryland Heflin, Ruby, Va.

Nicholas Kominos, United States Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Herman Will, 100 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

George Bradford Reeves, Chapitco, Md.

J. C. Portis, Luponto, Ark.

Mrs. W. Eugene Pharis, 156 Helfenstein Avenue, Webster Groves, Mo.

Dr. Jimmye S. Hillman, head, department of agricultural economics, the University of Arizona, Tucson, Ariz.

Rev. Sidney Lovett, pastor, Rock Spring Congressional Church, Arlington, Va.

Rabbi Hyman S. Krash, 141 Xenia Street SW., Washington, D.C.

John W. Ball, R.F.D. 2, New Berlin, N.Y.

Rabbi Sholem B. Kowalsky, 73–50 173d Street, Flushing, N.Y.

Robert Hoffman, Alden, Iowa.

Tom Gill, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Wallace J. Campbell, Foundation for Cooperative Housing, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Paul W. Opsahl, 705 North Third Street, Aberdeen, S. Dak.

Dr. Henry A. McCanna, 475 Riverside Drive, room 510, New York, N.Y.

W. J. H. McKnight, 475 Riverside Drive, room 1020, New York, N.Y.

Robert D. McMillen, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Arthur C. Ringland, 4722 Dorset Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.

Mrs. Murry M. Schott, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Jack Sampier, editor and publisher, National Livestock Producer, Chicago, Ill.

Kenny Schuman, Iowa Farmers Union, 2302 University Avenue, Des Moines, Iowa.

Lionel Steinberg, Box 501, Thermal, Calif.

D. Wynne Thorne, Utah State University, Logan, Utah.

Mrs. Wallace Mason Yater, 4907 Indian Lane, Washington, D.C.

Ross B. Talbot, professor of government, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa.

Lyle Gottschalk, Route 2, Palouse, Wash.

V. T. Hanlon, East River Electric Corp., Madison, S. Dak.

Mrs. Duncan Howlett, 3710 Ingomar Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Mr. Thomas Kouzes, 3524 Barkley Drive, Fairfax, Va.

Jay I. Naman, president, Texas Farmers Union, 834 North Valley Mills Drive, Waco, Tex.

Mrs. Andrew G. Prandoni, 5016 Lowell Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Robert Grayson McGuire, Jr., 1611 Crittenden Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Clay L. Cochran, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Vernon Ferwerda, National Council of Churches, 110 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

Burnett J. Bergeson, 920 North Shore Drive, Detroit Lakes, Minn.

Dr. Russell Coleman, The Sulphur Institute, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

William C. Eckles, General Manager Pine Milk Products Corp., 500 North Park Ave., Fond du Lac, Wis.

Harry Edell, 5601 River Road NW., Washington, D.C.

George M. Elsey, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. Lee Feller, president, Fellmen & Alliance Association, Inc., 605 West Chicago St., Coldwater, Mich.

Joseph W. Fichter, 28 East Vine St., Oxford, Ohio.

A. Jack Hall, Virginia Farmers Union, Hotel Jefferson, Richmond, Va.

Daniel J. Carey, R.D. No. 2, Groton, N.Y.

R. S. Dunbar, Jr., dean, College of Agriculture & Forestry, West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va.

Robert Handschin, Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, St. Paul, Minn.

Oscar Heline, president, Iowa Farmer Grain Dealers Association, Marcus, Iowa.

Leon H. Keyserling, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Mrs. Robert L. Lamkin, 2106 North Huntington Street, Arlington, Va.

Rabbi Sidney M. Lefkowitz, 1708 Mallory Street, Jacksonville, Fla.

Mrs. Esther Murray, director, eastern area, Women's Activities Department of COPE–AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

George E. Nettels, Jr., Post Office Box 7, Girard, Kans.

Thomas E. Quigley, 1212 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Arthur H. Schulz, dean and director, State University Agriculture Station, Fargo, N. Dak.

E. V. Smith, Auburn University, Auburn, Ala.

George S. Weigold, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Arnie W. Agnew, Milton Junction, Wis.

Claude R. Wickard, former Secretary of Agriculture, Camden, Ind.

A. F. Troyer, president, Indiana Farmers Union, 1331 North Delaware Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

Maurice D. Atkin, Robert R. Nathan Associates, 1218 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Pat Greathouse, vice president, United Automobile Workers, AFL–CIO, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Robert M. Koch, president, National Limestone Institute, Inc., 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Robert C. Liebenow, president, Corn Industries Research Foundation, Inc., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Herschel D. Newsom, master, National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Governor William Avery, State Capitol, Topeka, Kans.

Dwayne O. Andreas, executive vice president, Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, St. Paul, Minn.

James G. Patton, president, National Farmers Union, Denver, Colo.

[From the Wheeling (W. Va.) Intelligencer, Dec. 28, 1965]

FOOD: IT MIGHT PROVE AT ONCE THE MOST EFFECTIVE AND LEAST COSTLY FOREIGN AID

Senator GEORGE S. MCGOVERN, Democrat, of South Dakota, has high hopes for a bill he has prepared for the upcoming session of Congress that would change drastically two major public policies—foreign aid and agricultural adjustment.

Under terms of the McGovern bill Congress would appropriate $500 million to buy food on the open market for distribution among the needy of underdeveloped countries, build ports and facilities for handling the produce and conduct programs in the improvement of food production methods in the lands involved. The program would be accelerated at the rate of $500 million each year for 7 years, then continue for 3 more years at the $3.5 billion level.

This might seem the most inopportune of all times to launch anything so ambitious and costly as the McGovern plan. With another multi-billion dollar deficit in the making, the already staggering public debt reaching new heights, a costly war to finance and a domestic program of unprecedented proportions just getting underway, Washington has a sufficiently difficult fiscal problem to solve without taking on anything new. Present indications, according to the best advices from official quarters, are that only through the exercise of strict economy will it be possible to keep the budget under $110 billion and to meet commitments without a tax increase.

What chance, then, would something like the McGovern proposal have of acceptance and why should it be seriously considered?

It may be that the exigencies of the times will argue against the McGovern bill. But it should not be dismissed out-of-hand. Its plus factors should be considered along with the minus.

For one thing, the purchases contemplated should make possible the relaxation of crop and acreage controls. Indeed, this revolutionary shift in foreign aid could lead to complete abandonment of our farm relief program, restoring agriculture to a condition of complete independence. This alone would save the $2½ to $3 billion the Government now pays farmers to restrict their production, to say nothing of the cost of storage and various administrative expenses associated with crop control. Indeed, it seems reasonable to say that the saving in farm

subsidies, etc., would more than provide the $3.5 billion McGovern is talking about.

Then there is foreign aid. The actual distribution of food and the operation of an intensive program of education in better farming methods, plus provision of tools and other equipment would constitute foreign aid of a far more practicable character than that now being provided. If efficiently implemented such a system would make possible the reduction if not complete elimination of the economic phase of our foreign aid program. And in the long run it might go a long way toward establishing peaceful relations that would lead to the abandonment of most of our military aid as well.

Finally, there is to consider the fact that we are just beginning to realize the gravity of the world food shortage. Those in best position to judge such things believe that unless a way is found soon to increase very materially the production and distribution of food on a world basis, actual starvation will be the lot of millions, privation and suffering of the sort capable of triggering massive and bloody revolt of many millions more.

Here in the United States we have a capacity for food production unapproached anywhere in the world. Not only is our land fertile, but our ability to put this fertility to use unique. What better disposition can we make of our abundance and know-how than in relieving want among others, not merely in the form of the food itself, but also and of greater importance in showing them how to make better use of their own resources? This would be something worthy of our best thought and best efforts, even were the cost greater on balance than probably is the case. When it is considered that we might accomplish what Senator McGovern and those who have been working with him on this project have in mind at an actual saving of money, the prospect becomes even more pleasing.

Senator McGovern's figures may need adjustment. The scope of the program and the rate of development might require paring down to meet our own immediate fiscal needs. But the idea, we think, is basically sound. At the very least it deserves the sympathetic consideration of the Congress and the American people.

[From the Springfield (Mo.) Daily News, Dec. 2, 1965]

FOOD SURPLUSES DWINDLING AWAY

There is startling news from the farm front.

U.S. stocks of surplus foodstuffs are no longer the seemingly inexhaustible mountains of yesteryear, when a prime headache for Government was finding ways to dispose of them or at least to curtail further accumulation.

To the citizen long accustomed to thinking of the farm surplus as not only a fixed feature but a chronic problem in American life, the news may come with something of the shock of another sign of changing times. This was the realization not so long ago that the Nation's vast gold hoard, far from being a built-in feature of the supersuccessful economy, was actually dwindling away.

Now it appears we may be facing a somewhat similar situation on the food front. Stocks of many basic commodities are no longer unmanageable, but have been worked down to about what is prudent for national reserves.

In wheat, for example, there are something like 800 million bushels in storage. It may look like plenty, but in fact it would meet U.S. requirements for only some 8 months in the event of a serious crop failure.

Such a crisis may appear unlikely, but another crisis is actually upon us. This is the growing food shortage in much of the rest of the world, in countries squeezed between mushrooming populations and virtually stationary food output.

Economists are warning that if a worldwide famine in the foreseeable future is to be averted, ever greater demands will have to be made upon the United States, Canada, Australia, portions of Western Europe and the other, very few, surplus food areas. These would be demands for which there is now no guarantee those nations would be able to meet.

This development comes after years of American farm policies designed to reduce production. Some 50 million acres have been taken out of cultivation and we currently are reimbursing farmers for retiring cropland and cutting production to the tune of something like $2 billion annually.

One concerned observer suggests that the time may have come to reverse U.S. policy, to begin stepping up production.

"I cannot believe the American people want to leave good cropland idle at public expense while hunger spreads across the world," says Senator George McGovern, of South Dakota, former food-for-peace Director.

It may be difficult to condition the American public to such a radical reversal. But that it may be necessary is one more indication that in a rapidly changing world nothing can be taken for granted, not even Fort Knox and ever-normal granaries.

[From the Mitchell (S. Dak.) Daily Republic, Nov. 24, 1965]

PREVENTING WORLD FAMINE

Kansas GOP Senator Frank Carlson the other day predicted a worldwide famine of incomprehensible magnitude and devastation "unless the world food output in the next 35 years is doubled." Carlson cautioned that people will not continue to starve quietly, "and Communist China will have her eyes on them. She boasts that she will encircle the capitalist world, and this could be if more food is not produced to fight the war of hunger.

"If what I have said becomes a prophecy, the chaos that would result could make Vietnam look like a neighborhood argument," the Senator said.

What most of us do not realize is that the old bugaboo of farm surpluses is no longer with us. Senator Carlson reported that the United States is experiencing a shortage of dried milk, rice, "and everything containing protein—except soybeans, of which we have a carryover of perhaps a hundred million bushels."

Between now and the end of the century, the world populatoin is expected to double—to reach the figure of 6 billion people. This sobering estimate requires the United States to lose no time in examining closely its entire national agricultural policy. The United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization—currently meeting in Rome—says that half of the world's population is now suffering some degree of hunger. Merely to maintain present inadequate dietary levels, FAO says, will require the doubling of food supplies by the year 2000, when the 6 billion population figure is reached.

In noting the growing demands on foodstuffs, the Washington Post suggests that any real improvement cannot be realized until the food-deficit countries "abandon their infatuation with industrialization as a quick and exclusive formula for development." These nations must put themselves hard at work developing their every agricultural potential.

The Post has given strong endorsement to a bill introduced by Senator George McGovern, Democrat, of South Dakota, first Director of the food for peace program under President Kennedy. Entitled the "International Food and Nutrition Act," McGovern's measure would provide funds to purchase food for shipment abroad, "but, more important, to improve storage and distribution facilities and strengthen the productive capacity in needy nations. This would be a useful complement to President Johnson's suggestion for a national strategic food reserve. Lord Boyd-Orr's idea of a world food bank also could well be looked at anew."

The Nation's farmers have the capacity to produce far more than U.S. requirements. Surpluses have been easy to come by, even in the face of cutting back the number of tilled acres. We can expect them to be called upon shortly to increase their output, not only to meet the needs of a burgeoning America, but to alleviate the hunger pangs of those in other lands. At the same time we must help these needy nations develop their agricultural technology to its utmost, to reduce the drain on the productive capacity of today's major food-producing nations.

[From the Nebraska Farmer of Sept. 18, 1965]

ARE WE HEADED TOWARD ALL-OUT PRODUCTION?—A PLAN IS BEING MADE THAT WOULD URGE FARMERS TO PRODUCE ALL THEY CAN—OBJECTIVE: TO HEAD OFF STARVATION

(By Marvin Russell)

Last April, the Nebraska Farmer said in an editorial: "We've been hearing a lot lately about the world's population explosion, and apparently it really is exploding. Does this mean that sometime soon farmers in the United States will need to take off their handcuffs and shift to all-out production? It might."

Now there are straws in the wind that indicate our national policy is trending in exactly that direction.

We are told that plans are being made right now under which the United States will attempt to do two things: (1) Get food in much greater quantities than ever before to starving people in many areas of the world; and (2) carry our agricultural know-how to these same people so that they may help themselves close the ever-widening gap between world food production and world population.

These plans are being pushed in high places, all the way up to the White House. Vice President Humphrey, long identified with the food for peace program, is much involved. In fact, that's what it really is—a food for peace program—but with one great difference. It no longer would be a half-hearted program to dispose of surpluses. It would be a program to use our great food production potential as a powerful tool in achieving our worldwide objectives. What are these objectives? You might term them containment of communism, world peace, and prosperity, and just plain humanitarianism that makes it unacceptable to us to let anyone starve if we can help it.

Legislation which would be a beginning on such a program already has been introduced in Congress. Bill Hosokawa of the Denver Post's Empire magazine, in an article titled "The Coming War on Hunger," tells of a bill introduced last June by Senator George McGovern, of South Dakota, "to provide for United States participation and leadership in an international effort to end malnutrition and human want."

After interviewing Senator McGovern and others in Washington, Hosokawa declared: "The implications of such a program on the American economy are tremendous, keeping in mind the fact that most of our surplus food is gone. In effect, such a program would be a green light to American farmers to grow all they can, with their produce to be used overseas because it is needed rather than because it is surplus.

McGovern said to close the food gap American farmers would have to produce one-third more wheat, increase milk output 50 percent, raise 25 percent more soybeans and step up production of vegetable oils by a third. The South Dakota Senator imparts a

sense of urgency to the matter. Need for great increases in our food production is here right now, he declares, and will reach the crisis stage before the end of the 1960's—not the year 2000.

An official at the U.S. Department of Agriculture told Hosokawa something that farmers already know—that we can increase farm output vastly without taxing our resources or going back to tilling marginal land.

McGovern said "American farmers could fill this order by putting land and resources now idle into productive use again. Only about 75 percent of our agricultural capacity is being used today."

Present plans leave a lot of questions unanswered.

Would acreage restrictions go completely out the window? Would farmers be encouraged to plant fenceline to fenceline?

What would happen to present price support and loan programs?

Would the Government buy produce directly from farmers for shipment overseas? Or would it enter established market channels and buy processed food in many cases? If so, would there be any Government influence on price at which processors buy their raw materials from the farm?

What will a shift to all-out production mean to the small farmer as compared to the large farmer?

What would the complications be in world trade in agricultural products? Particularly, what would an expanded food for peace program do to our own cash trade and that of other nations who are our friends?

But despite all the unanswered questions, one thing seems sure. It will mean great change on the farms of Nebraska and the Nation. It will put the farmer in the frontline of a Peace Army that can have vast influence on the world's future.

And it would seem to forecast an agriculture more prosperous than it has been for many years.

[From the Binghampton (N.Y.) Press, November 1965]

HUNGER IN HALF OF WORLD

Most Americans will sit down to a Thanksgiving dinner on Thursday grateful, in the words of the President's proclamation, for "much more than an abundant harvest." This will be a rich Thanksgiving for most Americans, but with the war in Vietnam coming ever closer to those they cherish, it will be a thoughtful day, too.

It may be a thoughtful occasion in another sense. While we are well fed, half the world's people suffer a degree of hunger. The situation soon will become acute. Richard W. gram, says that we face "a crisis of monu- Reuter, Director of the food-for-peace promental proportions."

Famine on an extensive scale in underdeveloped regions appears inevitable unless the poor nations soon begin to produce food as fast as they produce people. Underdeveloped nations in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America are near the threshold of starvation.

Merely to keep up the present inadequate dietary levels would mean doubling world food production by the year 2000, when world population is expected to reach 6 billion.

The United States and a few other food-surplus countries have been able to stave off disaster up to this time, but studies indicate that large-scale famine may ensue within 5 years if underdeveloped countries do not produce more food for themselves. The United States is nearing the end of its food surpluses.

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman said on November 15 that our carryover stocks of farm commodities are at their lowest level in 8 years, with grain surpluses nearly eliminated.

Raymond A. Iaones, Agriculture Department foreign trade chief, said on November 15 that U.S. farm exports will reach a new high of $6,200 million this year, with new peaks of $7 and $8 billion expected within the next few years.

Since 1954 the United States has sent more than $12 billion in surplus farm commodities to needy countries under the food for peace program, paid for either in their currencies or given in outright relief. Donations worth $1,700 million are donated annually.

The enabling legislation for the food for peace program (Public Law 480) expires at the end of 1966. Congress in 1966 will have to face an extension and probably a reorientation of foreign aid in the form of food. Also necessary will be a rethinking of agriculture policies in the absence of old premises of surplus.

The United States can increase production acreages, but there are limits to what can be done to head off world famine. Some experts even argue that food aid serves only to delay the day of reckoning and to make it severer. U.S. food has permitted various countries to delay decisions on agricultural and population problems. Availability of free U.S. food has disrupted domestic markets in some countries and discouraged production.

Underdeveloped nations must be wooed away from their preoccupation with industrialization at the expense of gains in agriculture. Senator George McGovern, Democrat, S. Dak., a former director of the food for peace program, introduced a bill this year that would combine efforts to increase U.S. farm production with renewed and greater efforts to help farmers in the poorer countries to increase their yields per acre.

The World Food Bank is promising. So are the newer programs aimed at population control. The White House Conference next week on health is bound to give much consideration to food-population control questions.

[From the Washington Post, November 1965]

OUTLOOK: HUNGER

Concern over the effect of the diminution of American farm surpluses upon mounting world food needs is causing a welcome and overdue reexamination of national policy. Whatever the future availability of additional food from the United States, patently there must be very much greater emphasis upon expanded local food production in the needy countries themselves.

World needs are staggering. Half the world's people now suffer from some degree of hunger, according to the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization. Merely to maintain present inadequate dietary levels will require the doubling of food supplies by the year 2000, when population is expected to reach 6 billion. In critical areas populations is outstripping food, as Malthus predicted. Per capita food production in Latin America has declined 5 percent in the last 5 years. Population growth there is 3 percent annually.

In dietary terms needs are even starker. Research now shows a correlation between protein deficiency and mental development. Damage sustained during the critical 1- to 6-age span is irreparable later. There is reason to think that this factor alone may account for much of the lethargy observed in some underdeveloped countries.

If there is to be any real improvement, a first requirement will be to persuade food-deficit countries to abandon their infatuation with industrialization as a quick and exclusive formula for development. Thanks in part to Marxist notions there has been a tendency in some countries to regard a steel mill as more important than adequate investment in agriculture. That is part of the difficulty in India as well as in many Communist countries.

For their part, Americans will have to recognize that shipment of their own surpluses abroad is only a partial and temporary answer to the problem. This realization may come hard to persons whose charitable instincts are affronted by the paradox of superabundance here and empty bellies elsewhere. Even though the gift or sale of food for local currency helps solve an American economic problem and may relieve some immediate hunger, it seldom contributes much productive capacity in the needy countries. In the absence of expanded local storage and distribution facilities, it sometimes merely aggravates the overall problem of postponing the reckoning.

So long as surpluses have dominated our consideration it has been difficult to focus on the more basic problem. In 1965–66 some $3.5 billion is appropriated for the food-for-peace program; but this year only $212 million is available for all forms of aid to agricultural production abroad including technical assistance and loans from local currency. Happily, the emphasis is changing to encourage far more attention to farm technology in Latin America and now in India.

