

United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, to the States respectively, or to the people?"

Both precedent and reason would seem to answer a resounding "Yes" to the question: "Is this law prohibitive?"

CONCLUSIONS ON THE COMMERCE CLAUSE AS A BASIS FOR A FEDERAL FAIR HOUSING LAW

It is clear that, under its commerce power, the Congress can prohibit certain aspects of racial discrimination. It is also clear that under the commerce power the Congress can regulate intrastate activities if they have a substantial effect upon commerce. The cases hold that the commerce power can reach retailers whose sales are wholly intrastate and only one-ninth of whose purchases are made out of State. *Meat Cutters v. Fairlawn Meats*, 353 U.S. 20 (1957). The cases hold that Congress can reach a farmer who grows wheat on his own farm for his own consumption even though the amount he grows may be trivial. *Wickard v. Filburn*, 317 U.S. 111 (1942).

Is there really any activity which can be considered so local that Congress cannot regulate it? Are the limitations on the commerce power real or only theoretical?

It is not too difficult to find some limits within the Constitution itself. In *Mabee v. White Plains Publishing Co.*, 327 U.S. 178 (1946), it was shown that even a daily newspaper, whose out-of-State circulation was only about one-half of 1 percent of its sales, could be reached under the commerce power by way of the Fair Labor Standards Act. Suppose, however, that instead of trying to regulate the wages and hours of the newspaper's employees, Congress tried to regulate its editorial policy. Suppose, for instance, that there had been so much editorializing on automobile safety that people stopped buying automobiles which, in turn, caused plant shutdowns and threatened the entire economy of the Nation. Suppose that Congress, after extensive hearings linking the economic depression to safety editorials, decided that the only way to relieve unemployment and get the Nation back on its wheels was to prohibit editorials on automobile safety. Could this be a valid exercise of the commerce power?

In addition to the question whether the rental of a room or the sale of a house by its owner is a transaction so strictly local that the Congress cannot reach it under the commerce power, title IV, as presently framed, presents questions akin to that posed by an attempt to reach a newspaper's editorial policy under the commerce power. Does title IV, by prohibiting a religious home from discriminating on account of race or religion in the disposition of its rooms, infringe upon the first amendment right to free exercise of religion?

Does title IV, by permitting a court to order a man to sell his home, on which he has invited bids, to a person whose bid was rejected on account of race, religion, or national origin, interfere with any of the homeowner's constitutional liberties?

Does title IV infringe on any constitutional liberty of a racial, religious, or na-

tional group by prohibiting it from subdividing an island or other tract of land for homesites to be sold or leased only by approval of the group?

Does title IV infringe any constitutional liberties of a man who rents a room or two in the house in which he lives by requiring him not to discriminate among prospective tenants on account of race, religion, or national origin?

Whatever determination the Congress makes with respect to these threshold questions will be entitled to great weight in the Supreme Court's deliberations in the event of title IV's enactment. It is the Court, however, which will have the final word, since the Court is the ultimate arbiter of the meaning of the Constitution. Although the commerce power of the Congress may be plenary, it is the Court which will determine whether the activity reached is truly commerce as well as whether the method by which Congress has chosen to regulate it is prohibited by some other provision of the Constitution. Perhaps the fairest generalization which may be made is that the closer Congress comes to restricting the purely private prejudices of the individual homeowner, the more likely will the Court be to find that the Congress has exceeded its power.

I, as a U.S. Senator, believe that Congress will have once again exceeded its power if it enacts title IV and I, therefore, am opposed to title IV, the "open occupancy" section of S. 3296.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 29, 1966, at 10 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 28, 1966:

U.S. MARSHAL

Jesse L. Dobbs, of Texas, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Texas for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

THE JUDICIARY

Joseph P. Kinneary, of Ohio, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Ohio, vice Mell G. Underwood, retired.

U.S. MARSHAL

Jackie V. Robertson, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of Oklahoma for the term of 4 years, vice William M. Broadrick, resigned.

IN THE AIR FORCE

Lt. Gen. Maurice A. Preston, XXXX (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President in the grade of general, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10 of the United States Code.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

Barnaby C. Keane, of Rhode Island, to be Chairman of the National Endowment for the

Humanities for a term of 4 years, vice Henry Allen Moe.

THE JUDICIARY

Woodrow B. Seals, of Texas, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Texas to fill a new position created by Public Law 89-372 approved March 18, 1966.

Ernest Guinn, of Texas, to be U.S. district judge for the western district of Texas to fill a new position created by Public Law 89-372 approved March 18, 1966.

Irving L. Goldberg, of Texas, to be U.S. circuit judge, Fifth Circuit to fill a new position created by Public Law 89-372 approved March 18, 1966.

Robert A. Ainsworth, Jr., of Louisiana, to be U.S. circuit judge, Fifth Circuit to fill a new position created by Public Law 89-372 approved March 18, 1966.

John C. Godbold, of Alabama, to be U.S. circuit judge, Fifth Circuit vice Richard T. Rives, retired.

C. Clyde Atkins, of Florida, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Florida to fill a new position created by Public Law 89-372 approved March 18, 1966.

William M. Taylor, Jr., of Texas, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Texas vice T. Whitfield Davidson, retired.

Jack Roberts, of Texas, to be U.S. district judge for the western district of Texas vice Homer Thornberry, elevated.

John V. Singleton, Jr., of Texas, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Texas to fill a new position created by Public Law 89-372 approved March 18, 1966.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate June 28, 1966:

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

Richard Helms, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of Central Intelligence.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 28, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Thou art my God, and I will praise Thee: Thou art my God, I will exalt Thee.—Psalm 118: 28.

Our Heavenly Father, in whom we live and move and have our being, so fill us with Thy spirit that we may not yield to temptation but be strengthened with inward power for outward tasks. May we meet our obligations with honor, our duties with faith, and our responsibilities with a high regard for the good of all.