In this connection Senator George McGovern, first Director of the food-for-peace program, recently introduced a bill that deserves widespread support. His International Food and Nutrition Act would provide funds to purchase food for shipment abroad but, more important, to improve storage and distribution facilities and strengthen productive capacity in needy countries. This would be a useful complement to President Johnson's suggestion for a national strategic food reserve. Lord Boyd-Orr's idea of a world food bank also could well be looked at anew.

Whatever is done, American production obviously will play a vital part. Soybeans and fishmeal, produced either here or abroad, are among the cheapest sources of proteins. With new hybrid wheat and corn the capacity for expanded American production is enormous, and balance will be imperative to avoid the creation of embarrassing new surpluses. We shall have to continue to donate large quantities of food for children's programs abroad while assisting other countries to increase their domestic production and finding better means of helping them bridge the gap between need and ability to pay.

Stress on agriculture alone will not suffice. Birth control, education, rural development, and industrialization all are necessary counterparts of more attention to farm technology and local food production. But the lesson of this century is that none of these other measures will succeed without primary stress on expanded food supplies. To meet the food needs now looming will necessitate changes in thinking and direction of effort altogether as radical as any revolution the world has ever known.

[From the Springfield (Mo.) Leader-Press, Nov. 26, 1965]

FOOD VERSUS PEOPLE

After years of being damned for his burdensome, price-depressing surpluses, the American farmer is beginning to come into his own as our agricultural production pattern adjusts to levels somewhat compatible with demand.

This is due to expanding foreign markets, in no small part to better Federal farm programs, and to farmers learning to curtail at least some of their output for better prices.

As a result, farmers' net income this year will be higher than it has been for a long time, and agricultural economists are almost unanimous in agreeing that 1966 farm income will be better yet.

Tragic as it may be for the world in general, the American farmer must be happy to learn at last that somewhere people need and want what he grows, even though that means that large areas of the world now contain

peoples who cannot produce their own needs so that hunger is a constant companion and starvation a ubiquitous threat.

Odd as it may seem, this poses a new farm problem—this one for our Federal Government more than for the farmer, however. The problem: Should American aid to those hungry nations be in the form of food or in technical aid in home food production?

There is a sharp cleavage developing in the Johnson administration over which approach to take.

As a spokesman for technical aid—training foreign nations to raise their own food—Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman has some telling points. America, the Secretary points out, cannot possibly hope to feed the whole world, therefore the only solution to hunger lies within the hungry countries themselves. Mr. Freeman also fears that the other answer—the end of all curbs on American farm output and a green light for production—will wipe out all the gains of recent years in curbing production, and again put the American farmer in jeopardy.

On the other side of the fence, leading spokesman is Democratic Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, of South Dakota, who contends that world famine isn't merely a fear of the future, it's actually a tragedy of the present. There is no time, the Senator declares—we must act now.

MCGOVERN believes that "the most challenging crisis for the rest of this century will be the accelerating race between food and people."

Another Senator, now touring Asia to see for himself, is proposing a middle ground. Senator VANCE HARTKE, Democrat, of Indiana, said this week that he would substitute food for dollar aid so that the money a nation like India, for example, spends for food may go into plants for manufacturing fertilizers and modern farm equipment.

But in this changed policy, Senator HARTKE would provide safeguards: only nations that would agree to modernize agriculture, and actually do it, would receive such aid. If they balk or fail to live up to their word, he'd cut them off so that they cannot "live on our handouts."

As Representative DURWARD HALL said here last week, there is plenty of land to raise the food the world needs; it's not the land, but the know-how, that's decisive.

No doubt the Congressman is right—to illustrate how right, Venezuela produces an average of 2 bushels of corn per acre as compared with 67 bushels to the acre as our national average.

So here it would appear, lies the answer: the middle road between the two extremes.

The choice isn't immediately at hand—the 1966 farm program is already laid out and it's too late to change—but this is a problem Congress must tackle in the year ahead. With hunger outracing production of food, there is no time to waste.

[From the Farm Journal, November 1965]

NEXT: THE WAR ON HUNGER

If you haven't read the article on page 33 (not printed in the RECORD), stop right now and do it. It reports the frightening prospect that the threat of starvation lies not far ahead for multitudes in vast regions of the world.

How can we help prevent it?

Well first we can't solve the problem just by sending food from here, although we'll have to send even more than now. Largely it must be solved where the problem exists. Let's consider both aspects.

The very label "Food for Peace" quite unintentionally gives us a false sense of comfort. It implies that if we'll just write a big enough check, and send enough food somewhere we will somehow have peace, and all will be well. Perhaps we ought to discard this lulling phrase for something that really pictures the emergency, like "The war on hunger," or "The fight for food."

To fight this war successfully we've got to be a lot tougher than we have been. We've handed out $21 billion worth of food in the last 10 years, too often saying, "Here it is, do what you want with it," simply because our overcautious State Department has been scared witless for fear of offending somebody.

Many a hard-pressed government, figuring we would continue to take care of the food problem, has diverted scarce resources away from agriculture to industrial or military uses. This only perpetuates their food problem.

Tying strings to our aid will win us no popularity contests, but if we are to continue to buy time for hungry countries, we'll have to require that they turn their own energies to their first need—food. We'll be glad to help them do it if they will.

Second, we could use our food in the war on communism much more effectively than we're doing. Wars aren't gentle. Food is a mighty potent weapon. It's one we have in abundance and one that the Communists lack and cannot get.

Why not use it instead of meekly handing it out to those who tell us to go jump in the sea? When a hungry man comes to our door we feed him, but we can let him chop a little wood first.

The food we do send can well be directed chiefly to feeding young children, and for charitable purposes, and for emergencies. Nutritionists say that a child seriously malnourished up to age 6 is maimed for life, mentally as well as physically.

We're currently fortifying the dried milk we send with vitamins A and D, and we're mixing protein concentrates and vitamins with native grains.

These things we can do, and need do in even greater measure, but having done them we will have met but a small part of the problem. We can't dump much more food on needy countries—we're sending about all they can take in and distribute now. Suddenly to flood them with more would demoralize their own struggling agriculture and compete with our own dollar sales.

What, then, can be done on the spot? Two things, neither of them quick or simple but both absolutely imperative: increase yields per acre (since these regions can't bring in many new acres) and slow down the birthrate. Farm Journal will soon report further on some new developments that will sharply affect the world's population problem.

What can be done to step up crop yields?

Not much can happen without such basics as stable government, education, and a system of incentives that lets a man keep enough of what he earns.

Farmers anywhere need good seed, fertilizers, pesticides, machinery, experiment stations, extension services, good farm magazines and farm radio, good roads, farm credit, and a system of markets that lets them sell something, rather than just feed themselves.

We've done quite a bit about some of these, but this is the area where we need to step up our efforts sharply. Sending food is a necessary emergency aid. Helping build agriculture on the spot is the only real solution.

There will doubtless be times when we will wonder whether anybody could help such people, or should try. But we'll have to try, and keep trying. We're spending decades—and $20 billion—to put a man on the moon. It seems at least as important to help the human race eat.

[From the Rapid City (S. Dak.) Journal, Oct. 3, 1965]

SURPLUS FOODS SHOULD BE USED

What to plant and how much is the problem plaguing legislators and farmers. The 4-year proposal now approved in Washington is a temporary, patched job which seems to have appeased very few.

It is known the United States can produce more food, whatever the crop or animals might be, on fewer acres than ever before. For those in the cities, it is difficult to understand why millions of dollars are paid each year to store more grain, bury more lard, give away butter, fail to process cotton for fabric or oil.

It is equally difficult for millions of Americans to understand why other peoples on this globe go hungry.

South Dakota's Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN offers a solution which could head off world famine and aid the cause of world peace. On September 20, Senator MCGOVERN told a regional Methodist conference in Sioux Falls:

"Food is a better form of aid than guns, and a whole lot safer for the world." He suggested hunger is a focal point where the United States can earn good will, rather than ill will.

Carl A. Quarnberg, Rapid City businessman with wide interests as operator of a flour mill and feed, seed, and grain buyer, processor, and distributor, wrote the following letter to Senator MCGOVERN:

"Press reports on your address greatly intrigue me.

"You are right. 'Food is a better form of aid than guns, and a whole lot safer for the world.' In that statement, you may have uncovered a really great idea that can be of real service to wheat farmers as well as starving people of the world.

"Wheat programs of the past have not been fully acceptable to farmers of South Dakota. And wheat farmers of western South Dakota are even more independent than those living on the east side of the river. Western ranchers and farmers are definitely individualistic. They like standing on their own feet. They definitely resent the idea that a Government employee sitting at a mahogany desk in Washington, D.C., must tell them what to plant and how much. They want their independence back. They want to use their own judgment as to what and how much.

"Again you are right. 'It is time to tell the world that we have a great unused farm capacity and that America is going to use it to help end hunger in the world.'

"Over the past many years, the United States has continually reduced wheat production while at the same time and under the same world conditions, Canada, Australia, and Argentina (even Germany and France) has encouraged increased wheat production, much to the benefit of their farmers as well as consumers.

"Again you are right when you say, 'If we spend as much money purchasing and distributing our farm surplus production as we now spend paying farmers not to produce, we would lay a foundation for a greater farm prosperity at home and much less hunger abroad.' You have expressed a perfect two-point idea: Food for starving millions of the world; and in the very same breath, a possible answer to the ever-present but still unsolved farm problem.

"Your experience as Director of food for peace points to you as better informed on world food problems than any man in public life today. I urge you to pursue your idea to final conclusion. Laying all politics aside, I pledge my personal support to this end."

The capacity to produce seemingly unlimited supplies of commodities for citizens of the United States has been challenged by the farm bills. More production results on fewer acres. Subsidies for unplanted acres merely add to the total cost for taxpayers.

MCGOVERN served as Director of the food-for-peace program under the late President Kennedy. Subsequently he was elected U.S. Senator from South Dakota.

McGOVERN and Senator KARL MUNDT do not see eye to eye on the farm bills, nor on how best the surpluses might be utilized. Senator MUNDT does not believe in giving aid and comfort to the Communist enemy in any manner. Yet it seems there should be a way to win good will.

What better way to win than with our surplus foods?

[From the Orlando (Fla.), Evening Star, Jan. 4, 1966]

MORE BREAD AND FEWER GUNS

More food for the starving millions of the world is the goal of a bill by Senator GEORGE S. McGOVERN, Democrat, of South Dakota, which the midwesterner expects to get favorable consideration by the new Congress which meets next month.

The aim of the South Dakotan is to reverse the Nation's present policy of paying farmers not to grow crops and to use the $3 billion or so to buy food to help feed a hungry world.

Under this reversal of philosophy farm prices would be maintained by buying the surpluses under stepped-up production for shipment overseas.

And some of the money saved from the present payments for not planting would be used to stimulate increased food production in other countries by providing technical help and better seed and crop selection.

Senator McGOVERN believes, with considerable commonsense, that America can make more friends and do more good in the world by spending less for military aid and more for food for the hungry. He would eliminate military aid for such countries as India and Pakistan and those in the Middle East, Africa and Latin America, and spend the millions for food and technical aid for the farmers.

McGOVERN should get support for his bill, for it makes a lot of sense.

[From the Farmers Union Herald, Nov. 16, 1965]

THE RACE BETWEEN MAN AND FAMINE

As one of its major themes, the great convention of cooperative farmers going on this week in St. Paul—the 28th annual meeting of Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association—is discussing the century's most challenging crisis, the race bteween man and his food supply.

Never before in the history of mankind have the citizens of the world faced a problem of such magnitude. It is a problem we cannot escape. There is no rathole of smugness into which we can leap and then pull the hole in after us. The plain arithmetic of available food supply and the algebra of a growing world population are inexorable.

We must prepare now to meet and close the enormous food gap that looms on the horizon.

In only three regions of the world—the United States and Canada; Western Europe; and Australia-New Zealand plus parts of southeast Asia—are there adequate food supplies. In these areas, modern technology, concerned government, and economic incentives have combined to increase the productivity of the land at a rate faster than the population growth.

But the combined population of these food surplus regions includes only one-fifth of the world's people. The other four-fifths live in Asia, Latin America, Africa, and the Middle East. These areas are increasing their populations faster than the productivity of their cultivated acreage.

It is a highly significant fact that in the 1930's, for example, Latin America exported more grain than any other region of the world, including North America. Today, 30 years later, Latin America imports more grain than it exports.

Considering the combination of inadequate arable land, low agricultural productivity, and swift population growth in the underdeveloped areas, the prospect of providing an adequate food supply in those regions is not encouraging.

For several very important reasons, we must help these people.

To be brutally frank, there could come a time when if we do not help these hungry people with food they will try their best to take ours away. A hollow belly does not contain the milk of human kindness.

Second, the great contest of our time now turns upon whether we or the Communists can develop the most effective pattern for meeting the hunger and misery of an uncommitted world.

Third, there is the pure responsibility of brotherhood and mercy, the obligation which one man has to another.

"The quality of mercy is not strain'd.
It dropeth as the gentle rain from heaven
Upon the place beneath. It is twice bless'd:
It blesseth him that gives and him that takes.
'Tis mightiest in the mightiest. * * *"

This is what concerned farm leaders, like Senator GEORGE McGOVERN and Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY, are talking about when they plead for a more widespread recognition of the problem.

This is what concerned farm leaders, like M. W. Thatcher of GTA, are talking about when they urge all-out production on American farms so that the Nation's abundance of food and fiber can be used as a weapon for peace.

In a recent speech to his colleagues in the Senate, Senator McGOVERN described the challenge of world hunger and what he believes should be the proper American response.

In that speech, the Senator said, in part:

"I believe that we ought to declare an all-out war against hunger for the balance of this century. We should call on our farmers and our agricultural technicians to enlist for the duration in the war against want. We should announce to the world now that we have an unused food producing capacity which we are willing and anxious to use to its fullest potential. Our Government should leave no doubt that we will bend every effort to see that no nation—friend or foe—starves while we permit land and surpluses to remain idle."

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Tribune, Sept. 22, 1965]

FOOD FOR PEACE CAN BE A POTENT TOOL

With much of the world hungry and with excess agricultural capacity here at home, the United States has available to it a significant tool with which to encourage economic development abroad—economic development that can both serve humanitarian and social ends and also make our side stronger in the cold war.

The U.S. food-for-peace program was established in 1954, mainly as a device to dispose of our unwanted crop surpluses. Lately, more and more Americans, including Vice President HUMPHREY, have spoken out that food for peace should increasingly be used as a tool to aid and spur foreign economic development.

The announcement this month of a $35 million food-for-peace pact with a Spanish co-op group seems to be just the kind of creative project for which HUMPHREY and others have been arguing. The Spanish organization, representing 900 local groups and some 250,000 farm families, will acquire 600,000 tons of American feed grains over the next 3 years under long-term credit. In turn, the organization will sell the grain to its members, with the proceeds to be used to finance a network of grain-shipping and livestock-marketing facilities, including trucks, refrigeration equipment, elevators, slaughterhouses, etc.

If this scheme works, Spain, which is a meat deficit country, will build up a substantial beef industry—and will become an important importer of U.S. feed grains for cash. And Spain will have been aided in its economic growth.

The agreement is only the third such deal with a private foreign group (the other two deals were also made this year), but it is by far the largest. It clearly illustrates some of the potential ahead for the food-for-peace program.

[Editorial from the Cooperative Consumer, Sept. 15, 1965]

AMERICAN AGRICULTURE CAN LOOK FORWARD TO NEW WORLD DEMANDS

If American agriculture is as efficient as we all say it is, then why don't we make greater use of it?

That question is suddenly coming into the public consciousness. There are three reasons:

1. An increasingly realistic attitude toward foreign aid.

2. The growing realization that this Nation has reduced agricultural surpluses to the point some commodities are in such short supply that we would be hard put in case of a national emergency.

3. Repeated predictions of dire famine in parts of the world where populations are growing much faster than food supplies.

So-called insiders in Washington are saying that the Department of Agriculture and the White House are laying plans now for measures that will lead to letup in restrictions on land use and on the production of certain crops.

A move in the direction of greater use of food in foreign relations would come from a bill introduced during the summer by Senator McGOVERN of South Dakota. It would provide for stepping up shipments of surplus foodstuffs, along with technical assistance for developing countries.

Bill Hosokawa, associate editor of the Denver Post, went to Washington during the summer to study the food situation for himself, and in the Empire section of the Post he wrote:

"What troubles the food experts in Washington is that the enormous U.S. surpluses that helped feed the famished for a decade are now largely gone. Remember those pictures showing great mountains of wheat piled along railroad sidings of the West? You haven't seen any lately, partly because of the success of Federal restrictions on farm production, and partly because of massive shipments of food sent overseas.

"The question now is not how to curtail output, but how to make American farms produce more to help fill empty stomachs in India and South America and Africa and other undernourished areas of the world. Congress is likely to be hearing a great deal about this problem before long."

Hosokawa quotes Thomas M. Ware, chairman of the Freedom From Hunger Foundation and a man he describes as a hard-headed industrialist:

"There is a global food catastrophe building up on the horizon which threatens to engulf the free world and the Communist world alike.

We have been reminded for many years that American foodstuffs, properly used, could be more effective than guns in helping the developing countries attain stability. We have been reminded, too, that food can be more effective than guns or propaganda in the campaign against the Communist infiltrators who are competing with the forces of democracy in all of the new countries and some of the older ones.

But the argument for use of more food in foreign relations is heard today in a more favorable climate than has existed in the past.

Congress has faced this year's foreign aid bill without anywhere near the dissent that has marked debate of every foreign aid bill since Harry Truman launched the Marshall plan and followed it with the Point Four program.

Time magazine, which has never hesitated to criticize various aspects of foreign aid, takes a look at the broad sweep of events since the end of World War II and concludes that "Americans think the world a little healthier with U.S. help and think the United States a little healthier, too."

(Time also reported that President Johnson looks to few people for advice in foreign affairs with more trust and confidence than he looks to Barbara Ward, the brilliant British economist. Miss Ward argues with eloquence and logic that there is no hope for a world divided between rich nations and poor nations, and Lyndon Johnson seems to listen.)

The National Broadcasting Co. took a full evening on September 7 to look at foreign policy from every possible angle. While this was essentially a reporting program, it was presented in a tone generally approving the directions of those who would make liberal use of our surplus food production as an implement of diplomacy.

What we see, in effect, is a sort of coming of age of the whole concept of foreign aid and a growing acceptance that American agriculture can and should be called on for a bigger role in it.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 4, 1965]

UNITED STATES URGED TO DECLARE WORLD WAR ON FAMINE

(By Saville R. Davis, staff correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor)

WASHINGTON, October 4, 1965.—"We ought to declare an all-out war against hunger on this planet," says South Dakota's Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, "and do it now."

"The number of people is outracing the amount of food available at an almost unbelievable rate," he says. "In the next 35 years the population of the world will double—from 3 billion to 6 billion. And the food supply is not going up significantly.

"The enormous food gap in prospect is the No. 1 problem of the last third of the 20th century," the Senator contends.

"Hunger and malnutrition are serious enough today. But major starvation will be the most painful fact of life on this planet within 10 years, unless we start today to tackle it."

The American people are not aware of the facts, Senator MCGOVERN said in an interview. They still think of large American surpluses when in fact these are sharply reduced and approaching dangerously low levels. They see great efforts being made to produce birth-control programs, but these cannot be expected to solve the problem in time.

"Our position of moral leadership will not permit us to turn our backs on this problem. Nor will our national security. Much of the tension and unrest that open the way for violent upheavals and Communist inroads have their roots in hunger and misery."

Senator MCGOVERN has a bill before Congress to attack this problem. It would turn American farms back from crop controls to deliberately stimulated production.

"If we begin now to divert a portion of the $2 billion annual farm control budget into the purchase, shipment, and distribution of farm commodities abroad, where they are needed, we could double our food-for-peace effort with little increase in overall expense."

The McGovern bill would spend $500 million next year for three purposes:

To purchase needed nutritious foods in the United States for distribution abroad.

To help the receiving countries to store and distribute the food more efficiently, with better facilities.

Greatly to strengthen the food-producing capacity of farm people in the underdeveloped world, by all available technical and educational means.

A similar sum would be added each year for 6 years. The total would then equal the amount spent on foreign aid of all sorts by the United States in the coming year.

FARMERS CORPS SUGGESTED

But the switch from negative cropland restriction to a program of stimulating production in the United States would be a strong stimulus to the American economy, Mr. MCGOVERN said.

One of the Senator's more intriguing suggestions is that of an American farmers corps, not unlike the Peace Corps except that its members would have high professional ability.