Stimulate us with those deep and abiding convictions which keep our country strong, which make our churches vital, and fill our homes with love and joy and peace. May noble virtues live nobly in us and may we give them hands and feet in our day and for this hour in which we live—through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced

that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1240. An act for the relief of Harry C. Engle;

H.R. 3788. An act to revive and reenact as amended the act entitled "An act creating the City of Clinton Bridge Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors to acquire by purchase or condemnation and to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near Clinton, Iowa, and at or near Fulton, Ill.," approved December 21, 1944;

H.R. 3976. An act to amend the act of July 26, 1956, to authorize the Muscatine Bridge Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Muscatine, Iowa, and the town of Drury, Ill.;

H.R. 5204. An act for the relief of Joseph K. Bellek;

H.R. 6590. An act for the relief of Arthur Hill;

H.R. 8793. An act for the relief of Eugene J. Bennett;

H.R. 9302. An act for the relief of Lt. Charles W. Pittman, Jr., U.S. Navy;

H.R. 10994. An act for the relief of Charles T. Davis, Jr., Sallie M. Davis, and Nora D. White;

H.R. 12232. An act to amend title 1 of the United States Code to provide for the admissibility in evidence of the slip laws and the Treaties and Other International Acts Series, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13650. An act to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act to authorize increased agency consideration of tort claims against the Government, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13652. An act to establish a statute of limitations for certain actions brought by the Government;

H.R. 14025. An act to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 14182. An act to provide for judgments for costs against the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1535. An act to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to authorize the establishment of hazardous duty pay in certain cases;

H.R. 7423. An act to permit certain transfers of Post Office Department appropriations;

H.R. 13651. An act to avoid unnecessary litigation by providing for the collection of claims of the United States, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 14347. An act to liberalize the provisions for payment to parents and children of dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1611. An act to transfer certain functions from the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia to the District of Columbia court of general sessions and to certain other agencies of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 231. An act for the relief of James W. Adams and others;

S. 1571. An act for the relief of Kermit Wager, of Lebanon, S. Dak.;

S. 2076. An act for the relief of Kil Ja Chung;

S. 2295. An act for the relief of Gulseppe Rubino;

S. 2317. An act for the relief of Dr. Albert Victor Michael Ferris-Prabuh;

S. 2720. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to develop, through the use of experiment and demonstration plants, practicable and economic means for the production of fish protein concentrate;

S. 2784. An act for the relief of Doreen Delmege Willis;

S. 2997. An act for the relief of Noriko Susan Duke (Nakano);

S. 3052. An act to provide for a coordinated national highway safety program through financial assistance to the States to accelerate highway traffic safety programs, and for other purposes;

S. 3083. An act for the relief of Dr. Rafael A. Penalver;

S. 3189. An act for the relief of Dr. Alonso Portuondo; and

S. Con. Res. 99. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

THE LATE HONORABLE LOUIS CONVERS CRAMTON, FORMER MEMBER OF CONGRESS, FROM THE STATE OF MICHIGAN

Mr. MACKIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKIE. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce the death of our esteemed friend, the former Congressman from Michigan, Louis Convers Cramton, Thursday, June 23.

Memorial services for Congressman Cramton were at 3:30 p.m. Saturday in the First Presbyterian Church, Lapeer, with burial in Mount Hope Cemetery there.

It was Abraham Lincoln, Mr. Speaker, who said:

Die when I may, I want it said of me by those who knew me best that I always plucked a thistle and planted a flower where I thought a flower would grow.

Louis Convers Cramton, Representative in Congress from the Seventh District of Michigan for 18 years, passed away on Thursday last. It was my honor to know this man, Mr. Speaker, and I stand today to say that he plucked a thistle and planted a flower where he thought a flower would grow.

While one may chronicle the broad career of this great individual, none can recapture his crusading spirit nor dissect his tender love of humanity. These were Louis Cramton's qualities of greatness. It was this spirit and this love which motivated his efforts, as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for the Interior, to improve the lot of the American Indian. It was Representative Cramton who worked so tirelessly to develop and stabilize the higher educational institutions for Negroes, including How-

ard University in our Capital City. It was Louis Cramton, son of a Union soldier, who managed his own legislation to restore the Lee Mansion in Arlington National Cemetery, and who fathered the act to establish and develop the George Washington Memorial Parkway.

Louis Cramton was a unique man, Mr. Speaker. He was not at all hesitant to do the unpopular if he thought that it would stir the soil and allow a flower to grow. Michigan was proud to call him son, and I was proud to call him friend.

I feel a distinct personal loss in his passing and all of America will miss this courageous, creative and resourceful man who by his skill as well as his high integrity was a credit to the people he served.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, if the words "Well done, thou good and faithful servant" ever applied to a public official it applied to the Honorable Louis C. Cramton, a former Member of Congress from Michigan, who passed away a few days ago. I want to join my colleagues today in paying tribute to this highly respected and esteemed man.

Long before coming to Congress, I had known of the fine qualities of Louis Cramton. Whether serving a term as an elected official or as an appointed officer, Judge Cramton directed his almost limitless energies for the achievement of goals he was convinced were best for his State and for his country.

Few Members of Congress have ever had as broad a range of public life as Judge Cramton. Lawyer, newspaper publisher, railroad commissioner, assistant to a member of the President's Cabinet, Congressman, jurist, and State legislator—these are some of the fields in which Judge Cramton demonstrated his leadership.

For 18 years he very ably served the Thumb District of Michigan in this House. He was a brilliant man whose opinions were sought and respected. Little wonder then, that he was selected many times for important positions of trust in government. His elective political career began in 1909 when the voters selected him for his first term in the State legislature. His elective political career did not end until December 31, 1960, when he retired as a member of the Michigan Legislature at the age of 85.

Much credit for the establishment of the system of national parks goes to Judge Cramton who was a leading advocate of the park system during his years here in Congress. In the Michigan Legislature he was the architect of the State's fair employment practices law.

To his son, Louis K. Cramton, who lives in Midland, Mich., in the district I represent, and to his daughter, Mrs. Charles R. Murray of Saginaw, Mich., I want to express my sympathy.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this is indeed a sad occasion for me.

Over the past several years, I had come to know Louis Cramton quite well and had become very fond of him. For a

number of those years, he was my constituent until the boundaries of my district were altered by the Michigan Legislature.

But Louis Cramton was more—much more—than a constituent. He was an adviser, a teacher, an inspiration. Most of all, he was a good friend, a kind and gentle man.

Although he and I were of different political persuasions, to my knowledge we seldom disagreed. I think this is because he accentuated the positive—he sought out points of agreement and then carried on a dialog in that context.

Louis Cramton served in the U.S. House of Representatives from March 4, 1913, to March 3, 1931, then was a distinguished special assistant to the Secretary of the Interior. He was a Michigan circuit court judge until 1941, when he returned to the practice of law.

Then, at an age when most men are already in retirement, Louis Cramton successfully ran in 1948 for the Michigan State House of Representatives, in which he had served a term almost four decades earlier. He was reelected to the Michigan House of Representatives in 1950, 1952, 1954, 1956, and 1958.