It would consist of "retired farmers or working farmers willing to take leave of their own farms for a time."

They would go out like the highly successful agricultural county agents in the United States, as teachers who can show how as well as tell how, and who know how to combine new technology with old skills.

"When I was food-for-peace director under President Kennedy," he recalled, "I reached the conviction that the most overwhelming paradox of our time was to permit half the human race to be hungry while we struggle to cut back on surplus production.

"The sciences have broken the space barrier, at a cost heading toward $20 billion, but not the bonds of hunger."

The Senator based many of his facts on the rapidly enlarging hunger gap on a new official study of the situation by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

It compared for the first time, it is said, comprehensive figures on population growth with similarly careful figures on expectable food production.

OWN RESERVES CHECKED

A typical conclusion: In Asia, merely to maintain present meager diets, yields per acre must increase by more than 50 percent between now and 1980. This would require an annual use of an additional amount of fertilizer that would nearly equal the world's entire output of fertilizer today.

For many Americans, however, the Senator's account of the present state of American farm surpluses will be equally surprising.

"They are not much above the level, now, that is needed for our own national reserves," he said. For example: Wheat stocks have been worked down from 1.4 billion bushels at the start of this decade to 800 million bushels today. Corn and other feed grain supplies have been sharply reduced.

The present composite reserve of wheat and feed grains is scarcely equal to 6 months' consumption in the United States.

Senator MCGOVERN recalled that President Johnson recently suggested that Congress build a food reserve. If this were done on a 6-month supply basis, the present food-for-peace program of American aid abroad would have to be eliminated, or American farm production sharply enlarged.

Senator MCGOVERN wants the United States to work with and through the United Nations, as well as on its own, in the big enterprise that he recommends. The effort will have to be cooperative and international, he said.

Senator MCGOVERN, coming from a farm State as he does, is aware of the great complexity of the task of helping other countries with their farm production. The collapse of the high hopes for technical assistance after the last world war, he agrees, are illustration enough.

He mentions, as reasons why these hopes were not justified, the lack of an all-round approach to the problem: lack of rural education, adequate credit, forms of land ownership that reward incentive, rural extension services, farm-to-market roads or cash markets for produce. He blames the shortage of fertilizer, pesticides, good irrigation facilities, and methods, hybrid seed and feed-mixing equipment—and the knowledge to apply them.

UNITED STATES SEEN DISCARDING FARM CURBS TO FEED WORLD POPULATION GAIN—DEERE OFFICIAL EXPECTS MUCH OF RISE IN NEXT 15 YEARS TO COME IN LEAST PRODUCTIVE AREAS

CHICAGO.—World geographic factors may cause the United States to discard agricultural restraints and gear up to help feed a 40 percent increase in world population expected in the next 15 years, William A. Hewitt, chairman of Deere & Co., said.

"Never before has world agriculture faced such a challenge in providing the basic necessities of food and fiber as it will in the next 15 years," Mr. Hewitt said in a talk before the American Agricultural Editors' Association. "The challenge is unprecedented because the world has reached a turning point in land availability and use."

Mr. Hewitt, recently named to President Johnson's National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber, said one of the most alarming facts of the population explosion is that a major portion of the increase is coming in the very regions that are least equipped to feed themselves.

"Asia, Africa and Latin America were all net exporters of grain prior to World War II. Now they are net importers. Ultimately less-developed countries must raise their agricultural yields. But it will require time, the infusion of large amounts of capital they don't have now and such new technology as desalinization of sea water. In the meantime, they face a severe threat of famine unless they have outside help."

He said a combination of soil, climate and technological development will force upon the United States, Canada and Western Europe a major responsibility for feeding the world's burgeoning population.

"The most productive agricultural regions in the world fall between the 30th and 55th parallels. Outside those latitudes, productive agricultural capacity falls off sharply due to inadequate soils or climate, or both," Mr. Hewitt said.

Within the Communist world in the favorable latitudes, only Eastern Europe, the Russian Ukraine and limited parts of Red China approach comparable agricultural potential, and they have been unable even to provide enough food for the Communist world, he said. Major portions of Asia, in these latitudes, have inadequate rainfall or poor-quality soils or are rough or mountainous. And even some of the Asian areas with reasonably productive soils and climate are severely limited in agricultural capacity by lack of capital and technology and by a whole host of constraining traditions and institutions, he noted.

"Adding up the primary land for farm production, we arrive at this startling conclusion: The world must depend for a major portion of its agricultural production, at least in the next 15 years, primarily on 4 percent of the earth's total land area, and very little of this 4 percent is in regions where population is growing most rapidly," Mr. Hewitt said.

He went on: "It could be that within the next 15 years American agriculture may even have to discard some of the restraints built up by our continuing struggle with surpluses over the years and instead gear up to help feed the world." While noting that exporting food and fiber is a complex matter involving world politics, diplomacy and other considerations, he said the Nation should

evaluate its tremendous agricultural productive capacity as a "potential new diplomatic tool for human relief."

The Deere chairman said U.S. economic and military aid has already done much, first to rebuild the war-torn countries after World War II and more recently to defend the free world against communism's inroads. "But hunger still abounds and threatens to grow worse. For the future, food, more than guns, promises to become our major weapon for peace—a weapon the Communist world cannot hope to match," he added.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 5, 1965]

UNITED STATES URGED TO SPUR FARM OUTPUT TO ALLEVIATE WORLD FOOD CRISIS

(By Felix Belair, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, December 4.—A dramatic reversal of national agricultural policy is urged in a report by a select panel of businessmen, educators, economists, nutritionists, and Federal officials.

The panel recommends that farmers produce more, instead of less, to help meet the world food crisis.

The report, now quietly making the rounds of top Government levels, proposes a direct linking up of the productive capacity of American agriculture—the most efficient farm system in the world—to the Nation's foreign policy objectives, including economic aid to underdeveloped countries.

Several months in preparation, the report calls for the return to cultivation of all or part of 50 million idle acres capable of producing 40 million tons of grain that farmers now are being induced not to plant.

The report looks to a gradual phasing out of the present complicated system of price supports and other subsidies and to eventual reliance on the marketplace for producer rewards.

Existing price support programs would be retained during an indefinite transition period to keep a floor under farm income.

But the $1.7 billion annual cost of the food-for-peace program, which disposes of surplus commodities abroad for local currencies, would be assigned to the foreign policy budget instead of the domestic farm policy budget as at present, along with any additional costs.

The report attempts to define the elements of a U.S. food policy in relation to world food needs. It had its inception in a week-long seminar last July at the Center for Research and Education at Estes Park, Colo.

FINANCED BY FOUNDATION

Cochairmen of these sessions were Prof. Roger Revelle, director of the Harvard Center for Population Studies, and Richard W. Reuter, special assistant to the President and Director of the Office of Food for Peace, which was recently transferred to the State Department.

Thirty other representatives of various disciplines took part in the study, which was financed by the Rockefeller Foundation.

In terms of food and mouths to feed, the report reached these overall conclusions:

"1. Under any circumstances, the population of the developing countries is destined to increase very rapidly for at least the next 10 to 15 years. To meet this rapid increase in population, efforts in food production both in the Western countries and the developing countries, must be dramatically increased.

"2. The reproductive potential will rise so high by 1980 that a continuing rate of reproduction at present levels would presage worldwide disaster.

"3. It is essential that means be found to reduce the rate of population growth drastically in two-thirds of the world. Unless this is done, there is scant possibility that the food crisis can be resolved.

"4. A massive and intensive parallel campaign, both in food production and in population control, is essential to the future peace and welfare of mankind."

Such arrangements, it said, should require increased food production by recipient countries, including more intensive use of fertilizers and pesticides and the introduction of new lands into cultivation.

The report urged a tougher approach by this Government in negotiating agreements, through the food-for-peace program, to ship food abroad at bargain prices.

Negotiators for the United States should insist on greater use of fertilizer whether locally manufactured or imported, the report said, and should demand that the price policies of recipient underdeveloped countries be revised where necessary to provide greater incentives to food producers and distributors.

The report cited United Nations estimates that the world's population, now about 3.5 billion, would increase to 4.6 billion by 1980 and to some 6 billion by the year 2000. About 85 percent of this increase would be in the underdeveloped countries.

Projecting present average food production into the immediate future and without allowing for any increase in nutritional standards, the report estimated the food deficit of developing countries at 30 million tons in 1970 and 48 million tons in 1980. The estimated deficit takes into account mainland China.

The panel made no finding as to the amount by which nutritional standards should be increased in the developing countries.

But it said that if there was no increase, there would be a significant rise in the number of children, now put at 3 million, who die every year from protein-calorie malnutrition and in "the many more millions who are retarded in the physiological development by this condition."

"These malnourished, retarded survivors are major deterrents to the future social and economic development of their countries," the report said. "They will be the retarded young adults of 1985."

The study made the point, in stressing the need for increased local food production and for population control, that even if the more advanced nations had supplies available "the world's shipping and distribution facilities are inadequate for the large food transfers that would be needed.

"U.S. surplus today more and more exists in its capacity to produce than in accumulated stocks," the panel said. To harness the capacity of the American farm plant to the Nation's foreign policy objectives, it argued, would only give official recognition to the facts as they are.

"As far as the future is concerned," it said, "surplus disposal is not the real problem; rather it is a distraction from the real problem—how can American agriculture aid in meeting the needs of the less-developed countries?"

"Certainly American agriculture can help meet this challenge," the panel declared. "It can do it primarily by planning production, not on the basis of what is easy to produce, but on the basis of what the world needs."

[From the New York Times, Dec. 5, 1965]

INDIA TELLS OF RISING NEED

NEW DELHI, INDIA, December 4.—A delegation of U.S. Congressmen has been told that India will need a substantial increase in imported food grains to meet its food crisis following a disastrous drought.

Representative CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Democrat, of Wisconsin, told a news conference here this evening that the delegation was informed India might need about 12 million tons of wheat and rice next year, compared with present annual imports of about 8 million tons.

[From Business Week, Dec. 18, 1965]

UNITED STATES SHAPES FIGHT ON WORLD HUNGER: THREATENED FAMINES IN INDIA AND OTHER HUNGRY NATIONS HAVE LONG-TERM IMPLICATIONS FOR AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY, INTERNATIONAL POLITICS, FARM ECONOMY AND FOR BUSINESSMEN

The ugly threat of famine in India this winter is bringing to a head pressures in Washington for a radically new approach to the world food problem.

It is now almost certain that these pressures will shift the philosophy of the food-for-peace program from the negative one of surplus disposal to the positive one of producing to fill world needs. Tied to that will be a much more hard-headed effort to use U.S. food as a prod and a lure to induce food-hungry nations to boost their own output.

Implications: Immediate impact of the shift in food strategy probably won't be great. It will take time to turn the food-for-peace program around, to gear it into the foreign aid program, to retool domestic farm policies to mesh with world needs. It will take money, too. And President Johnson's hand is tightening on the Federal purse-strings as economic demands of the war in Vietnam mount.

Longer term though, the burgeoning world food crisis and the probable U.S. response to it will have profound implications for U.S. foreign policy, for international politics, for the American farm economy, and—not least—for U.S. business.

Focus point: There is no doubt that the Indian emergency has dramatized the long-recognized threat of an impending world food crisis and created a new sense of urgency—and hope—in Washington about meeting it.

Johnson is moving fast to try to head off mass starvation in India. Last week, he authorized shipment of 1.5 million tons of food grains from surplus stocks. That's three times average recent monthly shipments to India. It is expected that more will be made available as needed—and as Indian ports and distribution facilities are able to handle it.

Linked to the speedup in surplus food deliveries was a $50 million long-term U.S. loan to India to buy U.S. fertilizer. This was tied to an Indian government agreement to spend a matching $50 million of its own scarce foreign exchange to buy more fertilizer on the world market. This transfusion of fertilizer could boost India's grain output by as much as 3 to 4 million tons next year.

I. INDIA'S CRISIS

Millions of people may starve in India this winter despite the best efforts of the United States and Indian Governments. The estimated shortfall of grain production is 10 to 12 million tons—about twice normal U.S. annual food-for-peace shipments. Normal capacity of Indian ports to handle food deliveries is about 700,000 tons—though that has been boosted on a crash basis to as much as 900,000 tons during past food crises. The internal distribution system also is overloaded, with surpluses in some places and famine in others. Hoarding as usual is adding to the grim prospect.

This year, a drought caught India by surprise. It is said to be the worst of the century and is ruining what had promised to be a good harvest. But the longer term outlook is alarming. India still is supplying only 90 percent of its food needs. It already is consuming 20 percent of the U.S. wheat crop. With population expanding at a rate of more than 11 million a year, by 1970 that percentage could rise to 50 percent if drastic action isn't taken.

Fertilizer is first: To meet this longer term threat, Washington is stepping up the pressure—using India's mounting food needs as a lever—on New Delhi to overhaul its agricultural system. That means greatly increased storage—insects and rodents consume 20 percent of India's grain—use of pesticides, transportation, price reform to give farmers incentives and credit to permit them to respond to them.

Most important, it means fertilizer. Washington is pressing New Delhi hard to relax further its insistence on government control of the industry—and its prices—in order to encourage private foreign investors to build the capacity India desperately needs and can't afford to buy on its own account.

Fertilizer is the most urgent single need to boost India's farm output. India uses only 2.6 pounds per acre per year compared to 10 pounds in Russia, 36 pounds in the United States, and 246 pounds in Japan. It takes 5 to 9 years for the Indian Government to bring a plant into operation, compared to an average 18 months in the United States. And existing state-owned plants are operating at only 63 percent of capacity.

Two years ago, Bechtel Corp. approached the Indian Government with a package offer to build four of five fertilizer plants in India. The deal fell through when New Delhi refused to assure the U.S. companies of the price flexibility they felt they needed to make a reasonable profit.

Now India's thinking is changing under the threat of famine and United States urging. Agreement is reported near on parts of the original Bechtel package. But India's need for fertilizer is so big that the country may have to go further than it is yet willing to go.

II. DWINDLING STOCKS

The threat of famine in India comes at what is already a time of decision for Washington on international food policy. Public Law 480, under which the food-for-peace program is operated, expires at the end of next year. Meanwhile, once bulging U.S. surpluses are rapidly disappearing. Indeed, surpluses of most of those farm commodities that the hungry nations need are down to or below levels that the Agriculture Department deems "prudent" to maintain as national reserves.

Some action thus is demanded next year. The United States obviously cannot and will not taper off food shipments as the need is growing desperate. But with the food-for-peace program scraping the bottom of the surplus bins, the program clearly will have to be put on a new basis.

Alternatives: A recent, still secret U.S. Government study indicates that even on the optimistic assumption that developing countries can slow their population growth rate by one-third by 1975, they are almost certain to face widespread starvation during the coming decade unless drastic steps are taken to redress the balance between food and people.

This week, Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, which represents nearly half of the Nation's farmers, seized upon the Indian famine to call for a greatly expanded food-for-peace program.

Last week Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, Democrat, of North Carolina, powerful chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, made a similar plea in Washington to the just formed Committee on the World Food Crisis. The committee includes leaders of the National Farmers Union and the National Grange.

COOLEY pledged to call hearings of his committee early next year to study expanded U.S. farm production to meet food needs abroad.

Earlier, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee had scheduled hearings on a bill introduced this year by Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, Democrat, of South Dakota, former food-for-peace director. This would call for scrapping the present food-for-peace program and launching a new program based on the Government buying in the marketplace foods needed abroad.

President's plan: Johnson's position at this point is not clear. Last month, he was on the point of announcing an expansion and overhaul of the food-for-peace program. But, angered by a news leak the day before he planned to make the announcement, he delayed making it.

His program at that time called for integrating the food-for-peace program tightly into the overall U.S. foreign aid program. It would have linked food for peace more closely to self-help measures to improve farm production in receiving nations. Food would be withheld from governments that failed to launch effective agricultural development programs.

At the same time, proceeds of sales of U.S. food would be channeled into technical assistance for agriculture, use of food for wages in farm development programs would be stepped up. U.S. food could be used to cushion reforms in pricing and marketing policies, or given to farmers to induce them to take the risks of trying new methods.

Vietnam problem: There are reports too, that the mounting costs of the war in Vietnam are giving Johnson pause before embarking upon a potentially costly expansion of the food-for-peace program. COOLEY hopes and Shuman asserts that such an expanded effort could be financed largely out of savings of funds now spent for curtailing farm production. COOLEY points out, for example, that under the new farm bill as much as $900 million could be spent over the next 4 years by the Federal Government for retiring cropland from production.

But many USDA officials are skeptical. And MCGOVERN sets the cost of his program at $500 million a year initially, rising by that sum each year to a ceiling of $3.5 billion.

Officials have only begun to look closely at the problems that would be posed by the sort of expanded food-for-peace program being suggested by MCGOVERN. But they clearly would not be simple to resolve.

[From the London Times, Nov. 23, 1965]

FAO GETS WARNING ON WORLD HUNGER—NEXT DECADE THE VITAL PERIOD

Mr. B. R. Sen, the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization's director-general, and Professor Gunnar Myrdal, the Swedish economist, warned the FAO conference here today of the urgent need to avert the increase in hunger that was threatening to arise in the next decade or so. The distant future, Professor Myrdal pointed out, would probably take care of itself but the next few years were the ones which worried him.

Mr. Sen said the situation in general was alarming. Drawing attention to the obvious gap between the FAO's objectives and the realities of the world situation, he stated that in some of the most heavily populated areas the outbreak of serious famines within the next 5 to 6 years could not be excluded.

LAWLESS HUNTING

The answer might eventually be found in technological advance. It was known that yields could be multiplied many times if existing knowledge in agricultural sciences could be even partially adapted and applied to tropical conditions.

Besides this, large resources of land and water still remained unexploited. The oceans continued to be subject to lawless hunting by man, though, properly husbanded, they could provide rich and inexhaustible harvests. The scientists were holding out vistas of practically limitless food supplies at some future time from such new sources as chemical synthesis, fermentation and micro-organisms.

These glittering prospects should not blind us to the realities of the immediate situation. Today 10 to 15 percent of the world's population was undernourished and up to half suffered from hunger, malnutrition or both, and the numbers were increasing daily. The necessary rate of increase in food production to avoid serious breakdown had not been reached in the underdeveloped regions during the past decade.

Measures covering a wide field of economic and social policy would have to be taken to break the cycle of self-perpetuating poverty. In assessing priorities, agriculture must be given first place—crash programs of industrialization, however attractive politically, could not meet the essential conditions for economic growth unless based on a parallel development in agriculture. The main aim should be a higher rate of agricultural productivity in the developing countries.

Explaining the reasons for agriculture's disappointing performance, Mr. Sen said the greatest single obstacle to increased farm production in developing countries was the lack of any real incentives to farmers. Increased production often seemed to the farmers too risky to justify additional effort and costs. Especially serious was the instability of farm prices, particularly after the harvest when most farmers had to sell their surplus to pay off debts.

Professor Myrdal, delivering the McDougall lecture, knocked home some of Mr. Sen's points with vigor. He estimated the sum spent on armaments and war preparations throughout the world, largely by the advanced countries, at more than $200,000 million. This was larger than the total national incomes of all non-Communist underdeveloped countries. Contrary to expectations 10 years ago, not only grants and concessional loans but also the total flow of financial resources had leveled off. The situation had grown tighter because the rich countries could not agree among themselves on how to secure exchange stability and world liquidity.

They create for themselves the illusion of being short of international funds by lack of proper planning in their internal affairs and inadequacy of their own central banking and monetary cooperation. The preservation of internal and external balance in the economic development of rich countries does not, in my opinion, constitute insoluble technical problems. This is a field where policies are dangerously lagging behind our available knowledge.

What the underdeveloped countries could demand was not only freer access to markets but a discrimination in their favor. "Such a discrimination would only tend to restore a measure of world balance."

EQUALIZATION AT HOME

There was a growing popular apathy toward a more generous policy to benefit poor countries. This was partly caused by success in spreading knowledge of the problems. It had been simplified to the extent of becoming "coined into commonplaces." There was also the feeling that the spokesmen for the poor countries, who mostly belonged to the privileged strata, "should do some equalization at home before they appeal for more international solidarity."