Louis Cramton's life was dedicated to public service—to the improvement of conditions for his fellow man. His accomplishments were many, and they will live on and on even though he is no longer with us.

I recall especially his work in behalf of our national park system. In recognition of his enduring contributions, he is known as the "godfather of the national parks."

He was an early and consistent supporter for equal opportunities, the author of Michigan's fair employment practices law and one of those responsible for the development of Howard University as a great educational institution.

Mr. Speaker, there are not many of whom it can truly be said that our country is a better place because they lived and worked in it. Louis Cramton is one of that select group.

With his death, Michigan has lost one of its most distinguished elder statesmen.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACKIE] has just informed this body, the Honorable Louis C. Cramton, a Member of this House from 1912 to 1931, died this past weekend.

Lou Cramton was a public servant of whom the public was justly proud. He had foresight—foresight to support and fight for national parks a half century ago, long before the need became so acutely evident as it is today. He had courage—courage to press for civil rights and fair employment practices in the years the Ku Klux Klan was riding high, even in the North. He had compassion—compassion to vote for and personally give funds for underprivileged kids who needed help to attend college. These and many other fine qualities served him well, and served this Nation well, not only in his years in Congress, but also as circuit judge, member of the State legislature, and attorney for the Federal Government.

But Mr. Speaker, Lou Cramton was not only an able official, he was also an idol to many a boy and girl, and mother and dad, in his community. For years he lived in Lapeer, Mich., a small city in a farm area. One of his nearby neighbors was a girl named Anne Biggs, now my wife. Her mother, now Mrs. Lynna Snowman, would point to their neighbor Lou Cramton and say to Anne and her brother Bob, "That Lou Cramton is one of the finest men in government that I know of. I wish all the rest were as sensible and honest as he is."

Mr. Speaker, Lou Cramton inspired that kind of admiration in many persons. Another so inspired was another young neighbor, Alice Grant, now Mrs. Alice Bingner, who published an editorial earlier this year, in the Livingston County Argus Dispatch, of Brighton, Mich., a part of which reads as follows:

I think there is something more important than voting for a man who thinks my way.

I prefer the man I can trust to vote the way he truly believes is right for his constituents.

I knew a politician who did. Louis C. Cramton (R) of Lapeer County. At ninety-one he is retired due to ill health. Had I been active when he introduced prohibition to the United States, I would have said "I disagree. This won't work". And Cramton's idea did fall. But Cramton didn't. He was—is—a great man. He played a vital part in preserving national parks; he was instrumental in organization of the first college for Negroes. He worked hard in Congress and the Michigan House of Representatives and as a Circuit Judge and has received honorable recognition for it. I am sure he made other boo-boos in his various capacities. But I am sure he never made a mistake that wasn't honest. He did what he felt was right and proper. What more can any of us do?

Mr. Speaker, Lou Cramton accomplished much in his 90 years. Perhaps his finest accomplishment, however, was to demonstrate to many a young man and woman that the people who lead a democracy can be as proud an asset as democratic government itself.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point an obituary for Louis C. Cramton, published June 25 in the Detroit Free Press:

LOUIS CRAMTON, PUBLIC SERVANT

Services for Louis C. Cramton, who spent more than half a century in public service as a Michigan congressman, judge and state representative, will be at 3:30 p.m. Saturday in the First Presbyterian Church, Lapeer.

The 90-year-old lawmaker died Thursday in the Saginaw Rehabilitation Center, which he entered five weeks ago for surgery. The nature of his illness was not disclosed.

Cramton, often called the "godfather of national parks," had retired in 1960. Born Dec. 2, 1875, in Lapeer County, he studied law at the University of Michigan, where he received his degree in 1899.

He was elected a state representative in 1909, and two years later was elected to Congress from the 7th District. He served in Congress until 1931, when he was defeated, largely because of his strong support for Prohibition.

During his years in Congress, he wrote legislation establishing Isle Royale National Park in Lake Superior and the George Washington Memorial Parkway in Maryland and Virginia. He also was instrumental in restoring national monuments in Williamsburg, Yorktown and Jamestown, Va.

From 1931 to 1932 he was a special attorney for the U.S. secretary of the Interior. He returned to Michigan and was elected a Lapeer County circuit judge, a post he held until 1941.

In 1948, at the age of 73, he was returned to the Legislature, where he remained until failing health forced him to retire from public life in 1960.

Cramton was author of Michigan's Fair Employment Practices Act and an early supporter of Howard University in Washington, D.C., a school of predominantly Negro enrollment. In 1961 the university dedicated a school on its campus to him.

His last years were not free from want. Despite his many years in public service, his only income after retirement was from Social Security and a small pension which he received from the Legislature.

Surviving are a son, Louis K., of Midland; a daughter, Mrs. Charles R. Murray, of Saginaw, and three grandchildren.

The body will be in the Baird-Newton Funeral Home in Lapeer until noon Saturday.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MACKIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life and service of the late Honorable Louis Conners Cramton.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1967

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House on Wednesday last, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1180) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1967, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present for the consideration of this vital legislation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri makes the point of order that a quorum is not present, and evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

	[Roll No. 156]	
Addabbo	Clawson, Del	Ford,
Arends	Colmer	Gerald R.
Ashley	Conte	Gallagher
Ayres	Conyers	Giaino
Baring	Craley	Gilbert
Bates	de la Garza	Goodell
Bingham	Diggs	Green, Ore.
Blatnik	Dorn	Hagan, Ga.
Callaway	Dulski	Harsha
Cederberg	Ellsworth	Harvey, Ind.
Celler	Everett	Herlong
Clausen,	Farbstein	Hicks
Don H.	Fogarty	

Hull	Morton	Scheuer
Kelly	Multer	Smith, N.Y.
King, N.Y.	Murphy, N.Y.	Stephens
McCarthy	Murray	Teague, Tex.
McEwen	Nelsen	Thompson, N.J.
Mackay	O'Neal, Ga.	Toll
Mailliard	Pool	Tupper
Martin, Mass.	Powell	Utt
Moeller	Resnick	Whitten
Morris	Roncalio	Williams
Morrison	Rooney, N.Y.	Willis

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 364 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1967

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], that the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1180) be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. Res. 1180

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the several departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational units of the Government for the fiscal year 1967, namely:

SEC. 101. (a) (1) Such amounts as may be necessary for continuing projects or activities (not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution) which were conducted in the fiscal year 1966 and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority would be available in the following appropriation Acts for the fiscal year 1967:

Legislative Branch Appropriation Act;
Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act;

Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriation Act;

Independent Offices Appropriation Act; and
Department of Defense Appropriation Act.

(2) Appropriations made by this subsection shall be available to the extent and in the manner which would be provided by the pertinent appropriation Act.

(3) Whenever the amount which would be made available or the authority which would be granted under an Act listed in this subsection as passed by the House is different from that which would be available or granted under such Act as passed by the Senate, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued under the lesser amount or the more restrictive authority.

(4) Whenever an Act listed in this subsection has been passed by only one House or where an item is included in only one version of an Act as passed by both Houses, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued under the appropriation, fund, or authority granted by the one House, but at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate or the rate permitted by the action of the one House, whichever is lower: *Provided*, That no provision which is included in an appropriation Act enumerated in this subsection but which was not included in the applicable appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1966, and which by its terms is applicable to more than one appropriation, fund, or authority, shall be applicable to any appropriation, fund, or

authority provided in this joint resolution unless such provision shall have been included in identical form in such bill as enacted by both the House and Senate.

(b) Such amounts as may be necessary for continuing projects or activities which were conducted in the fiscal year 1966 and are listed in this subsection at a rate for operations not in excess of the current rate or the rate provided for in the budget estimate, whichever is lower, and under the more restrictive authority:

Activities for which provision was made in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1966;

Activities for which provision was made in the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1966;

Activities for which provision was made in the Public Works Appropriation Act 1966;

Activities for which provision was made in the Military Construction Appropriation Act, 1966;

Activities for which provision was made in the Foreign Assistance and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1966;

Activities of the Office of Economic Opportunity;

Activities of the President's Commissions on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice and on Crime in the District of Columbia;

Department of Justice; Activities of law enforcement assistance; and

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare;

Elementary and secondary educational activities;

Higher education facilities construction; Grants for public libraries; and

Activities under title III and part B of title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

(c) Such amounts as may be necessary to enable the Veterans Administration to carry out the provisions of the Veterans Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966 (Public Law 89-358).

(d) Such amounts as may be necessary for continuing projects or activities for which disbursements are made by the Secretary of the Senate, the Senate items under the Architect of the Capitol, and the item for salaries and expenses of the Library of Congress, all to the extent and in the manner which would be provided for in the budget estimates for the fiscal year 1967.

SEC. 102. Appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall remain available until (a) enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution, or (b) enactment of the applicable appropriation Act by both Houses without any provision for such project or activity, or (c) August 31, 1966, whichever first occurs.

SEC. 103. Appropriations and funds made available or authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution may be used without regard to the time limitations set forth in subsection (d)(2) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and expenditures therefrom shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, funds, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 104. No appropriation or fund made available or authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be used to initiate or resume any project or activity which was not being conducted during the fiscal year 1966. Appropriations made and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for any project or activity during the period for which funds or authority for such project or activity are available under this joint resolution.

Mr. MAHON (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the joint resolution be dispensed with, and that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD and be open for amendment at any point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Speaker, it is known to all that the whip notice announced that probably the defense appropriation bill would be considered today. But the situation is such that I must say that it will not be considered today and will not be considered this week. This clarifies the situation, probably, with regard to plans of some of the Members.

What we are now considering is a continuing resolution for the new fiscal year 1967, which begins this coming Friday, July 1, 3 days hence.

For the next fiscal year which begins on Friday, Congress has not appropriated any money to run the Department of Defense.

For the fiscal year which begins on Friday, Congress has not appropriated any money for military construction in Vietnam or elsewhere.

For the fiscal year which begins on Friday, Congress has not appropriated any money for foreign assistance.

For the fiscal year which begins on Friday, Congress has not appropriated any money for public works activities, such as dams, reservoirs, harbor improvements, reclamation projects, power agencies, and so forth.

For the fiscal year which begins on Friday, Congress has not appropriated any money for the antipoverty program—the darling of some, but which is not supported so warmly by others.

For the fiscal year which begins on Friday, Congress has not appropriated any money for elementary and secondary education. Of course, our school people keep clamoring for advanced action by the Congress in order that they can make their plans, but we have appropriated no money for elementary or secondary education assistance; nor for the higher education assistance program for the forthcoming fiscal year. Nor have we appropriated any money for grants to library services for construction.

For the fiscal year which begins on Friday, Congress has not appropriated any money to run the District of Columbia government.

Appropriations for all of these purposes are pending in the Committee on Appropriations, or, in the case of the Defense bill, pending here in the House. They lack authorization of law which, as all Members are aware, must be enacted before it is in order under the rules for the Committee on Appropriations to bring in the necessary appropriations.

Of course, the bills I have enumerated are in addition to several other bills for the new fiscal year which are still pending. Four of those bills are pending in

the other body—Agriculture; Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare; independent offices; and the legislative bill. And the State, Justice, Commerce, and judiciary bill is still pending in the committee.

Now, this situation may seem a little inexplicable, especially since this is the 28th day of the 6th month of the session. Congress tends to move with deliberate speed in dealing with public matters, and this is not the first time this sort of situation has arisen.

But there is a remedy for the situation, and it is being proposed by the Committee on Appropriations in this resolution; namely, that for the next 60 days—that is, for July and August—the Federal Government can pay its bills and operate on a minimum basis until the regular bills are disposed of. Because only two regular bills for 1967 have been enacted, the pending resolution is very far reach-

ing in nature. The pay of Government employees, the pay of the military, and the pay of those who are fighting in Vietnam, for examples, could not be met except by the enactment of this resolution by the Congress. The pending resolution is the customary remedy brought before the House for a good many years past on the eve of the new fiscal year for the explicit purpose of avoiding interruptions of continuing governmental functions. It is rather fully explained in the committee report which is available at the desk.

RÉSUMÉ OF THE APPROPRIATIONS BUSINESS OF THE SESSION

With the reporting of the defense appropriation bill for fiscal 1967, now pending in the House, the Committee on Appropriations has disposed of roughly 87 percent of the amounts involved in budget estimates of appropriations likely

to be considered in appropriation bills this session.

Under the original plan announced by the Committee on Appropriations on March 15, all of the appropriation bills for 1967—not counting the customary closing supplemental—were to be reported to the House by June 16. But delays occasioned largely by failure of several of the related annual authorization bills to move more expeditiously have substantially disrupted the schedule, with the result that five bills—again not counting the closing supplemental for 1967—are still pending in the committee. These are the State-Justice-Commerce-judiciary bill; the public works bill; the foreign assistance bill; the military construction bill; and the District of Columbia bill. Hearings are completed. The committee is marking time.