On land tenure, he said a substantial and rapid increase in agriculture yields has rarely if ever occurred in traditional self-sufficiency farming where illiteracy was prevalent and the relation between the farmer and his land was such that he had little possibility and little incentive to exert himself.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Dec. 14, 1965]

FARM GROUP URGES END TO USE OF U.S. FOOD SURPLUS AS FOREIGN AID—INSTEAD, FARM BUREAU HEAD SAYS, GOVERNMENT SHOULD BUY SUCH HUNGER RELIEF ON OPEN MARKET

CHICAGO.—The Government should purchase food for overseas hunger relief on the open market at going prices, rather than using Federal farm surpluses, the head of the Nation's largest farmers' organization suggested.

In a speech to the annual convention of the American Farm Bureau Federation here, Charles B. Shuman, president of the 1.7-million-member organization, noted that the U.S. food-for-peace program will be up for congressional review next year.

In this revision, the surplus-disposal aspect should be discontinued," he said, "and the food-aid needs should be purchased on the domestic market at the going market price. These purchases of grain, cotton, dairy, livestock, fruit, and vegetable products would quickly strengthen market prices and assure the resource adjustments needed," Mr. Shuman said.

The food-for-peace program, enacted in 1954, has been primarily a surplus-disposal device, but "it has been increasingly used for foreign aid," Mr. Shuman said.

Changes in the food-for-peace plan could lead to the farm bureau's long-sought goal of scrapping Federal programs to control farm output, Mr. Shuman said. "If the market price is given the opportunity to respond to foreign-aid demand, it should be possible to discontinue the present control programs and price supports could be used only as originally intended—to stabilize marketing, not to fix prices," he said.

Other results of such a change in food for peace, Mr. Shuman suggested, could be "huge reductions in farm program costs," an elimination of losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Agriculture Department's marketing arm, and large cuts in administrative expenses.

The Government also should tie its food aid to an international promotion of capitalism, Mr. Shuman said. Asserting that "socialism and hunger are irrevocably associated," he said, "the world desn't need to starve if the underdeveloped areas can be induced to accept the incentive method of capital formation—competitive capitalism."

He said, "Further extension of food aid by the United States should be conditioned upon the willingness of the recipient country to replace government management of agriculture with a market-price system."

Despite its farm abundance, "the United States can't feed the world. We need to inquire into the causes of hunger in a world that has ample resources to feed any foreseeable population level," Mr. Shuman said. He concluded that socialism must be blamed for world hunger because it is "the one common denominator" that applies to nearly all hungry nations.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Nov. 17, 1965]

REPERCUSSIONS HINTED IN U.S. FOOD PLAN

(By Josephine Ripley)

WASHINGTON.—An expansion of the food-for-peace program, such as President Johnson is reported to have in mind, could have major repercussions down on the farm, and even in the kitchen, in the opinion of authorities here.

They admit that it could, and may well, result in a radical change in the present far-flung farm program and even raise prices to the consumer.

If the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture is authorized to go into the open market to buy the food required for expanded foreign assistance, as contemplated, in all probability it would bid up the price.

"Yes, I would say it would affect consumer prices to some extent, though not radically," acknowledged one authority close to the scene.

For the Secretary of Agriculture to buy in the open market instead of reaching for Government surpluses is a sensational new development.

But the fact is, surpluses in most commodities have been reduced to the point where they are hardly more than those necessary for a strategic reserve.

As an example, the Commodity Credit Corporation had a carryover of 1,400 million bushels of wheat in 1961. It is down to 800,000 bushels now.

The Secretary has already been given authority, under the farm bill of 1965, to buy dairy products for domestic and foreign assistance programs in the market.

A bill introduced last summer by Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, Democrat, of South Dakota, would give the Secretary added authority to buy needed food products in the open market if Government-held surpluses are not sufficient for domestic and foreign-aid distribution.

FOREIGN POLICY INSTRUMENT

This same bill also authorizes the adjustment of production controls so that farmers could put more land into crops, if needed.

All this represents a sudden and dramatic reversal of farm policy, one which could shake American agriculture to its foundations.

Behind it is an inner council decision to make far more extensive use of food as an instrument of foreign policy.

The President's plan—withheld from announcement when it was divulged prematurely in a newspaper story—would, in effect, integrate the food-for-peace program with other economic aid.

It would call for increased efforts to encourage agricultural development in the food-deficient countries.

Food for peace now is paid for in the currency of the receiving country, although some is purchased with dollars. The President would like to see more dollar payments and hopes to encourage that through making long-term credit available.

The long-term objective is to stimulate the economies of these less-developed countries and create new customers for U.S. products.

STIMULATION SOUGHT

A recent study shows that "when per capita income in the less-developed countries increases 10 percent, dollar sales of U.S. farm products go up 21 percent."

As for a possible "food shortage" in the United States as a result of reduced surpluses, Secretary Freeman recently termed that suggestion "silly."

At the same time, it is recalled by others that the President said last January he would send up a bill to establish security reserves for food. He did not follow through, however, because, as one authority explained, "he discovered if we put aside substantial reserves, there would not be any surplus to be used for food for peace."

TASK FORCE SET UP

The President, in his plans for a bigger, broader food for peace drive, is acting on the advice of a task force composed of representatives of the Department of Agriculture, Food for Peace, and the Agency for International Development.

The task force is understood to "lean toward the McGovern bill." However, the President will send up his own legislation, possibly preceded by a special message to Congress.

A special committee on the world food crises now is being formed, headed by James Patton, head of the National Farmers Union. It will have its first meeting here early in December. The committee's purpose—to work for the passage of the President's food for peace program.

[From the Kansas City Star, Oct. 13, 1965]

FARM OUTPUT CRUCIAL: SENATOR FRANK CARLSON OF KANSAS TELLS FFA SESSION THAT WORLD AGRICULTURE IS SHRINKING IN FACE OF EXPANDING POPULATION

Senator FRANK CARLSON, Republican, of Kansas, told the Nation's future food producers here today that agriculture now faces history's most crucial problems—an expanding population and shrinking food supply.

He told the young farmers that substantial increases in food production will be required in all parts of the world to feed a doubled world citizenry expected within 35 years.

AT FFA SESSION

CARLSON spoke at the opening session of the 38th convention of the Future Farmers of America at the municipal auditorium.

"The population of the world is growing even more rapidly than ever and it is very uncertain at this stage whether the world will be able to feed its increasing population in the next 10 to 15 years," the speaker said.

He said, however, that the problem should be attacked on two fronts—sharing the U.S. food abundance abroad, and increasing production in underdeveloped countries.

CARLSON said sharing this country's food more effectively should be a short-term effort over the next 10 or 15 years.

"This will require," he said, "not only stepping up our production at home—which is the easy part of the task—it will require more technical guidance to the receiving countries in building up their port unloading and handling facilities—their storage structures and the entire system of food distribution.

"I believe we can profitably double our existing programs of food production for export."

FARM PICTURE BRIGHT

CARLSON called the U.S. farm production and export situation "the most encouraging agricultural picture we have had in many years."

He said the second front in the war on hunger is the urgent need for rapid acceleration of food production abroad.

"We must assist the underdeveloped countries in the world to undertake the kind of agricultural revolution which we have experienced in the last 100 years," he said. "There is an urgent need for the knowledge and skills of our agricultural technicians—research scientists—extension workers and experienced farmers."

He said although such aid is not cheap, it is "less costly than military hardware."

A POWERFUL TOOL

"Food abundance is a powerful instrument capable of replacing despair with hope and converting the seeds of violence into the foundations of peace.

"It is a matter of concern to us," he said, "because a hungry world is a world of turbulence, fraught with danger. It is a world of instability and unrest and breeds wars.

"Our Nation," the speaker concluded, "has never had a greater opportunity to demonstrate its Christian principles."

[From the Enid Morning News, Nov. 14, 1965]

POPULATION EXPLOSION MAY CAUSE FOOD SHORTAGE SOON

In 1789 England's Rev. Thomas R. Malthus stated as part of his premise that

trouble for the world was ahead in this manner:

"First, that food is necessary to the existence of man. Second, that the passion between the sexes is necessary, and will remain nearly in its present state."

For 150 years, most of the world scoffed at his warning that man would outpropagate his capacity to feed himself. But today there is chilling evidence that that time has arrived.

Consider: Almost one-half of the world's 3.3 billion people go to bed each night either hungry or grossly ill fed. By the year 2000, before today's children have reached middle age, that 3.3 billion will have multiplied to 7.4 billion. The Population Reference Bureau views this as calamitous.

More than 85 percent of those new 4.1 billion will be born in Africa, Asia, and Latin America which now suffer the greatest food deficiencies. And today's well-fed world, western Europe and North America, will continue in a lopsided advantageous position. Three million children die each year because inadequate food spawns or encourages fatal diseases. Concerned officials are just beginning to find out to what extent. Latin America, Africa, and Asia all are hollow shells of food production. The entire world's expandable arable land area is estimated at only about 5 percent.

Russia, potentially one of the world's great food producers, now has a potential desert of millions of acres as a result of former Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev's disastrous virgin lands program. Those lands were suited only for light grazing but plowing loosened to the winds the irreplaceable layers of topsoil.

VOICES OF CONCERN

The strokes for this bleak picture come from the Food for Peace Office, the Agriculture Department, the Population Reference Bureau, and the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization.

Others are added by Senator GEORGE S. MCGOVERN, Democrat, of South Dakota, advocate of a tangible program to feed the world's people; Thomas Ware, chairman of the Freedom From Hunger Foundation, and Prof. Nevin S. Scrimshaw, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

The so-called developed countries—North America, Europe, the Soviet Union, Japan, and Oceania—are blessed with two vital factors in the face of survival: control of fertility and ability to produce food.

In those countries the balance between births and deaths has resulted in a relatively slower rate of population growth. Their birth rates range from 17 to 25 for each 1,000 persons.

But in the "developing" countries the birth rate runs from 39 to 50 for each 1,000.

"It is the 2.4 billion people in these countries who are most acutely caught in the looming population crisis," the Population Reference Bureau, a non-Government agency, said. "There is an ardent hope that general decline in fertility is imminent in the developing countries. New fertility-control techniques enhance this possibility."

LATIN AMERICAN RATE HIGHEST

Latin America's annual population growth rate of almost 2.5 percent is the highest for a single area. At that pace its 248 million people will double in 29 years.

By comparison, Europe's rate has been only 0.7 percent for 35 years, and the same rate is expected for the next 35 years.

Asia's annual growth rate of 1.4 percent is expected to rise to 2.5 by 2000, giving it an overall population of about 4 billion—a billion more than the present entire world population.

It is too early to tell what results birth control programs will produce. Japan, with legalized abortions, has brought its growth rate under some degree of control. Nationalist China and South Korea are well along that road. India is beginning.

Whatever happens, overall population growth is not expected to be stopped, short of a nuclear war involving most of the major countries.

With the acceptance as fact that more and more people are coming, the next question is, Where will they get food?

Thomas Ware told a Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee in June that only 3.5 percent, or less than 4 billion acres of the world surface, is capable of growing food. And that land is constantly threatened by erosion from deforestation, exhaustion, war, and unscientific use.

Ware urged more use of fertilizer, better seeds and tools, weed and pest controls, better distribution systems and greater use of the sea as a source of food.

Most of all, Ware urged concerted action—by governments, private agencies, and individuals.

INTERNATIONAL HEAD PROPOSED

MCGOVERN, backed by Senator GAYLORD NELSON, Democrat, of Wisconsin, has offered a beginning—a bill to establish an international food and nutrition director.

The measure, which MCGOVERN terms a 10-year war against want, would authorize $500 million annually with which the President would buy U.S. foods to be sold, exchanged, or donated to needy nations.

The legislation has been assigned to the Foreign Relations Committee. A companion measure has been introduced in the House.

MCGOVERN estimates that only about 75 percent of U.S. cropland capacity is in use but yields per acre continue to rise. Feed grains now need only 2 acres for the same yields that required 3 acres just 5 years ago. Similar increases have been made for wheat and rice.

No one believes the United States can feed all of the hungry world. But it can contribute and, with other governments, can provide the food. But quantity is not enough.

The food-for-peace office tells of a Guatemalan girl who was so ill nourished that she weighed only 55 pounds at age of 11. A baby in Colombia reached only 5 pounds in 9 months.

Professor Scrimshaw said that malnutritions kills one-third to one-half or more of the children before age 5 in many developing countries. He said that nutritional advances must accompany greater food output if starvation is not to be replaced only by illness and disease.

FEAR OF WORLD FAMINE IS VOICED BY FOOD EXPERT

(NOTE.—While America cuts food production, hundreds of millions in the world are starving. Former Food-for-Peace Director GEORGE MCGOVERN, now a U.S. Senator, warns that if a crash program is not developed to greatly raise world food output, mass famine will occur in the next decade.)

PULLMAN, WASH., November 21, 1965.—Mass starvation on a scale never before experienced by the human race will stalk undeveloped nations by 1975 unless drastic steps are taken immediately to increase world food production.

That is not rhetoric. It is the sober prediction of a well-informed man, Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, Democrat, of South Dakota.

MCGOVERN was U.S. Food-for-Peace Director before his election to the Senate in 1962. He has continued to take a close personal interest in the developing world food gap and probably knows as much about it as any man alive. He is greatly troubled by what he knows.

"Unless we do a great deal more than we're now doing to increase food production in this country and abroad," he said, "mass starvation will be the most painful fact of life on this planet within 10 years."

PROBLEM STRESSED

The South Dakota Senator said hunger is already a much more serious problem than most well-fed Americans realize.

"Half a billion people go hungry every day of their lives," he said. "Another billion are undernourished, because of a shortage of protein in their diet. At least 3 million children die of malnutrition every year."

You don't see much of this in America. This country, Canada, Western Europe, Australia, New Zealand, and parts of Argentina and southeast Asia have adequate food supplies. But in other parts of Asia, Latin America, Africa, and the Middle East, there simply is not enough food to go around.

Moreover, the situation in these areas is growing steadily worse, because population is growing much faster than food production.

NEED TO PERSIST

Even if the undeveloped nations should begin tomorrow to take drastic and effective measures to curb population growth, their need for increased food supplies would remain desperate.

Consider India for example. It has already launched a vigorous birth control program. But by the most conservative estimates, its population can be expected to increase during the next 15 years from 450 million to more than 600 million. Yet India's food production is already inadequate for the existing population—and is increasing hardly at all.

Can't we ship some of our surplus U.S. farm commodities over there to feed the hungry Indians?

"We're already doing that on a substantial scale," MCGOVERN said. "But food reserves in the United States and other food surplus countries are by no means as large as commonly believed. Our national farm policies have been aimed for years at reducing production. We've taken 50 million acres of cropland out of cultivation. As a result of Government controls, we have worked down our farm surplus stocks to a level little above that needed for our own national reserves.

"For example, we now have only 800 million bushels of wheat in storage. That wouldn't meet our own requirements for 8 months if we had a crop failure. And it wouldn't be a drop in the bucket if we began to encounter worldwide famine."

MCGOVERN said the time has come to reverse the direction of U.S. farm policy and begin "stepping up production instead of cutting it down."

"I think we ought to be deliberately producing surplus farm commodities for shipment overseas," he said. "I cannot believe the American people want to leave good cropland idle at public expense while hunger spreads across the world."

But American farms at best can satisfy only a fraction of the world's food needs, he said. "The most urgent need is for a rapid acceleration of food production abroad."

He proposed that the United States organize a farmers corps, rather like the Peace Corps, to show undeveloped countries how to get greater production per acre.

He said the United States should also provide funds for fertilizer, pesticides, irrigation development, hybrid seed, farm-to-market roads and other things which undeveloped nations need in order to carry out "an agricultural revolution like the one we've had during the last century."

"This type of aid is not cheap," he conceded. "But we are now spending more than $2 billion a year to reimburse farmers for retiring cropland and reducing production. If we began to divert a portion of that farm budget into the purchase, shipment and distribution of farm commodities abroad, we

could double our food-for-peace effort with little increase in overall expenditures.

"And the impact on the American economy would be much better than our present programs. Full farm production leads to the purchase of more farm machinery, more gasoline and tires, more trucks, more seed, fertilizer, and so on."

LEGISLATION OFFERED

McGOVERN has put his ideas into a bill which he calls "the international food and nutrition act." It would authorize a gradual increase in expenditures, reaching a maximum of $3.5 billion a year after 6 years, to purchase nutritious foods in U.S. markets for shipment overseas, and to undertake projects aimed at increasing food production in undeveloped countries.

Although he would prefer that Americans support such a program out of simple humanitarian concern for starving people, McGOVERN points out that a case can also be made for his bill as a weapon against Communist expansion.

"The unrest that opens the way for Communist inroads often has its roots in hunger," he said. "Helping poor countries raise their food production would be less expensive and much more constructive than shipping them arms."

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 7, 1965]

A HUNGRY WORLD'S BITING DEEP INTO OUR SURPLUSES

(By Carroll Kilpatrick, Washington Post staffwriter)

A subtle change in America's agriculture, combined with the rapid increase in world population, has created a problem that could be the principal issue in the next session of Congress. President Johnson has ordered a governmentwide study of the subject and is expected to make his recommendations a major part of his 1966 legislative program.

In simple terms, America's food surpluses—once a major political and economic problem—are being depleted while the demand for food elsewhere in the world is multiplying at an alarming rate.

Some experts think that the greatest issue the world faces for the remainder of this century is how to feed the hungry and to prevent a Malthusian calamity. Richard W. Reuter, director of the food-for-peace program, says that we face "a crisis of monumental proportions."

For years, America has thought of itself in terms of enormous food stocks: bulging wheat bins and mountains of potatoes, dairy products and feed grains.

But in recent years, commercial exports have risen, food-for-peace programs have expanded and the school lunch and acreage reduction programs have proved effective.

Reuter points out that many commodities are no longer in surplus, or at least not in "unlimited" surplus as they were a few years ago.

Cotton and tobacco now account for 40 percent of the Commodity Credit Corporation stocks. The major food item we have had in surplus—grains—has been reduced from 4.1 billion bushels 4 years ago to about 2.6 billion today. Rice, beans, vegetable oils, and butter are in such limited supply that they are no longer available for foreign donation programs.

There is one new surplus—a surplus of storage space. And there is a surplus of agricultural capacity.

The administration is tightlipped about its plans. But there is activity in half a dozen agencies in an attempt to devise proposals that the President can ask Congress to act on next year.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk addressed a private meeting of the Government's farm advisers the other day and warned them that the Nation's foreign and defense policies were involved in the food challenge.

The stark fact is that "the less-developed world is losing the ability to feed itself," Reuter says. Because of the huge population growth, "the underdeveloped countries are slipping backward in food production."

Unless the trend can be reversed, he warns, "there will be widespread starvation in little more than a decade. At this point in history, the struggle to overcome hunger in the world is a losing battle."

For the last 7 years, the growth of world population has been at a rate of about 2 percent annually. The growth of food production has been about 1 percent.

Malthus warned a century and a half ago of precisely this kind of threat. He believed that population tends to multiply faster than food supplies and that the inevitable result is more poverty, disease, and death.

America, Japan, and Europe may have escaped the Malthusian threat; most of the rest of the world has not. As Lester R. Brown has noted in a series of Agriculture Department reports, the problem is growing worse every year because the underdeveloped countries have run out of arable land.

There are new acres in this country that could be put into production if needed, whereas in many underdeveloped countries, especially in Asia, virtually all the arable land is in production now. The task in those lands is to increase yield, but more fertilizer, new methods, better seeds are needed.

In the United States, the need for more food has been met in recent years by an expanding yield per acre, not in finding new acres. One American farmer produces enough food for himself and 30 other persons; many farmers elsewhere do not produce enough to feed themselves.

The most far-reaching American proposals to meet the problem were put forward last summer by Senators GEORGE McGOVERN, Democrat, of South Dakota, and GAYLORD NELSON, Democrat, of Wisconsin. McGOVERN is a former director of the food-for-peace program. They would combine an effort to increase American production with a new attempt to help farmers in underdeveloped lands learn how to increase the yield per acre.

If American farmers would put into production land and resources now idle, they could produce a third more wheat, 25 percent more soybeans and 50 percent more milk, McGOVERN says. This added production could be used overseas where most needed without a drain on America's gold and dollar resources, McGOVERN believes.

Underdeveloped countries would pay the United States for these commodities with local currencies, and McGOVERN's plan would finance an intensive program to assist them to bring their productivity and populations into balance—thus defeating Malthus's law.