The following table reflects that situation:

The regular annual appropriation bills for fiscal year 1967 as of June 28, 1966

Bill	Reporting schedule, Mar. 15, 1966	Reported to House	Passed House	Passed Senate	Final congressional action	Notes
Interior.....	Mar. 31	Mar. 31	Apr. 6	May 12	May 19	
Treasury-Post Office.....	Apr. 4	Apr. 4	Apr. 6	May 23	June 15	
Agriculture.....	Apr. 21	Apr. 22	Apr. 26			
Labor-HEW.....	Apr. 28	Apr. 28	May 5			Bill omitted provision for 4 going programs, involving budget estimates for 1967 of \$3,903,000,000, due to lack of authorization bills, as follows: Antipoverty; elementary and secondary education; higher education amendments; and grants for library services and construction. Will be considered in a supplemental.
Independent offices.....	May 5	May 5	May 10			NASA authorization bill passed House (H.R. 14324) but not Senate at time of reporting the appropriation bill.
District of Columbia.....	May 12					Awaiting conference disposition of District of Columbia revenue bill, H.R. 11487, which bears on budget requests pending for 1967.
State, Justice, Commerce, and judiciary.....	May 19					
Defense.....	May 26	June 24	(¹)			Defense authorization bill delay (S. 2950). Awaiting certain authorization action.
Public works.....	June 2					
Legislative.....	June 2	June 3	June 7			
Foreign assistance.....	June 9					Awaiting authorization bills for foreign assistance and the Peace Corps.
Military construction.....	June 16					Awaiting military construction authorization bill.

¹ Scheduled for House floor action June 28 but subsequently deferred to later consideration.

NOTE.—Supplemental bill, for which no reporting date was set, is not listed.

Mr. Speaker, supplementing my remarks, 9 appropriation bills have been brought to the House this year—2 supplementals for the fiscal 1966 and 7 of the 12 regular bills for the fiscal 1967 which begins 3 days hence. In those nine bills—again, including the pending defense bill—we considered budget requests of \$113.8 billion and appropriated or proposed to appropriate \$114.5 billion, a net increase above the budget, overall, of \$667 million. Very broadly, it is useful to divide these into two categories—defense and nondefense.

The pending defense appropriation bill for 1967 carries \$58.6 billion, a net addition of \$946 million to budget requests of \$57.7 billion. And this is in addition to the requested \$13.1 billion defense supplemental enacted without amendment earlier in the session. So that these two bills for the Defense Department this year involve \$70.8 billion of the budget requests and at the moment, \$71.7 billion in appropriations. The military construction bill for 1967, involving \$1.1 billion or so, is yet to come.

The principal item causing the Defense bill to be above the budget estimates considered in connection with it

relates to pay of military personnel in uniform. When the budget was made up, the Defense Department estimated pay and allowances for a certain military strength as of June 30, 1966. It has developed, however, that there will be about 108,000 more military personnel on board at that date than had been budgeted. The Committee felt that sufficient funds to pay them should therefore be included in the bill, and has added \$569 million for that object.

In the other seven—nondefense bills—of the session, the House made a net reduction of \$280 million from budget appropriation requests of about \$43 billion, allowing \$42.7 billion; in the fiscal 1967 nondefense bills only, the grand total for the six bills as initially passed by the House is just a shade under the budget requests. While the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare bill for 1967 was about \$490 million above the budget requests, the other five bills, as shown on the table I will include after my remarks, reflected cuts from the budget that slightly more than offset that.

Four of these bills—two for fiscal 1967 and the two supplementals for 1966—have cleared the Senate and final con-

gressional action has been had on them. They involved budget requests for appropriations of about \$24.7 billion from which the net aggregate cut was \$301 million.

The bills for 1967 still pending in the committee presently involve budget requests of \$15,762 million:

[In millions]	
State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary.....	\$2,598
Public works bill.....	4,169
Foreign assistance bill.....	3,924
Military construction bill.....	1,115
District of Columbia bill (in Federal funds).....	53
Antipoverty, elementary and secondary education, higher education, and library services and construction (items that were left out of the Labor-HEW bill because authorizations for them were not through the House).....	3,903

To these amounts there would have to be added whatever supplementary requests may be submitted later in the session for the closing bill. All told, the bills yet to be reported will probably account for something like 13 percent of the appropriation bills for the session. This assumes no further multibillion

Vietnam supplemental this session—nothing beyond the more or less customary closing supplemental tentatively in the range of \$1.5 billion or so.

Prospectively, then, budget requests for appropriations for action in this session will aggregate in the order of \$131 billion. None of these figures include the so-called permanent appropriations, estimated in the January budget at about \$13.8 billion for fiscal 1967—mainly interest on the public debt—that recur automatically under earlier law without annual action by the Congress. It now looks like the grand total appropriations this year, including these permanents, will approximate \$144 or \$145 billion. That would compare with approximately \$119.3 billion of appropriations in the first session of this Congress—an increase

of some \$25 billion. Because of the distorting effect of large war supplements, a session-to-session comparison is far more reliable and instructive than the fiscal year basis.

It was only a little over a year ago that much was heard about breaking the so-called \$100 billion budget barrier, which of course referred to the administrative expenditure or disbursement budget rather than the appropriations budget. Appropriations are the necessary forerunners of expenditures, and that the latter will follow from the former is a budgeting truism. Appropriations are accurate barometers of expenditure trends. Thus it is clear that the Congress, in the present circumstances, is well on the way toward the second 100 billion mark.

I should say further that while not all of the budget is processed through the appropriation bills, most of the spending side of it is handled through them. I am including a table summarizing the totals on the bills. While the House has shown a slight reduction, in total, below the President's budget requests in the nondefense bills, thus at least holding the line in that respect, it has taken action in connection with several of the authorization bills that substantially exceed the applicable provisions made for those bills in the President's budget, and that would result in expenditures in excess of those estimated and contemplated in the President's budget. Counting those actions, at this point the House is well above the President's recommendations with respect to fiscal 1967.