[From the New Haven Register, Aug. 29, 1965]

U.S. FARM SURPLUS FOR WORLD'S HUNGRY?

WASHINGTON.—For years, a bountiful America has struggled—and spent millions—to control its farm surpluses.

Now a farm State senator wants an about-face which would let farmers grow more food on more land and would distribute more of it to the world's hungry millions.

Led by Senator GEORGE S. McGOVERN, Democrat, of South Dakota, a group of midwestern Democrats in Congress contend it is neither sensible nor moral for the United States to follow a program of sharply curtailed food production when every day half a billion people go to bed hungry.

And they warn that strict Federal controls have reduced the Nation's food stockpiles to such a low point, that there are not enough of some of basic commodities to maintain a 6-month reserve for home consumption.

They admit that the problems in their plan could be many and complicated. But they argue that the results would be good for American farmers as well as for international relations. They believe President Johnson agrees.

The roots of the food-for-peace (FFP) program lie in a 1954 law which provides for the distribution of surplus U.S. crops to have-not nations. The food may be given, bartered, sold for the currency of the receiving nation, or bought through a 40-year American loan plan.

In 1961 the program was designated food for peace, with McGOVERN as its first director. But he found his office carried little authority. He resigned in 1962 to run for the Senate. But his 18-month exposure to FFP left its mark.

On one side of the world he had seen mass graves of those who had starved to death; children whose gaunt limbs and distended stomachs testified to their hunger, and some blind from lack of proper nourishment.

At home were millions of acres taken out of production in a continuing battle against too much food, even while farmers declared that their private economic depression could eventually engulf the cities.

President Johnson suggested in his farm message to Congress establishment of strategic reserves of food but he submitted no bill to accomplish this.

Representative CLAIR A. CALLAN, Democrat, of Nebraska, did so June 3 with a measure which called for reserves of food equal to half a year's requirements. According to his calculations, this would wreck the FFP program.

Under his proposal, for example, 600 million bushels of wheat would be kept on hand. That would leave only 41 million for distribution abroad.

Two weeks later McGOVERN submitted to the Senate an "International Food and Nutrition Act of 1965." It would authorize an additional $500 million of foods of all kinds, not merely those now surplus, for distribution to hungry nations.

The program would be increased at the rate of $500 million a year until it reached $3.5 billion in 10 years.

His bill went to the Foreign Relations Committee whose chairman, Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, has indicated he believes FFP should be stepped up from the mere dumping of surplus foods to providing the vitamins and proteins which hungry children require.

Support for his plan was forthcoming.

Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY promised whatever help he could give. Senator WALTER F. MONDALE, Democrat, of Minnesota, claimed that McGOVERN's plan would work for this country's own interests.

"For every 10 percent the less developed countries increase their income level, they expand their dollar purchases of our farm products by 16 percent," he said. "Italy, Japan, and Nationalist China have moved from the status of food aid recipients to major dollar customers for our farm exports." But some Members of Congress doubt that McGOVERN's proposal would do the job.

[From the Southwestern Miller, Dec. 14, 1965]

URGE LARGER FOOD CROPS—U.S. HESITATES—COMMITTEE ON THE WORLD FOOD CRISIS, FORMED IN WASHINGTON, SEEKS RETURN TO PRODUCTION OF 55 MILLION ACRES NOW WITHDRAWN—PLAN NATIONAL CAMPAIGN FOR CHANGE—UNDER SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE SCHNITTKER SEES NO NEED FOR PRESENT POLICY REVERSAL

WASHINGTON, December 13.—Foundations were laid in Washington Thursday for a national campaign to bring about a reversal in the present American Government policy of food crop controls that would release to production 55 million acres now

withdrawn through Federal payments and also halt further land retirement from food raising. The week also witnessed an assertion by Under Secretary of Agriculture John A. Schnittker that the Agriculture Department is well aware of the international food situation but sees no reason for relaxing the acreage limitations now in effect. The demand for acreage freeing for food was launched at a meeting at the Washington Hilton hotel which brought about the formation of the Committee on the World Food Crisis.

COOLEY DECLARES FOR CROP RISE

Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, Democrat, of North Carolina, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, a speaker at the Thursday meeting, supported the objectives of the return of farmland now withdrawn from food production. It is time for "an about-face" on domestic farm policy, Mr. COOLEY, a powerful figure on agriculture in Congress, declared at the meeting. Not only the 55 million acres, but land to be retired under the adjustment program of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 should come under the changes proposed. Mr. COOLEY said that the new land retirement plan, if not altered, could bring about the withdrawal of 40 million more acres of land in the next 10 years.

Mr. COOLEY also reported that he had informed President Johnson that he plans to hold hearings early in the next session of Congress on the development of a new program to expand production in the interest of the needy nations of the free world.

M'GOVERN FOR LESS CROP CONTROL

Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, Democrat, of South Dakota, former director of the food-for-peace program, who spoke at the afternoon session of the Thursday meeting, called for increased supplies of food for the needy over the world and outlined the legislation that he is sponsoring for the easing of crop controls with that objective. Hearings will be held early in January on this measure, he stated.

"There is no doubt in my mind that we can win the race against population and famine in the years ahead," Senator MCGOVERN said at the luncheon gathering of the organization meeting in introducing Paul Hoffman, who will head the new United Nations development program starting January 1. Mr. Hoffman addressed the luncheon.

"We have the tools and the knowledge to drive hunger from the earth within the next decade," Mr. MCGOVERN also said. "We can end this century with a better fed world than we have today in spite of population growth if we conduct the war against hunger with a fraction of the zeal and resources we now bring to military conflict."

SCHNITTKER POINTS TO LIMITATIONS

The Cooley declarations, in line with the general tenor of the speakers at the organization's meeting of the Committee on the World Food Crisis, were followed by a statement by Under Secretary Schnittker, in which he asserted that he saw no reason for a change in administration crop control policy at this time. Mr. Schnittker said in part:

"There are vast needs for American grains abroad, particularly in India, but there are limitations on the quantity we are able to supply. The major limitation is the ability of many needy countries, and this includes India, to handle, process, and distribute supplies."

FAILS TO BRING DELAY ON MEETING

It is reported that Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman had suggested that the meeting which formed the Committee on the World Food Crisis be delayed until a later date, or abandoned, pending the formulation of national administration policies now under study. The Agriculture Department was not represented at the meeting.

GRANGE MASTER IS CHAIRMAN

The meeting elected Herschel D. Newsom, master of the National Grange, as chairman of the new committee. James J. O'Connor of St. Joseph's College in Philadelphia, was named vice chairman. Mr. O'Connor is president of the American Freedom from Hunger Foundation.

Robert M. Koch, president of the National Limestone Institute, Inc., was named executive director.

Dr. Flemmie Kittrell of the home economics department of Howard University was elected secretary.

The organization also includes a board of 30 members, among whom are Dwayne Andreas, head of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association in St. Paul, and Robert C. Liebenow, former president of the Chicago Board of Trade, and now with the Corn Industries Research Foundation in Washington.

CAUTION IS ADVISED ON PROGRAM

Gov. William H. Avery of Kansas, who participated in the meeting, urged caution in developing the program to the extent of assurance of reasonable profits from expanded production.

Representative PAUL FINDLEY, Republican, of Illinois, cautioned against any announcement to the world that the United States plans a massive, worldwide feeding program. He added that "it is a mistake to assume that we can feed all the hungry."

Louis H. Bean, noted agricultural economist long in the Department of Agriculture, now retired, asserted that it would be a mistake to encourage emphasis on livestock production in the developing countries because vegetable proteins can be more economically used for food than in the form of meat.

Representative PAUL H. TODD, JR., Democrat, of Michigan, declared that any effort to enlarge food supplies would fail to relieve hunger unless strong family planning controls are initiated and assiduously followed.

Hope was held out by K. S. Sundra Rajan, a member of the Board of the World Bank for India, that his country may become self-sufficient in food by 1971, but now is in urgent need of food.

The meeting brought a number of suggestions that American food aid should extend not only to food itself but to the solution of the problem of deliveries and processing. Senator MCGOVERN even mentioned assistance in building roads.

FOR EVENTUAL FREEING OF PRICES

WASHINGTON, December 13.—A program for the eventual freeing of market prices and the return to cultivation of all or part of the 55 million acres now withdrawn from production has been submitted to the Department of Agriculture by a panel of businessmen, educators, nutritionists and Federal officials. The report urges a massive and intensive campaign to increase food production and to control population. A gradual phasing out of the present system of price supports and other subsidies and eventual reliance on markets is urged. The present food-for-peace program, announcing to $1.7 billion a year, would be transferred to the foreign policy budget instead of the domestic farm program.

[From the Washington Post, May 20, 1965]

U.S. REPORT WARNS OF WORLD FOOD DILEMMA

(By Gaylord P. Godwin, United Press International)

Countries containing two-thirds of the world's people are losing the capacity to feed themselves and have little chance of ever doing so, the Agriculture Department reported yesterday.

Nearly all the major rice-producing countries of Asia face this problem.

A report issued by the Agriculture Department's Economic Research Service said the problem is that many of the densely populated, less developed countries have just about exhausted the supply of new land that can be readily brought into production.

Their only recourse is to increase the yield per acre as North America and Western Europe have done, and their hopes of doing this are not good, the report said.

In releasing the report, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman said problems of staggering proportions face the underdeveloped countries in trying to keep food production anywhere near the rapid growth in population.

"Both land and time are running out for these countries," he said.

The report said that most of the countries in trouble had raised yields at very modest rates over the past 25 years by putting more men to work in the fields as the population grew.

[From the Chemical and Engineering News, Dec. 27, 1965]

UNITED STATES SEEKS NEW MEANS TO AID WORLD'S HUNGRY—CONGRESS, AGRICULTURAL EXPERTS, AND RESEARCH WORKERS ARE EVOLVING WAYS TO SPEED AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT IN POOR NATIONS

The United States is getting set to revamp its efforts to feed the world's hungry and speed the growth of agriculture in underdeveloped countries. For the past several months American nutritional and agricultural leaders have been helping the administration sculpture new shapes for and give new directions to the Food for Peace Act (which expires a year hence) and other forms of agricultural foreign aid.

On a basic research level, efforts are being made to recruit industrial and university help in setting up laboraory facilities for studying land and climatic factors which prevent effective adaptability of American techniques to the problems of underdeveloped countries.

Meanwhile, congressional leaders are themselves fashioning legislation broadly aimed at returning retired cropland to use for growing food for hungry nations, and establishing incentives for the poor nations to elevate yields per acre to boost their overall economies. The results of all the activity are bound to be of production and marketing significance to the U.S. food, fertilizer, and pesticide industries, as well as to Federal and university research programs.

Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, Democrat, of North Carolina, chairman of the House Agricultural Committee, plans hearings on Capitol Hill in January on the possibility of expanding American farm output for feeding the hungry. Also slated for considerable attention by Mr. COOLEY's committee are ways of easing food distribution problems.

The committee intends to give ear, moreover, to criticisms such as those voiced by Cocommitteeman PAUL FINDLEY, Republican, of Illinois. Representative FINDLEY thinks overemphasis on American food shipments would cut into potential foreign markets of developing countries and thwart their chances of expanding trade. "We can help developing countries learn the techniques of modern production," adds Mr. FINDLEY, "by establishing, for example, a 'capitalist corps' as counterpart to the Peace Corps, composed of people with firsthand experience with our system of raising capital and satisfying consumer demands."

The Food for Peace Act, while never intended as primarily a humanitarian venture, is nevertheless criticized because it isn't sufficiently charitable, tough-fisted, and relevant to a country's food needs. Passed in 1954 and amended frequently since then, it was instituted ostensibly to help the United States get rid of its surplus crops

while salvaging as much of their market value as possible. Its critics contend, too, that it hasn't really been used to prop the developing nations firmly on their agricultural feet.

On the other side of the Capitol, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee plans hearings early next year on Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN's, Democrat, of South Dakota, international food and nutrition bill, essentially a replacement for the Food for Peace Act. The bill would provide $500 million over each of the next 7 years to purchase critical foods pinpointed to nutritional needs on a country-by-country basis; improve reception and distribution facilities; and improve crop yields.

The administration, spurred by overpopulation awareness and India's potential famine, has taken many steps to start its own ball rolling. Last month President Johnson moved the food-for-peace program from the Agriculture to the State Department, where it could mesh rather than clash with the economic development plans of the Agency for International Development. AID has shifted focus building firm agricultural bases in developing countries as preludes to the growth of capital goods economies.

Much of the current agricultural and fizz in the State Department is about feeding the preschool child. AID during the past few weeks has begun a pilot program to test the effects of adding appropriate vitamins and minerals to dried milk and fish-vegetable proteins shipped abroad for young children, pregnant women, and lactating mothers. AID is beginning an attempt to get U.S. companies interested in producing and packaging these new, inexpensive foods, as the beginning of what would hopefully be a mildly booming industry.

One needn't look far to comprehend why American free enterprise hasn't rushed in to take part in the opportunity in the developing nations. A recent report of businessmen to AID sums up the situation in these countries: "Inflation, to greater or lesser degrees, is common to nearly all developing nations. Systems of business, law, and regulation are outmoded; capital markets are rudimentary, and there is, nearly everywhere, political risk."

Among the report's recommendations, two stand out:

Amendment to tax laws so that losses suffered by American-owned subsidiaries in developing countries can be offset by profits earned elsewhere.

Reduction of the cost of selected risk guarantees against inconvertibility of currencies, nationalization and confiscation, and losses from war and revolution. Overall, the panel recommended agricultural vigor before industrial venture.

POTENTIAL

It isn't possible to estimate in dollars the industrial potential of the evolving program. But in the words of one agricultural industry executive, "The impact could be tremendous all across the board." Any degree of extra crop growth would mean more production of fertilizers and pesticides. Moreover, as the investment climate in the developing nations improves, the same industries—with food processing firms—would be expected to move in to take part (for profit), in self-help policies of these countries. Benefits to American industry could accrue in the long run, too. For example, Japan, now self-sufficient in agriculture, is buying more American foods than ever before.

[From U.S. News & World Report, Oct. 4, 1965]

THE WORLD'S BIGGEST PROBLEM: HOW EXPERTS SEE IT

How can the world feed all its people, at the rate the population is growing? That is becoming the world's No. 1 problem.

A look at what's happening shows why experts are worried. The human race is doubling in numbers every 35 years. That means the food supply must be doubled, too—in just 35 years.

Can that be done? Or is famine ahead?

For United States, it means a new challenge. And officials already are moving to meet it.

The population explosion: Worldwide world's population now 3.3 billion. World's population by year 2000 6 billion, up 83 percent, almost doubled in just 35 years.

Problem: Growth will be biggest in areas already short of food.

North America: Now 214 million, by 2000 350 million, up 64 percent.

Latin America: Now 245 million, by 2000 630 million, up 157 percent.

Europe: Now 678 million, by 2000 780 million, up 15 percent.

Africa: Now 309 million, by 2000 775 million, up 151 percent.

Asia: Now 1.8 billion, by 2000 3.4 billion, up 89 percent.

Oceania: Now 18 million, by 2000 30 million, up 68 percent.

Startling facts that dramatize the world's biggest problem are brought to light by an international industrial conference sponsored by Stanford Research Institute and the National Industrial Conference Board.

The problem is this:

In the next 35 years, the world's population, now about 3.3 billion, will skyrocket to about 6 million—almost doubling by the year 2000.

Biggest population increases—more than 100 percent—will come in the less developed nations, where population already is pressing severely against food supply.

Smallest increases—about 40 percent—will come in the well-fed, industrial nations best able to handle growth.

These United Nations estimates of future population are conservative. Actual increases may prove to be much higher.

The story of what these figures mean was reported by experts at the conference, held in San Francisco in September.

NEEDED: TWICE AS MUCH FOOD

The drama of the population story is this:

The world, even now, is facing a food problem. Diets are inadequate in the huge underdeveloped areas of the world, which include almost all of Asia and Africa and most of Latin America.

Just to maintain the present inadequate level of diet will require a virtual doubling of the world's output of food in the next 35 years.

This vast increase in food production must be achieved at a time when nearly all of the virgin lands of the world already have been brought into production.

There is no assurance that the job can be done in time.

Great famine, as a result, could be the outlook.

This warning is voiced by Dr. Earl L. Butz, dean of agriculture at Purdue University and onetime chairman of the U.S. delegation to the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations:

"The world is on a collision course. When the massive force of an exploding world population meets the much more stable trend line of world food production, something must give. Unless we give increased attention now to the softening of the impending collision, many parts of the world within a decade will be skirting a disaster of such proportion as to threaten the peace and stability of the Western World."

SPEEDUP IN POPULATION GROWTH

But, it is asked: Hasn't the world always found a way to feed its ever-growing population?

The answer, according to the experts, is that the problem today is far more complex than at any time in the past.

For one thing, population growth is faster now—and getting faster all the time. Dr. Butz paints this picture:

"At the beginning of the Christian era, world population was estimated to have numbered around 250 million.

"In the next 16 centuries it doubled, reaching 500 million by 1600.

"Three centuries later, by 1900, world population had tripled, and stood at about 1.5 billion.

"In the less than two-thirds of a century since 1900, world population has approximately doubled again.

"Reliable estimates indicate that in the little over one-third of a century remaining until the year 2000, it will double again.

"The astonishing fact is that the human race is currently doubling in numbers every 35 years.

"Obviously, this rate of growth cannot persist indefinitely, because of the sheer limitation of space and food."

Complicating the problem is the fact that food production is not increasing as fast as the population. Dr. Butz reports this:

"The man-food ratio around the world, never high enough to be very exciting to two-thirds of the world's population, has actually been in a decline the last half dozen years.

"Total food output has increased during those years, to be sure, but at a slower rate than population increase. In many of the world's underdeveloped areas, the man-food ratio is in a serious decline."

WHERE FOOD CRISES LOOM

The drama of the food problem that lies ahead will center in the following areas: Latin America, Asia, Africa.

Latin America's population in the next 35 years will zoom 157 percent—from 245 million people now to 630 million people by the year 2000.

Even now, Latin America as a whole is compelled to import food to feed its own people. The only Latin American countries classified by the U.S. Department of Agriculture as having adequate diets are Mexico, Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay. Ahead, for Latin America, is the problem of finding food for 385 million more people within 35 years.

Asia, which already holds 55 percent of the world's population, is expected to show a rise of 89 percent in population in the next 35 years—up from 1.8 billion now to about 3.4 billion in the year 2000.

Here, too, is an area that must import food to live. Today Red China is forced to buy grain in large quantities. The millions of India are heavily dependent on food supplies from the United States. Few Asian nations are able to provide their people an adequate diet.

Asia's problem, loaded with potential for future tragedy, is where to find food for the 1.6 billion additional people that it must feed 35 years hence.

Or take the case of Africa, heading for a population growth of 151 percent in the remainder of this century. Only South Africa, in this whole vast continent, is classified as having an adequate diet today. Africa, already importing food, faces the problem of feeding 466 added millions by 2000.

Taken all together, the hungry countries of the world—those considered by experts to have deficient diets—now contain about two-thirds of the world's population but produce only about one-third of the world's food. And it is almost exactly these hungry areas that face the biggest population growth in the years ahead.

A TURN IN THE FOOD FLOW

What makes the food problem even worse is the decline of underdeveloped areas as food producers. Only a generation ago, Asia, Africa, and Latin America were regions with food surpluses. They exported grain to the more advanced countries, especially to Europe.

Now the food flow is reversed. The underdeveloped areas that once grew more food than they ate now must import food from the developed nations.

The reason is that food production in those hungry, underdeveloped areas is not increasing fast enough to keep pace with the increase in population. From 1953 to 1963, there was an actual drop in the amount of food produced locally per person in the underdeveloped regions.

DILEMMA OF THE WEST

Here's a problem for the free world: Communist countries, including Red China, face a smaller population explosion than non-Communist countries.

The outlook, as analyzed by the experts, is that the population in the Communist world will grow about 49 percent while the population in the free world will grow about 98 percent between now and the year 2000.

What this means is that growing food problems could fan agitation for revolution in areas not now Communist.

OVERCROWDING

Not only food but living space will become a serious problem in the population explosion ahead.

Even now, many parts of the world are overcrowded. The following figures show the density of population in 1965 and the density expected by 2000.

Population per square mile

	1965	*2000*
Asia	108	202
Africa	26	65
Europe	167	192
Latin America	31	78
North America	26	41
Oceania (Australia, New Zealand, etc.)	5	10

As these figures show, North America will continue to be a part of the world that offers its inhabitants the most elbowroom. But even Americans will begin to feel crowded.

NOTE OF HOPE, TOO

One hopeful note is sounded by the experts: The world is not likely to run out of essential fuels or industrial materials in this century.

Sir John Cockcroft, winner of the Nobel Prize for physics in 1951 and now master of Churchill College at Cambridge, England, told the conference:

Reserves of coal, oil, gas and uranium will be adequate to provide increasing amounts of power for many years.

By the time uranium supplies run out—if they ever do—man will know how to extract energy from water.

Industry will have to turn to lower grade sources of raw materials. But the ocean floor may yield large quantities of manganeses, copper, nickel and cobalt. And plastics will be improved to replace metals in many uses.

A WATER SHORTAGE?

Water, in the crowded world of the future, looms as a problem almost as serious as that of food. Sir John Cockcroft discusses the water situation in these words:

"Water supplies could be a limitation on the development of the economy, especially water supplies for industrial and agricultural use, since requirements are likely to double in the next 20 years. The future of Asia, Africa and Australia could be vitally affected by water shortage, and even in some parts of the United States this is becoming a problem.

"Desalination of brackish and sea water may help in some areas of the world, especially if combined with less wasteful methods of using water for agriculture and the development of plant varieties which require less water."

WHAT EXPERTS BELIEVE

Is there an answer to the world's biggest problem? Two things must be done, say the experts:

1. Increase food production greatly.
2. Reduce the world's birth rate.

"In the long run," says Dr. Butz, "say by the close of this century, birth control is the only solution."

But Dr. Shiroshi Nasu of Tokyo University warns:

"The control of population growth, although it might become a kind of necessity in the future, cannot be depended upon too much now as the major means of adjusting the unbalanced food and population relationship.

"As the adoption of birth control among the developing nations will presuppose a raised standard of living, a wider diffusion of general education as well as a changed mental outlook, it will certainly take many years to come. During this time, the predicted crisis will not stop approaching.

"It will be a race between the two, and our prospect of winning the race is not too bright at present.

"So we have to turn our attention toward the increase of food production."

U.S. ROLE IN FOOD BATTLE

The United States, it is clear, will play a leading role in the coming battle to feed the world.

This country produces so much surplus food that the official policy has been to limit grain production.

Now official thinking is beginning to change.

On September 23, a new policy was proposed by Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, Democrat, of South Dakota, former director of the food for peace program. He told the U.S. Senate:

"The most overwhelming paradox of our time is to permit half the human race to be hungry while we struggle to cut back on surplus production.

"I believe that we ought to declare an all-out war against hunger. We should announce to the world now that we have an unused food-producing capacity which we are willing and anxious to use to its fullest potential."

A bill has been introduced by Senator MCGOVERN which would authorize the Federal Government to buy American-produced food to give to hungry nations or to sell to them at bargain prices. Other countries also would be given help in improving their own food production.

President Johnson is known to be thinking about the world food problem. He has expressed the conviction that the United States cannot remain secure as an "island of abundance" in a world full of starving people.

The time is seen approaching when U.S. farmers will be asked to spur food production—instead of curb it.

THE CHALLENGE FOR AMERICA

Can the United States really feed the world of the future?

"The opportunity for increased food production on the North American continent is tremendous," says Dr. Butz, a former Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

However, he points out: "We can add only a limited supply of additional arable land. We can get some additional food from the sea—but here again we face practical limits.

"The only practical alternative available to us is the accelerated application of capital and technology to our own agricultural system in an effort substantially to increase output per acre and per man."

This also is pointed out by the experts: United States and Canada themselves face a population growth of about 64 percent in the next 35 years. Those additional people will take a large part of any increase in production.

Feeding a population the size of that foreseen by 2000 is going to be a job too big for any one country. Yet, for the United States, says Dr. Butz: "There is no realistic alternative for us except to gear up to meet this challenge."

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Jan. 4, 1966]

FOOD—KEY 1966 ISSUE

(NOTE.—After years of putting the brake on farm production, Congress may soon tell American farmers to step on the gas. There isn't enough food in the world for hungry peoples. This may bring about a major step-up in the food-for-peace program due to expire at the end of 1966. A clash between farm policy and foreign policy could touch off sparks of controversy.)

(By Josephine Ripley)

WASHINGTON.—After the Vietnam war, food for peace may be one of the big issues before the 89th Congress.

It is a worldwide problem. Final decision on the U.S. role in the international food crisis will have impact on farm policies at home and foreign policy touching many lands.

The present food-for-peace legislation, known as Public Law 480, expires at the end of the year.

EFFECTIVENESS SEEN

Congress will be asked to expand and extend this program. Famine is imminent in India; it hangs like a threatening cloud over many other lands.

"The world food crisis" is a matter of deep concern and discussion here and abroad.

Thus the U.S. food-for-peace program becomes extraordinarily significant.

Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, Republican, reached by telephone in Vermont, said he favors an expanded program adapted to world problems.

"I think food is an effective force in the world today," he said.

"It is cheaper than missiles and bombs—and probably more effective in the long run."

Then, too, he added, "as nations of the world become more interdependent, the chances of war become less, automatically. You can't go to war with someone you are dependent on," he argues.

Senator AIKEN speaks from firsthand impressions, having just returned from Vietnam and other Far East countries.

But the shrewd Vermonter is not for tipping the American horn of plenty recklessly.

"We should help the food-short nations to produce their own food supplies," he explained. "Until they do, we should help to tide them over. They need technical help in improving their production in order to feed their own people."

Some countries challenged to produce sufficient food of their own are not doing so. He mentioned India and the Philippines. The tendency of these and other governments has been to concentrate on industrial rather than agricultural production.

VIEWS ON INDIA

Senator AIKEN says: "As far as India, we should give immediate help to prevent famine. But we should not enter into any long-term arrangement with India."

Under the present food for peace program, the United States is providing about $1,700 million a year in surplus food crops to food-deficit nations.

There are three methods of distribution:

1. In exchange for foreign currencies;

2. When sold for dollars on a long-term credit basis;

3. Food donated free in cases of disaster.

The largest distribution, by far, comes under the foreign-currencies category. These currencies have only limited use; they cannot be converted into dollars.

To expand and revise the food for peace program to any extent would call for an American farm policy switch with profound grassroots implications.

SURPLUSES USED

The world's hunger has practically eaten up those burdensome farm surpluses. The basic purpose of food for peace in the beginning was to help dispose of these surpluses.

Now, except for cotton and tobacco, they have practically disappeared.

This could mean that farmers instead of cutting back on production may be encouraged to step it up.

What the experts are saying, in effect, is that if there is a population explosion, there must be some kind of a food explosion, too.

Even so, many farm authorities here would oppose any move to do away with production controls entirely.

GAINS SIGHTED

Senator AIKEN is one of these. He thinks it is time "for our producers to be given a little freer hand." But he would be for continuation of a realistic price-support program and flexible controls.

One Member of Congress who is giving a great deal of thought to all this is Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, Democrat, of North Carolina, chairman of the House Agriculture Committee.

Reached by telephone in North Carolina, Mr. COOLEY said he was in favor of the food-for-peace program.

"I think it has accomplished a lot," he said, "in relieving hunger for millions of people."

He will hold hearings on the world food crisis early in the year. He feels "we are going to have to continue the program." However, he anticipates "controversy in committee."

There are Members of Congress who consider food for peace "just a giveaway program. That's where the rub comes," he said frankly. "The cost of it."

"And as for giving away food, it is not as easy as one would think," said the legislator. "In one case, we wanted to send in food supplies where people were starving. We found there were no roads to transport this food to the people. We talked about an airlift, but found they had no airports near enough to the area."

The new food and peace bill will have to take these things into consideration, Mr. COOLEY pointed out. Also, he added, the effect of any increased movement of American farm products on other exporting nations.

BILL INTRODUCED

One of the most vigorous advocates of more food for peace is Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, Democrat, of South Dakota. The Senator has his own food for peace bill, introduced during the first session.

It is a matter of great urgency, as he sees it.

"I think by the end of this decade the food crisis is going to be the overwhelming problem of the world," he told this correspondent.

"There is no time to lose. We should begin right now to forestall it.

"If it were not for the food for peace shipments to South Vietnam today, the shortage of food would bring on an inflation that would topple the government there in 30 days," he said.

He recently returned from a tour of that country.

The United States is sending some 300,000 tons of rice a year to South Vietnam. North Vietnam, the land of the rice paddies, is exporting rice to obtain currency for war materials, he reported.

Senator MCGOVERN's bill would authorize funds to break what he calls the "bottleneck" to distribution. That is, to help build warehouses for storage and facilities for food distribution.

FUNDS SPOTLIGHTED

It would authorize funds to purchase nutritious foods for the various assistance programs in the open U.S. market, if necessary—foods such as milk, rice, and other nutritional commodities. These purchases would be made by the Secretary of Agriculture.

In the last session of Congress, the Secretary was authorized to purchase dairy products in the open market. Senator MCGOVERN would expand this authority to cover other commodities.

At present, all food commodities for the special aid programs except dairy products must come from Government-held surpluses.

His bill also provides for an increase in Agency for International Development (AID) operations, and for technical assistance to help nations increase their own production.

The administration proposals, not yet announced, are understood to follow these same lines in general. Except, perhaps, for the outright purchases by the Government in the open market in competition with the trade—a move which it is admitted is almost certain to bid up prices, temporarily at least.

PROGRAM OPPOSED

Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Democrat, of Louisiana, chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee which would normally consider such legislation, does not favor the program.

He considers it essentially "a giveaway program."

"Will you vote for it?" he was asked by this reporter.

"It depends on what it does," was his reply. "If it is to continue as a program of enlarged foreign aid, I would be against it."

His well-known opposition prompted the assignment of the McGovern bill to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee rather than Senator ELLENDER's agriculture committee.

In fact, one of the most controversial aspects of the food-for-peace program centers around jurisdiction. Not only in Congress, but between Government agencies.

The food-for-peace office was recently moved from the Executive Office of the President to the State Department.

Senator AIKEN and Mr. COOLEY were both against the State Department's taking over the program.

"The State Department is no qualified judge on the adequacy of food supplies in this country," declared Senator AIKEN.

Mr. COOLEY called it "absurd to put this program under the jurisdiction of the State Department. It would be like the tail wagging the dog. The State Department has a legitimate say with regard to foreign policy implications, but this is primarily an agricultural problem," he asserted.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 5, 1966]

CONGRESS TO PRESS FARM AID REVISION—WORLD NEEDS SPUR DOUBTS ABOUT PRICE SUPPORTS

(By Felix Belair, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, January 4.—With administration approval or without it, a determined effort will be made in Congress to change the direction of domestic farm programs toward expanded production of major food crops.

The paradox of spending more than $4 billion a year to hold down surplus farm production and to study the effects of overeating at home—while half the human race goes hungry and undernourished—is causing some second thoughts within the administration as well as on Capitol Hill.

Two White House study groups and a succession of privately financed investigations have called for a change. So have the national farm organizations.

There is general agreement that it is morally and politically untenable for the United States to go on curbing food output while increasing populations in developing countries face mass starvation in this century.

COSTS ARE SOUGHT

The White House studies were not made public. One reason was the Budget Bureau's insistence that there should be a reasonably accurate estimate of costs involved before the President lent his name to recommendations that would reshape existing programs.

A preliminary estimate by Government experts suggested that it would cost about 25 percent more than present control and price-support programs if farmers were allowed to plant at will and the food was given away to the needy in underdeveloped countries.

Advocates of expansion insist that this 25 percent need not be a net addition to the current outlay for acreage control. They believe that with producers organized into marketing cooperatives the rewards of the marketplace could eventually replace price supports and other Government subsidies.

In any case, the combination of humanitarian and economic arguments has produced an emotional crusade among farm organization and development leaders that the administration has been hard put to control. Given the natural instinct of farmers to produce more rather than less, and the obvious incentive of farm equipment and fertilizer manufacturers, the question arises whether the drive can be checked.

M'GOVERN PRESSING BILL

The chief legislative vehicle of the expansionist concept is a bill prepared by Senator George McGovern, Democrat of South Dakota. It would provide up to $3.5 billion a year to the President to finance open-market purchases of food for the needy overseas, to improve port facilities, storage and distribution facilities in developing countries, and to help them increase their own food output.

The legislation would authorize and appropriate $500 million the first year and provide for increasing this amount by $500 million each year for 7 years.

The President would be authorized under the bill to create an international food and nutrition office to administer the new program. This would give an expanded role and permanent status to the existing Office of Food for Peace, which was recently transferred from the White House to the State Department under Richard W. Reuter, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State.

GRADUAL RELAXATION CITED

The measure contemplates a continuation of some acreage-control and price-support program pending the development of greatly improved storage and distribution facilities in the food-deficit countries. It also looks to a gradual relaxation of controls on domestic production until a major part of the 50 million acres now untilled are returned to production.

Hearings on the legislation already have been assured by House and Senate committees. HAROLD D. COOLEY, chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, has notified President Johnson of his intention to end the present system of acreage controls as soon as possible.

In the Senate, J. W. FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, has assured Mr. MCGOVERN that his group would consider the measure on foreign policy grounds even if this means duplicating in part hearings held by the Senate Agriculture Committee.

Humanitarian considerations aside, cosponsors of the bill—of whom there are more than 30 in both Houses—have weighty arguments to support their position. Food, they point out, is the one form of foreign aid that can be provided without any transfer of the Nation's physical resources or effect on its balance of international payments.

It makes no sense to them to curb the world's most efficient farm plant while 70 percent of the 670 million children in developing countries suffer malnutrition that leaves half their number stunted both mentally and physically and presents hazards to economic progress as well as political stability.

Those in charge of food and farm policies have no quarrel with these arguments. But they are greatly concerned that the mounting clamor for increased production may result in trying to do too much too soon. Their primary concern is the maintenance of relative stability in farm prices and income.

If acreage controls were abandoned too soon, they say, the result might be food supplies far beyond the effective domestic and foreign demand and, as a result, depressed prices and farm income.

The Department of Agriculture says the United States has the farm capacity and the reserve food stocks to meet any sharp increase in demand for food. But this does not take into account the possibility of a crop failure or other disaster affecting farm output.

CONSUMPTION LEVELS LISTED

At current consumption levels, the Nation will hold about 700 million bushels of wheat at the end of the current crop year. The past average domestic requirement has been about 600 million bushels. Past average commercial sales for dollars abroad have been about 200 million bushels.

On top of this cash demand for wheat food-for-peace shipments have been running about 550 million bushels a year.

In the context of an abundant supply of feed grains and a prospective wheat crop in the current year indicated at about 1.3 billion bushels, the department's view is that the wheat carryover is ample. The feed grain supply at the end of the crop year in October will be about 59 million bushels. This compares with a prudent reserve figured at about 45 million bushels.

SENATOR WARNS OF CRISIS

It is at this point that the advocates of expansion part company with the departmental experts. As Senator MCGOVERN puts it:

"The composite wheat and feed grain reserve of the United States would scarcely meet our own consumption needs for 6 months if a catastrophe should wipe out our crops in a single growing year.

"And if we were to carry out President Johnson's suggestion and establish food reserves sufficient for 6 months' consumption, we would have to end our food-for-peace program immediately or launch much greater production."

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman has said that total crop production could be increased at least 20 percent in the next 2 or 3 years by returning the 50 million untilled acres to production, by increasing the use of fertilizers, by wider use of improved seed varieties, and by employing better technology more intensively.

A DOUBLED WHEAT CROP

If all idle acreage were planted to wheat, that crop could be doubled in 2 years, according to this estimate, with most of the increase coming in the first year.

If the currently diverted 50 million acres were put back into the same crops as they produced formerly, the resulting output over harvests in 1965 would be 450 million more bushels of wheat, 125 million more bushels of soybeans, 1.8 billion more bushels of corn, and 275 million more bushels of grain sorghums.

The advocates of increased production are saying in effect, "Let's do it."

Every study thus far agrees that the United States and the other advanced nations combined cannot close the prospective gap between food supplies and increasing population in the needy developing countries.

For one thing, there are not enough ships to deliver the additional food if it were produced. It is agreed that the needy nations themselves must make up the the major part of their deficit.

However, supporters of the McGovern bill insist that hunger and malnutrition will not wait until developing countries acquire the know-how and the equipment needed to do the job for themselves.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on the next printing of S. 2157 the names of the Senators from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE and Mr. BAYH], the Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] be added to the bill.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, no day passes which does not bring new evidence of national and international concern with the world food problem.

Shortly after I introduced the International Food and Nutrition Act, the Rockefeller Foundation sponsored a seminar at Estes Park, Colo., on "U.S. Food Policy in Relation to World Food Needs." Dr. Roger Revelle, director of the Center for Population Studies at Harvard University, and Richard W. Reuter, director of food for peace, served as cochairmen. There was 30 eminent participants—a cross section of Americans—including such men as Dr. Louis H. Bean and Dr. Don Paarlberg, both former economic advisers to Secretaries of Agriculture, Dr. Bean served in a series of Democratic administrations and Dr. Paarlberg during the Eisenhower administration. Others included Dr. C. Clement French, president of Washington State University, R. L. Clodius, vice president of the University of Wisconsin, Dr. Theodore W. Schultz of the University of Chicago, Mr. Harry Graham of the National Grange, Mr. Paul Cifrino of Supreme Markets in Dorchester, Mass., Felix Belair of the New York Times editorial staff, and Maurice D. Atkin of Robert Nathan Associates, economic consultants here in Washington who do a great deal of work in the international field.

The Rockefeller Foundation group was in session 5 days. I would like to read just the final, short paragraph, after recommending the whole volume to my colleagues. Their report said:

In conclusion, a clear transition period is at hand both with regard to the purpose of Public Law 480 and with regard to the recognition of new and growing needs and opportunities. A new approach to world food shortages and food production policy is required which recognizes the dynamic possibilities of shifting from surplus commodity disposal to one predicated on meeting human needs through a rational exploitation of the U.S. capacity for agricultural production.

The Agricultural Research Institute of the National Academy of Sciences and National Research Council devoted its meeting October 18–19, 1965—about 4 months ago—to "World Food Needs and Production—Present and Future." The report of the proceedings is now available. In the foreword to that volume, it is explained:

It was decided to contrast agricultural production in the United States, as the most technologically advanced nation in the world, with that of newly developing nations. This juxtaposition brings into sharper focus the problems facing the United States in its world responsibilities, both in supplying human foods directly, and in undertaking to provide the skills of our specialists and certain resources for improving production in the needy nations themselves. The presentations contained herein indicate the magnitude of problems for which adequate answers have yet to be found.

Besides reports of their business sessions, the volume contains 17 papers by the most eminent scientists in their fields on world food production, protein deficiency, and potentialities in seed crops and ocean fish resources for meeting that deficiency, problems of mechanization of agriculture in various areas of the world, soil management in the United States contrasted with food-deficit tropical areas, insect, pest and disease control, and weed control problems here and around the world.

The volume gives insight not only into the magnitude of problems of world food supply and the grasp which our scientists have of these problems, but also into the awareness and the preoccupation of our scientists with the fact that those of us who inhabit this ark hurtling through space, as Adlai Stevenson described it, must be about the task of matching food production with population growth, stimulating the former and retarding the latter, if we can.

In every walk of life in America, from farms to scientific circles, this world food problem is at the top of the agenda of problems to be met, and of things to be done.

This is also true throughout the world.

During the recess, I had the honor of being a Senate Member of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization meeting in Rome, Italy.

The world food crisis topped the agenda there. The great world economist Gunar Myrdal dealt with it in the keynote address at the meeting. I was honored with an invitation from Director General B. R. Sen to address the meeting on the world food problem because of my past service as President John F. Kennedy's food for peace director here in the United States and because, as such, I had been authorized to submit on behalf of the United States to the FAO meeting in 1961, the proposal for a world freedom from hunger program. It was adopted on a trial basis with a $100 million annual budget. That

program was unanimously voted to be continued and expanded by the nations represented at the Rome meeting, concluded in December.

Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman and Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Dorothy Jacobsen, who headed the U.S. delegation, made valuable contributions to the discussion of world food efforts in their addresses. The meeting demonstrated both the breadth and depth of worldwide concern with food and fiber problems, and again demonstrated to me the unusual opportunity our Nation has, as the world leader in agricultural production and agricultural production technology, to show all mankind that America seeks a great international society, as well as a Great Society domestically, in which all men live in dignity and in peace.