Here are the tabulations:

The appropriation business of the session as of June 28, 1966

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget estimates	Passed	Difference		Budget estimates	Passed	Difference
1. House action (including Defense bill as reported):				3. Closing supplemental budget requests yet to come (wholly arbitrary amount, assumed for purposes of this tabulation)	1,500(?)	(?)	(?)
(a) 2 supplementals for 1966	15,949	15,701	1-248	Total for remaining bills to be reported—on basis stated (about 13 percent of total likely to be considered)	17,262(?)	(?)	(?)
(b) 7 regular bills for 1967	97,840	98,755	+915	4. Grand total likely to be considered in bills of the session	131,051	(?)	(?)
9 bills of the session (about 87 percent of total likely to be considered)	113,789	114,456	1+667	5. Permanent appropriations that recur without annual action by Congress, mainly interest on debt (tentative estimate from January budget)	13,800	(?)	(?)
2. Bills for 1967 still in committee:				6. Grand total for the session (tentative, subject to some refinement)	144,851	(?)	(?)
(a) State-Justice-Commerce-Judiciary	2,598			Bills enacted by Congress:			
(b) Public works	4,169			2 supplementals for 1966	16,156	15,924	1-232
(c) Foreign assistance	3,924			2 regular bills for 1967	8,587	8,518	-69
(d) Military construction	1,115			Total for bills enacted	24,743	24,442	1-301
(e) District of Columbia	53						
(f) Deferred HEW items (antipoverty; elementary and secondary education; higher education; and library services and construction)	3,903						
Subtotal, budget requests now pending in committee	15,762	(?)	(?)				

¹ Includes \$242,000,000 cut from a repayable advance (from the general fund) to the social security medicare trust fund.

² Would compare with approximately \$119,310,000,000 in the last session—an increase roughly, of \$25,000,000,000.

Summary of action on budget estimates in appropriation bills, 89th Cong., 2d sess., as of June 28, 1966

	Budget estimates to House	Passed House	Budget estimates to Senate	Passed Senate	Enacted	Change at latest stage of action
1. Bills for fiscal 1967:						
Interior	\$1,329,960,500	\$1,295,169,500	\$1,340,260,500	\$1,329,755,000	\$1,321,615,800	-\$18,644,700
Borrowing authority	(26,000,000)	(26,000,000)	(26,000,000)	(26,000,000)	(26,000,000)	
Treasury-Post Office	7,246,720,000	7,210,177,135	7,246,720,000	7,210,049,135	7,196,429,135	-50,290,865
Agriculture	7,022,638,000	6,876,027,000				-146,611,000
Borrowing authority	(702,100,000)	(852,000,000)				(+149,900,000)
Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare	10,083,184,500	10,573,272,500				+490,088,000
Independent Offices	14,319,611,291	14,017,299,000				-302,312,291
Legislative	173,793,578	172,146,333				-1,647,245
Defense (reported)	57,664,353,000	58,611,045,000				1+946,692,000
2. Supplementals for fiscal 1966:						
Defense supplemental (Vietnam)	13,135,719,000	13,135,719,000	13,135,719,000	13,135,719,000	13,135,719,000	
2d supplemental	2,813,552,168	2,564,872,568	3,020,810,903	2,801,226,003	2,788,143,303	2-232,667,600
3. Cumulative totals for the session:						
House	113,789,532,037	114,455,728,036				1+666,195,999
Senate			24,743,510,403	24,476,749,138		2-266,761,265
Enacted			24,743,510,403		24,441,907,238	2-301,603,165

¹ Reported.

² Includes \$242,000,000 cut from a repayable advance (from the general fund) to the social security medicare trust fund.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the resolution which the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is now presenting is the customary type of continuing resolution which has been passed from time to time in years past, I would suggest, with possibly one exception. We are starting the new GI bill with payments under this continuing resolution.

Mr. Speaker, legislation has been passed by this body and approved and signed into law by the President of the United States, but the Bureau of the

Budget has not fixed a budget for the new GI bill.

Mr. Speaker, these men are being released daily into civilian life and they need funds.

Mr. Speaker, if this joint resolution is approved, it will permit the Veterans' Administration to make rehabilitation payments and readjustment payments, until the final bill is enacted; is that not correct?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] is the chairman

of our subcommittee which initially considers appropriations for the Veterans' Administration. While it would have been desirable that the Bureau of the Budget submit that request, the gentleman from Tennessee has joined with the rest of us in approving the availability of funds for the forthcoming 2 months for the purpose of carrying on the new GI educational benefits program. We voted for it and we must fund it, and I commend the gentleman for calling attention to this matter.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I want to stress that this is the customary continuing resolution, with this one possible exception of funding a portion of the new GI bill?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Texas yield to me?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of interest in the National Defense Education Act student loan program.

I have had many calls to my office—and I am sure that the clerk of our committee has been contacted also—regarding the funding of the student loan program during the months of July and August.

Mr. Speaker, these are the 2 months in which the funds are most needed to make loans to students for the next school year.

For 1966 there was appropriated \$180 million for that purpose. In the bill for fiscal year 1967 that passed the House May 5, \$190 million was appropriated for that purpose. In the budget that was submitted to the Congress, only \$34 million was recommended for the fiscal year 1967.

So that all of the Members will understand the terms that are in this continuing resolution, I think it should be pointed out that it will permit the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Office of Education to make the allocations not on the basis of the 1967 budget estimate but on the basis of the 1966 appropriation level. Some people have incorrectly put out the information that it will have to be a \$34 million allocation base. The base will truly be \$180 million. The allocations for the months of August and July, which are so important in the starting of a new school year as far as colleges and universities are concerned will be on the basis of the larger amount.

Mr. MAHON. It is correct to say that the funds for the student loan program will be available at the rate of the current fiscal year, fiscal 1966, which will not be quite as high as is recommended in the bill which passed the House, but will be much higher than the budget estimate. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. Speaker, as to the several appropriation bills still to be reported, may I just say that when the related authorization bills have been approved by the Congress, then we can bring in the military construction, public works, foreign aid, District of Columbia, and we can

take up the defense bill, and others and move, I hope, rather swiftly toward an adjournment date.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for an additional 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If we concur in this 2-month extension, it would bring the continuing resolution to the first of September. What assurance does the gentleman have or does anyone else have that by the first of September we will be prepared to adjourn and get out of Washington to do some necessary work in our districts.

Can the gentleman give us any assurance that, after adopting this continuing resolution, the leadership will give us a sine die adjournment date?

Mr. MAHON. I have no assurance—not even a whisper—as to when the House may adjourn. The Congress can adjourn when the authorization bills are approved and when the appropriations are made. I would hope with the gentleman that we could adjourn rather soon, by the expiration of this 60-day period. But I have no assurance and I do not think anyone is in a position to give any assurance.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is one of the most persuasive Members of the House and I would hope that he can somehow impress upon the leadership on his side of the aisle the fact that it would be most welcome and advantageous to get out of here by the first of September, if not before.