There is no question that the overwhelming majority of the people of this Nation, and world leaders, wish to see the war against want given new force just as we hope that the shooting war can be ended.

It is my truly fervent hope that during this session of Congress we will join with the President and the administration in escalating the war against hunger to the limit of our capability and to the limit of the absorptive capacity of areas of need and that we will support this constructive effort just as unstintingly as we support defense against any military threat to our national security.

The United States needs to have its world neighbors know that we regard the croplands, the grazing areas, the fisheries, the scientific laboratories, the farm supply and the farm machinery industries of the world as the most important battlefields of our time.

Every day our military men issue a communique giving a count of the dead bodies of enemy soldiers known to have resulted from the operations of our troops and allied forces. It is intended to discourage our foes and reassure our people and our partisans. But this also tends to create an image of America none of us desires, an image of a nation preoccupied with killing and destruction.

It is a false image, as the response to proposals to close the world food gap which I have experienced and reported to you today very eloquently testifies.

We need to have daily communiques on lives saved in the world by American food aid; daily bulletins on how many hundreds or thousands more children have been reached with the calories, the proteins and the vitamins they have lacked for sound, healthy bodies, and how the war against want is progressing.

Such communiques would project not only a far better image of America in the world than the daily body counts, but a far truer one.

Our Government must this year, without regard to demands on us from other activities or excusing ourselves on fiscal grounds, do what the Estes Park conferees so well summarized for all Americans, when they reported:

A new approach to world food shortages and food production policy is required which recognizes the dynamic possibilities of shifting from surplus commodity disposal to one predicated on meeting human food needs through a rational exploitation of the U.S. capacity for agricultural production.

Mr. President, at the time the proposed legislation was introduced, there was understandably some question as to which committee would have primary jurisdiction. Because very clearly the bill has far-ranging foreign policy implications, it may have led one to think that it ought to be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. However, the measure also has very important significance in terms of our domestic agricultural problems. There has been some understandable and sincere differences of opinion as to which committee should have jurisdiction. The Parliamentarian, I believe on perfectly sound grounds, recommended that the bill be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. Since that time, following discussions with the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], there seems to be some reason for thinking that perhaps his committee should have jurisdiction over the legislation.

I hope to discuss this subject further with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and be prepared, next week, to address a unanimous-consent request to the Senate that the proposed legislation be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I send a resolution to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 175) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to as follows:

S. RES. 175

Resolved, That Mr. LONG of Louisiana be, and he is hereby, elected Chairman of the Committee on Finance, in lieu of Mr. Harry F. Byrd, Sr., of Virginia, resigned from the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect of the memory of the late distinguished Representative from North Carolina, Hon. Herbert C. Bonner, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 17, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 14, 1966:

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Robert C. Weaver, of New York, to be Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

Robert C. Wood, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

James S. Duesenbery, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the Council of Economic Advisers, vice Otto Eckstein.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

George A. Avery, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years expiring June 30, 1968.

COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

Harold Howe II, of North Carolina, to be Commissioner of Education, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

Franklyn A. Johnson, of California, to be an Assistant Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Dr. William B. Bean, of Iowa, to be a member of the Board of Regents, National Library of Medicine, Public Health Service, for a term expiring August 3, 1969, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Dr. Stewart G. Wolf, Jr., of Oklahoma, to be a member of the Board of Regents, National Library of Medicine, Public Health Service, for a term expiring August 3, 1969, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE

Roger W. Wilkins, of the District of Columbia, to be Director, Community Relations Service, for a term of 4 years.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Nathan M. Koffsky, of Maryland, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

William Gorham, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

BUREAU OF MINES

Walter R. Hibbard, Jr., of New York, to be Director of the Bureau of Mines, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION

Paul Kaplowitz, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the U.S. Tariff Commission for the term expiring June 16, 1967, vice Ben David Dorfman.

FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

Theodore Jaffe, of Rhode Island, to be a member of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States for a term of 3 years from October 22, 1965, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

U.S. ATTORNEY

Cecil F. Poole, of California, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of California for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

U.S. MARSHALS

Wiliam H. Terrill, of Colorado, to be U.S. marshal for the District of Colorado for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

George E. O'Brien, of California, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of California for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

Archie Craft, of Kentucky, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of Kentucky for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

Joseph F. Novak, of Delaware, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Delaware for the term of 4 years, vice Edward J. Hussey, deceased.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Charles F. Baird, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy, vice Victor M. Longstreet, resigned.

IN THE ARMY

Charles Hartwell Bonesteel III, O18655, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), for appointment as senior U.S. Army member of the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 711.

The following-named officers under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Maj. Gen. Andrew Jackson Boyle, O19924, U.S. Army, in the grade of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. James Benjamin Lampert, O20147, U.S. Army, in the grade of lieutenant general.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons, who were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to the offices indicated:

Marshall P. Jones, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Malawi;

Cecil B. Lyon, of New Hampshire, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ceylon, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Maldive Islands.

The following-named persons, who were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to the offices indicated:

For appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 1, a consul general, and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America: Leon E. Woods, of Maryland.

Now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a counsel general of the United States of America: Magdalen G. H. Flexner, of Florida.

Now a Foreign Service officer of class 6 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America: W. Graham Metson, Jr., of California.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 7, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Robert J. Baker, of the District of Columbia.
Ronald B. Casagrande, of New York.
Michael K. Consedine, of New York.
Charles N. Dudley, of Florida.
Charles Edward Emmons, of California.
Peter T. Hansen, of Florida.
Brooke C. Holmes, of California.
Darryl N. Johnson, of Washington.
Raymond C. Jorgenson, of North Dakota.
John M. Joyce, of Colorado.
Ira H. Levy, of Missouri.
Robert L. Michael, of Ohio.
David F. Moore, of North Carolina.
Gary G. Morley, of Arkansas.
Donald R. Niemi, of Wisconsin.
Richard T. Scully, of Virginia.
Phillips S. Waller, of California.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Charles L. Bell, of Ohio.
David H. Burns, of Massachusetts.
Michael P. Canning, of North Dakota.
Emil Castro, of New York.
Miss Victoria R. Cordova, of Washington.
Robert A. Desmuke, of California.
A. Lester Glad, of California.
Scott S. Halliford, of Tennessee.
Hugh J. Ivory, of New York.
John P. Leonard, of New York.
Larrie D. Loehr, of California.
Clyde V. Prestowitz, Jr., of Delaware.
Herman J. Rossi III, of Washington.
Michael M. Skol, of Illinois.
Seton Stapleton, of New Jersey.
Donald B. Westmore, of Washington.
James Alan Williams, of Virginia.
Donald J. Yellman, of Iowa.

Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Monroe E. Aderhold, of Michigan.
Willard W. Angel, of Idaho.
Ralph L. Boyce, of Virginia.
Peter F. Brescia, of Maryland.
I. Paul de Pedraza, of Florida.
Charles B. Dickens, of Wisconsin.
Charles R. Doscher, of California.
George L. Gaddie, of Florida.
Francis V. Gardner, of Virginia.
R. Laurence Garufi, of New Jersey.
James R. Graham, of Wisconsin.
Miss Barbara A. Hutchison, of Delaware.
Miss Tana M. Mayland, of California.
Miss Marion M. Montague, of the District of Columbia.
Arthur R. Nayer, of New Jersey.
Edward Melvin Starr, Jr., of Maryland.
Joe B. Vogel, of Florida.
Lindsay H. White, of New York.
John Z. Williams, of New Jersey.

A Foreign Service Reserve officer to be a consul and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America: John R. Cassidy, of Missouri.

Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America:

Glenn O. Brown, of Illinois.
Adrian B. Giazza, of Nebraska.
Warren S. Hawley, of Maryland.
Andre J. Le Gallo, of New Jersey.
Joseph M. Medich, of Indiana.
Francisco X. Mendoza, of Virginia.
Lawrence A. Penn, of New York.
William E. Spruce, of Maryland.

Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Mrs. Miña Shayne Goldberg, of Virginia.
Miss Margaret Ann Murphy, of California.
John J. Reed, of California.

Foreign Service Reserve officers to be secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

William Astill, of Rhode Island.
Richard K. Cooke, of Texas.
Lawrence R. Devlin, of California.
Bertram F. Dunn, of West Virginia.
Peter K. Heimann, of the District of Columbia.
David B. Kelly, of Virginia.
John E. MacDonald, of the District of Columbia.
William D. Miller, of Pennsylvania.
Oscar F. Morrison, of the District of Columbia.
William E. Nelson, of New York.
Frank Rettenberg, of New York.
James N. Tull, of Virginia.
John D. Walker, of the District of Columbia.
Morris Weisz, of Maryland.
Ralph R. Westfall, of Virginia.
William H. Wright, of the District of Columbia.
David C. L. Yu, of California.

Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Leroy C. Aycock, of Texas.
Harold T. Christie, of New York.
John C. Gilmore, of Massachusetts.
James M. Hall, of Washington.
Benjamin C. Hilliard 3d, of Nevada.
John L. Leader, of New York.
W. Lehman Smith, of Pennsylvania.
Ancel N. Taylor, of Idaho.
Paul A. Terry, of California.
Anthony S. Vitale, of Virginia.
Robert D. White, of the District of Columbia.
Sidney L. Woollons, of California.

The following-named persons to the offices indicated, pursuant to section 517 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended:

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 1, consul general, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Burnett F. Anderson, of the District of Columbia.
Henry F. Arnold, of New Jersey.
Alfred V. Boerner, of California.
Saxton Bradford, of Arizona.
Leslie S. Brady, of Maryland.
Edgar D. Brooke, of Virginia.
Kermit K. Brown, of Virginia.
W. Kenneth Bunce, of Virginia.
Jacob Canter, of the District of Columbia.
Alan Carter, of Maryland.
Richard G. Cushing, of California.
G. Huntington Damon, of New Hampshire.
Gordon A. Ewing, of the District of Columbia.
William J. Handley, of the District of Columbia.
Albert Harkness, Jr., of Rhode Island.
George M. Hellyer, of Washington.
James E. Hoofnagle, of Virginia.
Arthur W. Hummel, Jr., of Maryland.
William E. Hutchinson, of Maryland.
Harold Kaplan, of New Jersey.
William B. King, of the District of Columbia.
Mark B. Lewis, of the District of Columbia.
Robert A. Lincoln, of the District of Columbia.
Sanford S. Marlowe, of Texas.
John P. McKnight, of Virginia.
N. Paul Neilson, of Pennsylvania.
John R. O'Brien, of the District of Columbia.
Daniel P. Oleksiw, of Pennsylvania.
Frank H. Oram, of Maryland.
Hewson A. Ryan, of Massachusetts.
G. Lewis Schmidt, of California.
Leslie Albion Squires, of Hawaii.
Mrs. Patricia G. van Delden, of California.
William H. Weathersby, of California.
William E. Weld, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Barry Zorthian, of Virginia.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 2, consuls, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Martin Ackerman, of the District of Columbia.
Keith E. Adamson, of Kansas.
O. Rudolph Aggrey, of the District of Columbia.
Robert C. Amerson, of Minnesota.
John M. Anspacher, of the District of Columbia.
Gilbert F. Austin, of Washington.
Stephen W. Baldanza, of New Jersey.
Arthur A. Bardos, of Maryland.
Walter M. Bastian, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Bryan M. Battey, of Maryland.
Robert A. Bauer, of California.
Herbert Baumgartner, of Florida.
Stephen P. Belcher, of the District of Columbia.
Barry L. Bishop, of Texas.
Charles B. Blosser, of the District of Columbia.
Heath Bowman, of Florida.
Kenneth R. Boyle, of Alabama.
David C. Briggs, of Virginia.
Thomas J. Carolan, of Maryland.
Darrell D. Carter, of Illinois.
Terrence F. Catherman, of the District of Columbia.
Everett G. Chapman, of California.
Robert J. Clarke, of Pennsylvania.
Blake Cochran, of Maryland.
Philip J. Conley, of Maine.

Laurence P. Dalcher, of Michigan.
Wilson P. Dizard, of the District of Columbia.
Frank D. Dorey, of the District of Columbia.
Jerry C. Doster, of Virginia.
Henry A. Dunlap, of Maryland.
James R. Echols, of Maryland.
Richard Erstein, of Minnesota.
John H. Esterline, of California.
Alan Fisher, of the District of Columbia.
Gerard M. Gert, of California.
Jay W. Gildner, of the District of Columbia.
Lemuel E. Graves, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Fitzhugh Green, of New York.
Lawrence J. Hall, of Texas.
James J. Halsema, of Pennsylvania.
Richard T. Hamilton, of Virginia.
Robert C. Haney, of California.
Albert E. Hemsing, of New York.
John E. Higgins, of Pennsylvania.
Arthur S. Hoffman, of Virginia.
John F. Hogan, Jr., of Maine.
William C. Holcombe, of Virginia.
John N. Hutchison, of California.
Edward J. Joyce, of Virginia.
James Vincent Joyce, of Virginia.
Stanley E. Kalish, of the District of Columbia.
Joseph A. Kitchin, of Virginia.
Alexander A. Klieforth, of Virginia.
Joseph C. Kolarek, of the District of Columbia.
Arthur R. Lee, of Idaho.
Sam H. Linch, of Maryland.
Herbert F. Linneman, of Florida.
Wallace W. Littell, of Maryland.
Robert H. Lochner, of New Jersey.
Jack Masey, of the District of Columbia.
Richard M. McCarthy, of Virginia.
James H. McGillivray, of California.
Burtt F. McKee, of Alabama.
Henry L. Miller, of New York.
James Moceri, of Washington.
G. Richard Monsen, of Utah.
Daniel E. Moore, of Virginia.
Paul K. Morris, of Virginia.
John W. Mowinckel, of the District of Columbia.
Edmund R. Murphy, of California.
David Nalle, of the District of Columbia.
John P. Nevins, of Vermont.
Edward P. Nickel, of Connecticut.
John A. Noon, of New Jersey.
Renzo Pagin, of Virginia.
William E. Phipps, of California.
Darrell M. Price, of Virginia.
John T. Reid, of the District of Columbia.
John E. Reinhardt, of Tennessee.
Eugene Rosenfeld, of Virginia.
George A. Rylance, of Arizona.
Richard C. Salvatierra, of Arizona.
Edmund Schechter, of the District of Columbia.
Duncan N. Scott, Jr., of Texas.
Norman P. Scott, of Colorado.
Donald T. Shea, of Virginia.
David P. Sheppard, of the District of Columbia.
Abraham M. Sirkin, of Maryland.
L. Clyde Slaton, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
John J. Slocum, of Rhode Island.
Glenn Lee Smith, of California.
Robert D. Smith, of California.
Edward Stansbury, of Connecticut.
John C. Stoddard, of Connecticut.
John McH. Stuart, of New York.
Hugh B. Sutherland, of the District of Columbia.
Donald K. Taylor, of Maryland.
Francis B. Tenny, of Virginia.
Hans N. Tuch, of Illinois.
James N. Tull, of Virginia.
Harold E. Urist, of Virginia.
Serban Vallimarescu, of the District of Columbia.
Hoyt N. Ware, of Georgia.
James R. West, of California.
Michael Weyl, of the District of Columbia.
Joseph C. Wheeler, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Barbara M. White, of the District of Columbia.
Ernest G. Wiener, of the District of Columbia.
Donald E. Wilson, of Maryland.
Earl J. Wilson, of Texas.
Richard C. Wooton, of Virginia.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Edward Alexander, of New York.
Wilfred P. Allard, of Virginia.
James F. Anderson, of the District of Columbia.
William H. Anthony, of California.
William Astill, of Rhode Island.
Carl F. Bartz, Jr., of Virginia.
Robert H. Behrens, of Maryland.
William A. Bell, of the District of Columbia.
Raymond E. Benson, of New York.
K. Marshall Berg, of Iowa.
Royal D. Bisbee, of Illinois.
Robert J. Boylan, of the District of Columbia.
James E. Boyle, of Maryland.
William K. Braun, of Ohio.
Peter F. Brescia, of Maryland.
Hedin Bronner, of Illinois.
John F. Buckley, of New Jersey.
James F. Byrne, of New Jersey.
Stephen M. Carney, of Florida.
Frederick J. Cavanaugh, of Massachusetts.
Nelson Chipchin, of Maryland.
Dean O. Claussen, of Washington.
Thomas S. Cleveland, of Maryland.
Alvin H. Cohen, of Massachusetts.
John D. Congleton, of Virginia.
James D. Conley, of Illinois.
Dewey W. Conner, of Kansas.
Lyle D. Copmann, of Nebraska.
Miss Frances E. Coughlin, of California.
Robert T. Curran, of Michigan.
Miss Anne M. Davis, of California.
Carl E. Davis, of California.
Henry L. Davis, of Florida.
Miss Stella E. Davis, of Georgia.
John L. De Witt, of Pennsylvania.
Fred W. Dickens, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Richard F. Dienelt, of Pennsylvania.
Arthur V. Diggle, of Illinois.
Alan H. Dodds, of California.
Gerard A. Donohue, of Illinois.
Philip F. Dorman, of California.
Gerhard J. Drechsler, of the District of Columbia.
Darrell I. Drucker, Jr., of Maine.
David J. DuBois, of the District of Columbia.
Frank Eakin, Jr., of New Jersey.
Miss Ann Eckstein, of California.
Horace Y. Edwards, of Texas.
N. Marbury Efimenco, of Maryland.
Miss Mary M. Eich, of Pennsylvania.
Douglas A. Elleby, of Maryland.
James A. Elliot, of the District of Columbia.
Walter Engel, of New York.
Harold E. Engle, of Kansas.
F. Bowen Evans, of Maryland.
E. Lee Fairley, of New York.
A. Alexander Fanelli, of Virginia.
Eric Feiler, of the District of Columbia.
Miss Marjorie F. Ferguson, of the District of Columbia.
Lyne S. Few, of North Carolina.
Clifton B. Forster, of Maryland.
Morton F. Fosberg, of Maryland.
Abol F. Fotouhi, of North Carolina.
Eugene J. Friedmann, of Ohio.
Daniel Garcia, of the District of Columbia.
Fentress Gardner, of Florida.
Homer G. Gayne, of Virginia.
Carl L. Gebuhr, of Maryland.
John S. Getchell of the District of Columbia.
Donald Y. Gilmore, of Maryland.
Henry H. Gosho, of Maryland.
Donald G. Gould, of Maine.
James R. Graham, of Wisconsin.
William F. Gresham, of Illinois.
Miss Margaret R. Haferd, of Ohio.
Miss Elinor Halle, of Ohio.
William G. Hamilton, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Arnold C. Hanson, of Maine.
Richard P. Harris, of Maryland.
William M. Hart, of Florida.
John L. Hedges, of Illinois.
Peter J. Heller, of California.
Sherwin P. Helms, of Virginia.
Miss E. Audrey Henriksen, of Oregon.
George D. Henry, of Pennsylvania.
Daniel J. Herget, of California.
Clyde G. Hess, of Vermont.
Lawrence M. Howes, of Oregon.
Theodore R. Hupper, of Virginia.
Fredric B. Irvin, of Pennsylvania.
Alfred Jacobson, of Virginia.
Robert B. Jaffie, of California.
Robert A. Jellison, of Indiana.
Alfred N. Johnson, of North Carolina.
John A. Jones, Jr., of Virginia.
Harry Keith, of Maryland.
Daniel M. Kennedy, of Massachusetts.
Stepney C. Kibble, of the District of Columbia.
William D. Killea, of Pennsylvania.
Howard E. Kirchwehm, of Illinois.
Joseph I. Krene, of California.
Ernest G. Land, of the District of Columbia.
Robert E. Lasher, of Maryland.
Bernard J. Lavin, of Hawaii.
Leopold J. LeClair, of Virginia.
Maurice E. Lee, of Pennsylvania.
Robert Don Levine, of the District of Columbia.
Irving S. Lewis, of Maryland.
E. Russell Linch, of California.
Roman L. Lotsberg, of Maryland.
Roger M. Lydon, of California.
Kenneth J. MacCormac, of California.
John L. Maddux, of Virginia.
Haynes R. Mahoney, of Florida.
C. Conrad Manley, of Texas.
Pietro V. Marchetti, of Illinois.
Francis S. Mason, Jr., of Florida.
William C. Mateer, of Ohio.
John R. McCarthy, of Florida.
Richard G. McCloskey, of Washington.
A. Marvin McClure, of South Carolina.
Brooks McClure, of Maryland.
Harold G. McConeghey, of Virginia.
Miss Honor C. McCusker, of Maine.
James M. McDonald, Jr., of New Jersey.
James C. McIntosh, of Massachusetts.
Malcolm McLean, of Minnesota.
George E. Miller, of Pennsylvania.
James B. Miller, of Tennessee.
William J. Miller, of Maryland.
Paul A. Modic, of the District of Columbia.
Reuben M. Monson, of Texas.
Stefan P. Munsing, of Michigan.
Clifton B. Naughton, of California.
Edwin J. Neumann, of Maryland.
Patrick E. Nieburg, of New York.
Lynn H. Noah, of Vermont.
Stuart P. Olsen, of Washington.
Harold M. Otwell, of California.
Edwin C. Pancoast, of California.
Barrett Parker, of Maryland.
Lewis W. Pate, of Nebraska.
William K. Payeff, of South Carolina.
F. Taylor Peck, of the District of Columbia.
Harris Peel, of Vermont.
Perry L. Peterson, of Nebraska.
James T. Pettus, Jr., of Missouri.
Timothy A. Pfeiffer, of Maine.
J. Paul Phillips, II, of Maryland.
Richard B. Phillips, of Colorado.
Leon Picon, of North Dakota.
Edward E. Post, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
W. Clinton Powell, of Hawaii.
Paul J. Rappaport, of North Carolina.
W. Wolf Reade, of the District of Columbia.
E. Lewis Revey, of Florida.
Yale W. Richmond, of Virginia.
William H. Rodgers, of Maryland.
Roger P. Ross, of California.