Mr. MAHON. I think September 1 would be a good target date. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. While this subject is under discussion, I think it should be pointed out that there is nothing in this continuing resolution that will require the Congress to stay here until September 1. If we complete our work on the appropriation bills that will preempt the matter and the continuing resolution will expire.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. During the consideration of this continuing resolution in the full Committee on Appropriations, I brought out the fact that under the terms of this resolution the Teacher Corps can be continued at the same level that the supplemental appropriation bill, which passed the House earlier this year funded it for the fiscal year 1966. It was my intention and hope that the committee in its report would include language saying that

contracts could not be entered into with teachers or any school districts in the country for purposes of starting the teaching phase of the program until the regular 1967 appropriation bill is enacted with funds in it for this purpose. This is particularly needed in view of the fact that the House of Representatives did not appropriate any funds for the Teacher Corps for the fiscal year 1967.

If funds should be added by the other body, this will be a matter that will have to be resolved in a House-Senate conference. I have had a conference with the people responsible for the program in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and it is agreeable with them not to use this continuing resolution language to go forward on teaching contracts, but merely to use it to continue their training contracts and their training activity.

Does the gentleman from Texas share that point of view as far as the use of these funds is concerned?

Mr. MAHON. I have a letter which I would like to present that is directly on this point.

The letter is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., June 27, 1966.

Hon. GEORGE H. MAHON,
Chairman, Appropriations Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. CHAIRMAN: At your request we have reviewed the current status of the Teacher Corps program and endeavored to identify the activities which will be conducted during July and August under the proposed continuing resolution pending enactment of the regular 1966 Appropriation Act.

It might be helpful to review briefly the plan of operation for the program in order that the funding arrangements and the plans for this summer can be seen in proper context.

The Office of Education recruits corpsmen on a national basis by requesting applications for service in the Corps. Applications are reviewed and selection made of the most promising candidates. The Office of Education assigns the selected applicants to training institutions (universities and colleges) throughout the country. These institutions conduct training programs designed to prepare these people to teach in local school districts with heavy concentration of educationally deprived children. In conjunction with OE, the training institutions will identify the trainees who have successfully completed their training and who can properly function in their teaching assignments.

Upon completion of the training period, estimated at approximately three months, these teacher corps members will be assigned to the local districts requesting them and which have been approved by the State educational agencies. During the school year, the Teacher Corps members will be provided instruction leading toward the award of an advanced degree.

The Congress appropriated a supplemental appropriation of \$9.5 million to initiate the program in 1966. It was originally contemplated that we would recruit and train from these 1966 funds 3,750 members of the Teacher Corps. The lateness of the supplemental appropriation and the circumstances which surrounded the appropriation action caused us to reduce our plans to the recruitment of 1,600 members of the Teachers Corps. This change means that we will use only \$4.5 million of the 1966 funds. The \$4.5 million in obligations from 1966 funds will cover

the cost associated with recruitment, travel to training institutions, summer training, and the provision of the academic inservice training provided by the institution. Contracts are being executed with 42 institutions selected to carry out this program. This plan is consistent with the forward funding arrangements of all Department fellowship and training programs, including the fellowships and institute training programs conducted by the Office of Education under the National Defense Education Act.

The 1967 activities to be conducted during July and August will consist of direction and supervision of the program financed under Salaries and Expenses, Office of Education, and payment of limited amount for travel of Teacher Corps members to other training institutions when classes begin after July 1, 1966. This travel cost is not expected to exceed \$25,000.

Negotiations will be under way this summer with local school districts desiring to participate in the program. There are, however, no plans to execute contracts with education agencies until the regular appropriations bill is enacted. If the regular bill were not enacted before September 1, which seems to be only a remote possibility, we would then have to develop and inform you of the plans for September under a continuing resolution.

I hope this is fully responsive to your inquiry. If there is any additional information needed, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. KELLY,
Comptroller.

This letter from the Comptroller of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare states that no contracts will be made with any school for teachers under the language of this resolution.

This resolution will carry on the training programs but will not start any new programs or a program of contracting with schools for teachers. This letter makes it abundantly clear that the Teacher Corps will be carried on at the minimum level.

Mr. LAIRD. I thank the gentleman from Texas, and I would certainly support the resolution with that understanding. I think it is wiser for us not to obligate ourselves to teaching contracts under present circumstances.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I might add here that also I understand that some question has arisen as to whether or not the Bureau of Reclamation could continue to make feasibility studies after July 1. In this regard, I would say that it is the intention of this resolution to permit going activities to be continued into the fiscal year 1967. I am aware of the language in section 8 of Public Law 89-72 but regardless of that section, the continuing resolution that we are now considering will, when enacted, be the latest law on the subject and would carry out our intention to continue going activities.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DUNCAN OF OREGON

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon:

On page 4, line 18, strike out the period and insert, "Provided, That after June 30, 1966, and prior to the enactment into law of H.R. 14745, no new contractual arrangements shall be entered into in connection

with the National Teachers Corps nor shall any commitments of any kind be made with respect to the assignment of any teacher to teach in any school under that program."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, we have just had on the floor of the House a colloquy on this precise subject between the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]. In the recent committee meeting, at which the Committee on Appropriations considered this continuing resolution, a suggestion was made by the gentleman from Wisconsin similar to this amendment, in connection with an amendment which I then offered to strike entirely any reference in the continuing resolution to the National Teachers Corps.

My own feeling is that this program ought to be eliminated. It should be deleted. If that were done, it would be consistent with the philosophy of the continuing resolution, which, as reported on page 1 of the Committee report, indicates that we will fund existing programs at the lower one of three possible figures: The amount recommended in the President's budget, the amount appropriated in the preceding fiscal year, or the amount contained in an appropriation bill which has passed one but not both Houses of the Congress of the United States.

In this particular instance the Teacher Corps has had a very stormy record. In this instance an appropriation bill has already passed one body of this Congress containing no funds, and if we would follow precisely the philosophy mentioned in the third paragraph on page 1 of the report, we would strike the Teacher Corps out entirely.

There are Members of this body who have expressed some reluctance to terminating a program through the means of a continuing resolution, and I therefore have prepared an amendment along the lines suggested, both in committee and today, by the gentleman from Wisconsin, and which is also in line with the letter submitted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to the chairman, and which has just now been made a part of the record. This would in effect impose a limitation upon spending so that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare could enter into no new contracts for the Teachers Corps until the passage of the regular HEW appropriation bill.