Nicholas Ruggieri, of Rhode Island.
John W. L. Russell, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
William J. Sailer, of Illinois.
Cecil L. Sanford, Jr., of North Carolina.
Edward J. Savage, of the District of Columbia.
Clement G. Scerback, of Maryland.
Harold F. Schneidman, of Pennsylvania.
Frank A. Scott, of New Jersey.
Charles D. Searles, of Maine.
Jack H. Shellenberger, of Maryland.
Leon A. Shelnutt, of Alabama.
Howard R. Simpson, of California.
P. Warren Simpson, of Maryland.
Morton S. Smith, of Maryland.
Ralph Stuart Smith, of Maryland.
C. Kenneth Snyder, of Florida.
Marvin Sorkin, of the District of Columbia.
Clifford E. Southard, of Maryland.
William Lloyd Stearman, of the District of Columbia.
Henry H. Stephen, of Florida.
Victor L. Stier, of California.
Howard E. Stingle, of the District of Columbia.
Jerome A. Stone, of Florida.
G. Scott Sugden, of Maine.
Marshall W. S. Swan, of Maryland.
Joseph W. Thoman, of Virginia.
Don R. Torrey, of New Jersey.
Argus J. Tresidder, of Kentucky.
Neely G. Turner, of California.
Philip A. Turner, of Virginia.
Charles K. Waters, of Minnesota.
Merle M. Werner, of Nebraska.
Paul E. Wheeler, of Maryland.
Robert L. White, of Colorado.
Walter P. White, Jr., of Alabama.
Ernest H. Wiener, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
John Z. Williams, of New Jersey.
Harold O. Wright, of Illinois.
Jack R. Zeller, of Ohio.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Thomas G. Allen, of New Hampshire.
Richard T. Arndt, of New Jersey.
Theophilus E. Ashford, of New Jersey.
Norman C. Barnes, of New York.
David H. Barnhart, of Arizona.
Myron A. Baskin, of Virginia.
Edmund A. Bator, of Georgia.
Charles R. Beecham, of California.
Holley Mack Bell, of North Carolina.
Charles W. Bergstrom, of the District of Columbia.
Herbert K. Berthold, of Virginia.
Peter P. Bielak, of Connecticut.
Howard E. Biggerstaff, of California.
Stuart J. Bohacek, of Nebraska.
Edgar S. Borup, of Illinois.
James E. Bradshaw, of Tennessee.
William D. Bristow, of California.
Harry P. Britton, of California.
Richard C. Brower, of California.
Michael D. Brown, of New York.
Ivan M. Campbell, of California.
Lawrence O. Carlson, of Maryland.
Martin C. Carroll, Jr., of New York.
Miss Elizabeth Carver, of North Carolina.
Bernard Casper, of California.
R. Dabney Chapman, of Maryland.
Thomas G. Charouhas, of Washington.
Milton M. Chase, of Ohio.
Neale E. Clark, of Nebraska.
Fred A. Coffey, Jr., of Texas.
Edward J. Conlon, of the District of Columbia.
Edward F. Conyngham, of Oregon.
Francis A. Cooke, of Virginia.
A. Speight Cooper, of Georgia.
Joe B. Cox, of Ohio.
James F. Crane, of California.
William T. Crocker, of Massachusetts.
Robert D. Cross, of Colorado.
Richard H. Curtiss, of Virginia.
George T. Czuczka, of New York.
John J. Daly, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Philip A. Damon, Jr., of Virginia.
William B. Davis, of Michigan.
William F. DeMyer, of New York.
John DeNoia, of New Jersey.
Miss Joy A. Dickens, of the District of Columbia.
William S. Dickson, of New Jersey.
William E. Dietz, of the District of Columbia.
Philip DiTommaso, of Pennsylvania.
Mason C. Dobson, of Illinois.
Francis T. Donovan, of Pennsylvania.
Thomas C. Dove, Jr., of North Carolina.
Miss Nancy R. Downing, of Illinois.
Miss Elizabeth R. Earle, of the District of Columbia.
John J. Ewing, of the District of Columbia.
Jack B. Fawcett, of Colorado.
Harold W. Fellman, of Pennsylvania.
Edward J. Findlay, of Maryland.
Frederic A. Fisher, of Michigan.
John C. Fiske, of Iowa.
Donald R. Ford, of Hawaii.
Ben F. Fordney, of Virginia.
Evan Fotos, of Massachusetts.
Robert V. Gildea, of Maryland.
Robert C. Goodman, of California.
Orville H. Coplen, of Washington.
Richard J. Gordon, of Maryland.
Clifford P. Hackett, of Connecticut.
Ben H. Hall, of Maryland.
Allen C. Hansen, of New Jersey.
Miss Carol V. Harford, of California.
Theodore G. Hartry, of California.
Richard W. Helgerson, of South Dakota.
Miss Shirley B. Hendsch, of the District of Columbia.
David I. Hitchcock, of Connecticut.
James Hoyt, of California.
Benjamin H. Jackson, of Ohio.
Theodore R. Jaeckel, of the District of Columbia.
Charles A. Johnson, of Virginia.
Roy W. Johnson, of New Jersey.
Stanton Jue, of California.
Jack W. Juergens, of Kansas.
William J. Karppi, of Michigan.
Harry H. Kendall, of Maryland.
Donald J. Kent, of Maryland.
William H. Keogh, of Maryland.
Richard M. Key, of Maryland.
Ivan T. Klecka, of Illinois.
Kenneth D. Koch, of Michigan.
Miss Garnetta Kramer, of Illinois.
Thomas R. Kruse, of Iowa.
Miss Ethel A. Kuhn, of Washington.
Charles J. Lahey, of Maryland.
Gilbert I. Laskowski, of Texas.
Milton Leavitt, of Massachusetts.
Robert H. Leeper, of Pennsylvania.
Ralph Lewis, of the District of Columbia.
Theodore M. Liu, of Michigan.
Frenise A. Logan, of North Carolina.
Miss Margaret F. MacKellar, of California.
Herbert C. Madison, of the District of Columbia.
Harrington E. Manville, of Colorado.
John A. Mason, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
James O. Mays, of Georgia.
Miss Ellen Irene McCullough, of New Jersey.
Charles A. McGinley, Jr., of Maryland.
James A. McGinley III, of Florida.
Donald E. McNertney, of Iowa.
Charles L. Medd, of New York.
Mrs. Aileen S. Miles, of Virginia.
Ainslie B. Minor, of Florida.
Miss Theresa C. Mravintz, of California.
Arthur R. Nayer, of New Jersey.
Howard F. Needham, of Maryland.
Allan Nelson, of California.
Robert L. M. Nevitt, of Pennsylvania.
Robert L. Nichols, of New Hampshire.
Tom A. Noonan, of the District of Columbia.
Flemming E. Nyrop, of Virginia.
Victor B. Olason, of Washington.
Blanchard K. Parsons, of New York.
Wilbert C. Petty, of the District of Columbia.
Edward T. Pinch, of Florida.
Milos O. Ptak, of Ohio.
William H. Pugh, of New Jersey.
Edward T. Purcell, of Maryland.
R. Randolph Raven, of California.
Mrs. Katharine D. Ray, of Tennessee.
James M. Rentschler, of Pennsylvania.
William H. Riddell, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
David L. Roberts, Jr., of New York.
Blake W. Robinson, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Edward L. Robinson, of the District of Columbia.
Leonard I. Robock, of Ohio.
Robert A. Rockweiler, of Wisconsin.
James G. Rogers, of California.
Robert N. Rogers, of Illinois.
Gunther K. Rosinus, of Indiana.
Phifer P. Rothman, of Florida.
Vincent Rotundo, of New Jersey.
Howard H. Russell, Jr., of North Dakota.
Irving L. Sablosky, of Illinois.
John H. Scanlon, of California.
Eugene M. Schaeffer, of Tennessee.
Miss Catherine S. Scott, of the District of Columbia.
Harry E. Sedgley, of California.
Laurence Sharpe, of Maryland.
John W. Shirley, of the District of Columbia.
David W. Smith, of Utah.
Douglas H. Smith, of the District of Columbia.
Norris P. Smith, of California.
Donald E. Soergel, of Maryland.
Bart N. Stephens, of Florida.
Perry J. Stieglitz, of New York.
Miss Constance E. Stone, of Vermont.
David L. Stratmon, Sr., of Indiana.
G. Frederick Stutz, of Massachusetts.
Richard J. Sullivan, of Iowa.
Ted M. G. Tanen, of California.
Vernon R. Telford, of Georgia.
George R. Thompson, of New Jersey.
Eugene B. Thomson, of Maryland.
Miss Myrtle E. Thorne, of the District of Columbia.
Francis E. Townsend, of Washington.
Fred W. Trembour, of Virginia.
Graham Tucker, of Virginia.
Richard E. Underland, of Nebraska.
Frank D. Underwood, of Maryland.
Hal W. Vaughan, of Florida.
G. Claude Villarreal, of Texas.
John W. Vonier, of Virginia.
Robert C. Voth, of California.
William N. Wagley, of the District of Columbia.
Wilbur F. Weeks, of Connecticut.
James K. Welsh, Jr., of New York.
Miss Dorothea Western, of Wisconsin.
Ralph R. White, of Maine.
Lloyd H. Wilkins, of California.
Arthur K. Willey, Jr., of Virginia.
Jack E. Wyant, of Washington.
George G. Wynne, of North Carolina.
Douglas A. Zischke, of Minnesota.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, consuls, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Miss Denise M. Abbey, of Washington.
Sime H. Adelman, of Ohio.
Donald H. Albright, of Arkansas.
Philip W. Arnold, of New York.
James M. Ascher, of Illinois.
Rexford L. Baer, of California.
Miss Ruth Banonis, of Michigan.
Miss Margaret K. Beadles, of Kentucky.
Miss Evelyn M. Blickensderfer, of New York.
Edward R. Brandt, of Maryland.
Melvyn R. Brokenshire, Jr., of Texas.
Arthur L. Bunn, of Florida.
John R. Campbell, of California.
Robert A. Cattelli, of the District of Columbia.
John R. Challinor, of Illinois.
Robert L. Chatten, of Kentucky.
Gerald L. Clay, of Nevada.
John D. Clayton, of Virginia.
Frank Darlington, of Texas.
Miss Dora Dean, of Pennsylvania.
James H. De Cou, of California.

Dolf M. Droge, of Indiana.
William M. Dunn, of the District of Columbia.
Robert F. Ebersole, of Florida.
G. Michael Eisenstadt, of New York.
James Flood, of Pennsylvania.
George L. Gaddie, of Florida.
Norris D. Garnett, of California.
R. Laurence Garufi, of New Jersey.
Arthur S. Giuliano, of New Jersey.
Robert E. Goodenough, of Indiana.
Henry O. Green, Jr., of Arkansas.
John L. Griffiths, of California.
Howard W. Hardy, Jr., of New Jersey.
Miss Barbara S. Harvey, of Pennsylvania.
Harry L. Hughes, of the District of Columbia.
Miss Barbara A. Hutchison, of Delaware.
Jerry L. Inman, of California.
Anton N. Kasanof, of Florida.
Sean Kennedy Kelly, of Nevada.
Edward J. Killeen, of California.
Franz E. Krell, of Illinois.
Arthur D. Lefkowitz, of New York.
William R. Lenderking, Jr., of Connecticut.
Miss Joann Lewinsohn, of Oklahoma.
Frank A. Magary, of California.
Charles M. Magee, of Louisiana.
Miss Tana M. Mayland, of California.
John F. McDonald, of Maine.
James D. McHale, of Massachusetts.
Miss Gabriella E. Metcalf, of the District of Columbia.
Daniel L. Miller, of California.
Gordon W. Murchie, of California.
Edgar E. Noel, of the District of Columbia.
Michael T. F. Pistor, of Arizona.
Eugene Frederick Quinn, of Pennsylvania.
J. Thomas Rimer III, of Pennsylvania.
Ismael Rivera, of Maryland.
Miss Elizabeth K. Rousseau, of the District of Columbia.
Robert R. Ruggiero, of Rhode Island.
Philip W. Shepherdson, of Illinois.
Christopher L. Sholes, of New Jersey.
Edward J. Slack, of South Dakota.
Miss Dorothy M. Slak, of Ohio.
James F. Smith, of Ohio.
Peter N. Synodis, of California.
Miss Margaret V. Taylor, of California.
Jaroslav J. Verner, of Minnesota.
Nicholas Volk, Jr., of New Jersey.
Robert E. Zimmerman, of Illinois.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Dino J. Caterini, of Ohio.
Allan B. Croghan, of California.
Neal T. Donnelly, of New York.
Edward A. Elly, of Michigan.
Lawrence B. Flood, of California.
C. M. Fry, of Missouri.
Jack Golden, of Georgia.
Thompson A. Grunwald, of California.
Thomas J. Gunning, of Illinois.
Miss Helen S. Hanson, of California.
Peter J. Hickman, of Texas.
Talbott W. Huey, of Maryland.
Robert E. Knopes, of Wisconsin.
Bruce R. Koch, of Pennsylvania.
Robert F. Krill, of Pennsylvania.
David J. Levin, of Pennsylvania.
Donald E. Mathes, of Missouri.
John R. McLean, of Michigan.
Merrill S. Miller, of Virginia.
James L. Morad, of California.
Howard G. Neuberg, of California.
Edward T. Penney, of Illinois.
Charles R. Raisner, of Florida.
Donald E. Reilly, of California.
John F. Ritchotte, of Pennsylvania.
Sanders F. Rosenblum, of Michigan.
Robert H. Ruffner, of Michigan.
Henry B. Ryan, of Illinois.
James H. Sease, of Michigan.
Miss Barbara M. Shelby, of New Jersey.
John E. Slavick, of Ohio.
Robert S. Snow, of California.
Frank F. Starbuck, of Florida.
William Stephens, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Conrad Stolzenbach, of Ohio.
V. Jordan Tanner, of Utah.
Miss Marie Louise Telich, of California.
Jeremy W. Tryon, of Massachusetts.
Alfred J. Waddell, of the District of Columbia.

The following-named persons to the offices indicated, pursuant to section 516 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended:

For appointment as Foreign Service officers or class 7, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Barry E. Ballow, of California.
Robert K. Baron, of Pennsylvania.
Louis A. Barraza, of California.
Donald S. Birn, of New York.
Richard Birn, of New York.
Richard A. Boardman, of New York.
John T. Burns, of Florida.
Thomas A. Calhoun, of California.
James B. Carroll, of Illinois.
Miss Ruth Marie Connolly, of Massachusetts.
Miss Eleanor M. De Selms, of the District of Columbia.
Miss Joan L. Dickie, of New York.
Warren J. Dunn, of Virginia.
Miss Joan R. Edmonds, of California.
Philip W. Ernst, of Minnesota.
Thomas E. Finnerty, of Michigan.
Joel Anthony Fischman, of Massachusetts
Eli Fiam, of Virginia.
Robert S. Fletcher, of California.
Edward D. Franco, of Colorado.
John D. Garner, of Oklahoma.
Robert K. Geis, of Texas.
Paul L. Good, of Oregon.
John J. Harrigan, of Illinois.
Donald W. Hauger, of Florida.
Miss Corinne A. Heditsian, of New York.
Raburn L. Howland, of Ohio.
Miss Suzanne Hutchison, of Ohio.
Miss Mary Roberta Jones, of Montana.
John M. Keller, of Minnesota.
David Kuryk, of New Jersey.
Jerry E. Kyle, of California.
Robert R. LaGamma, of New York.
Alfred A. Laun III, of Wisconsin.
Leon Lederer II, of Virginia.
John R. Lepperd, of Virginia.
Malcolm A. McConnell, of Wisconsin.
Jerome K. McDonough, of Massachusetts.
John H. Melton, of Montana.
Robert S. Meyers, of California.
Miss Christine Morrissette, of Massachusetts.
Peter Cary Muncie, of Maryland.
J. Richard Overturf, of California.
Cecil E. Pollard, of California.
Douglas R. Price, of Virginia.
Miss Jeanne M. Pryor, of Arizona.
Harold F. Radday, of California.
Miss Karla Reed, of New York.
John M. Reid, of Virginia.
Peter J. Reuss, of Florida.
Joel W. Rochow, of Illinois.
Michael A. Rockland, of New York.
A. Rexford Rorex, of Florida.
Michael G. Roskin, of California.
Richard F. Ross, of Florida.
William A. Rugh, of New York.
Michael D. Schneider, of New Jersey.
Arnold J. Silverman, of California.
Leon M. S. Slawecki, of Pennsylvania.
Christopher Snow, of Utah.
Jon W. Stewart, of Arizona.
Wesley D. Stewart, of Ohio.
William F. Thompson, of Minnesota.
Franklin J. Tonini, of Florida.
Stewart A. Toy, of California.
Daniel L. Traub, of California.
David M. Wilson, of Massachusetts.
Kenneth C. Wimmel, of Ohio.
Peter C. Wolcott, of New York.
Robert J. Wozniak, of Michigan.
William M. Zavis, of Illinois.
Jan R. Zehner, of Ohio.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Thomas Hardy Crawford, of the District of Columbia.
Alan L. Gilbert, of the District of Columbia.
Charles R. Gostlin, of Ohio.
Miss Mary Anne Hammons, of Tennessee.
John F. Kordek, of Illinois.
Miss Jean Elizabeth Mammen, of New York.
Kent D. Obee, of Idaho.
Miss Mary E. Proctor, of Massachusetts.
Peter L. Quasius, of Wisconsin.
Miss Edith E. Russo, of Maryland.
Richard W. Schmidt, of Massachusetts.
Richard C. Schoonover, of California.
William Merrell Stott, of New York.
John E. Stuckey, Jr., of Kansas.
Miss Laurelane E. Vincent, of Oregon.

James L. Meyer, of California, for reappointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 6, a vice consul of career, and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America, pursuant to section 520(a) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Senator Muskie Urges Citizen Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 14, 1966

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President—

In a free society, there is really no way to achieve a more beautiful environment unless each individual citizen makes national beautification his personal responsibility.

Senator EDMUND MUSKIE, who spoke those words, has himself practiced what he preaches. As chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, he has led the way to enactment of legislation to control the poisoning of air and water, and he has pointed toward further progress by emphasizing intergovernmental cooperation and citizen participation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an interview with Senator MUSKIE entitled "This Must Be a Citizen Action Program," appearing in the General Electric Forum for October–December, be printed at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

THIS MUST BE A CITIZEN ACTION PROGRAM—AN INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR EDMUND S. MUSKIE, CHAIRMAN, SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON AIR AND WATER POLLUTION

Question. To be truly effective, any national program must ultimately have the