I would think that the letter alone might be enough, if it were not for the record of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on this particular subject. The Teachers Corps was authorized last year but no funds were appropriated for it. Funds were contained in the supplemental appropriation bill, which passed the Senate on April 27 of this year. On April 28 the House Appropriations Committee deleted any funds in the 1967 budget for this particular operation. On April 28 the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare halted the efforts which, in my judgment, they had prematurely made to

implement this Teachers Corps program. Why they ever started it and where they got the money to start it at that point is beyond me. They went ahead, and on May 6 they notified certain colleges they were approving their applications for contracts, whereas the supplemental appropriation bill which furnishes the funds was not signed by the President and did not become law until May 13.

All the amendment to the resolution would do would be to put into the law what these people say they intend to do anyway. In view of the record which the Department of Education has made in connection with this item, I believe it should be written into the law, and we should not rely on a colloquy on the floor of the House to establish this.

I hope the committee will accept this.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

I believe it is abundantly clear that this amendment is not necessary. It simply clarifies what I believe the resolution provides. And it is in complete agreement with a letter which has been placed in the Record in regard to this matter.

So, while I consider this amendment to be surplusage, I see no harm in placing it in the resolution, and I have no objection to it.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, in reading this amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon, I find it is identical language to that which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] suggested we put in the report. It carries out the suggestion he made at that time.

I have no objection at all to the amendment being accepted.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAHON: On page 2, in line 9, change the semicolon to a period and strike out the remainder of line 9 and all of line 10; and

On page 3, after line 24, insert: "Activities for which provision was made in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1966, and the Supplemental Defense Appropriation Act, 1966;"

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Has the gentleman from Texas any further amendment?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further amendment.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS AND NEED TO ESTABLISH A BLUE RIBBON COMMISSION

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. The resolution is necessary now. I hope we will not have to use this practice of continuing resolutions after August 31.

Mr. Speaker, originally the House schedule for today called for the consideration of the Department of Defense appropriation bill for 1967. The decision was made within the hour to postpone consideration of this bill for at least 2 weeks and finance the Department of Defense during July and August by use of the amendment just adopted to the continuing resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the "Additional Views" contained in House Report No. 1652, and in particular, in support of the establishment of a Blue Ribbon Commission to evaluate and assess the defense posture of this country now and for the future.

My remarks, Mr. Speaker, are extensive and they are submitted as background in an attempt to point up how vitally needed is the establishment of such a Commission.

They are not designed necessarily to set forth the recommendations of myself or my party. They are designed to demonstrate the crucial concern that is felt by many responsible officials of both parties with respect to the future defense posture of this country.

They are also designed to point up some of the major areas, which in my view, and in the view of others, deserve the most careful attention of such a Blue Ribbon Commission.

Quite obviously, these views are my own. They reflect in part my own assessment of the potential threat and my own analysis of this administration's response to that threat.

The administration's view is primarily contained in the voluminous testimony of the Secretary of Defense before our committee. It is for this reason that, in most cases, my differences with administration policy and administration defense plans will appear to be at personal variance with Secretary McNamara.

Such is not my intention. It is merely that the Secretary of Defense has presented us with the most comprehensive and detailed analysis of administration foreign and defense policy that it is most convenient to focus on his statements and his rationale as the basis for my own discussion.

Obviously, if the Secretary of Defense did not accurately and adequately personify administration thinking in this vital area, he would not be Secretary of Defense.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

Mr. Speaker, in the "Additional Views" contained in House Report No. 1652, signed by all members of the Defense Appropriation Subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL], and me, we said:

We the undersigned representing all minority members of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee strongly support a superior defense posture in order to maintain peace and insure the safety and integrity of our nation now and in the future.

We are concerned, as are many of our fellow citizens, about this nation's future ability to preserve such a posture.

These additional views are submitted as an expression of that concern.

The undersigned intend, as in the past, to support the Department of Defense Appropriation Bill for fiscal year 1967 though we do not agree with several aspects of its makeup.

Where we disagree, we believe that the current bill is inadequate for fiscal year 1967, especially with regard to our worldwide commitments, to future preparedness, and Southeast Asia.

What could be more penny-wise and pound-foolish than to save a few cents on defense today only to lose the peace tomorrow? The most expensive weapon is one that is not good enough for its intended purpose or not available when needed.

Only the strength of this nation can keep what peace there is in the world and prevent what war there is from spreading.

It is false economy and false security to let that strength dwindle over the long run just to make the books look good in the short run.

We do not oppose or propose a bill of any particular number of dollars or guns or bullets. We say that America can afford to pay for the best defense in the world—today and tomorrow. We say that we cannot afford to pay for less.

We are concerned. Other Committees of Congress in both Houses have made clear a similar concern. Nor are we unmindful that reasonable men may differ, nonetheless, about the validity of this assessment. There is, after all, no foolproof method by which fallible men can precisely determine what will be required in the future to assure our own security and our nation's ability to meet worldwide commitments.

It is for these reasons—and because only an objective third party can impartially arbitrate such a grave matter—that the undersigned propose enactment of a Joint Resolution calling for the establishment of a Blue Ribbon Commission, made up of the highest calibre experts from both the civilian and military communities, to conduct an independent and objective evaluation of the projected defense posture of this country.

This resolution would authorize the Congress to appoint members of the Commission and stipulates that the selection board shall be made up of the Speaker and Minority Leader of the House, the President pro tempore and Minority Leader of the Senate, and the Chairman and Ranking Minority Members of the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress.

The additional views that follow are submitted in support of the need for such an impartial review.

We are concerned, in particular, about the time frame of the 1970's and beyond. We feel that the Defense policies and projected programs of the past five years have not adequately taken into account the defense needs which the capabilities of our adversaries, real and potential, indicate will be required in the future. This concern encompasses our future preparedness in Inner Space (notably undersea technology and nuclear propulsion), Outer Space (military applications), Missile Technology (offensive and defensive), Manned Strategic Systems, as well as a wide range of concerns regarding limited warfare.

What follows will touch upon the highlights of these concerns in the hope that the Congress and the American people will come to agree with the undersigned that there is a legitimate and critical need for the early establishment of such a Commission.

BACKGROUND

The defense structure of any nation is determined by that nation's foreign policy.

The Secretary of Defense has said that the development of our defense structure should be guided by United States Foreign Policy.

With this principle there is no disagreement.

Yet, we do disagree with much that is being done in the Defense establishment today especially in those areas that directly affect our present ability (Vietnam) and our long-range ability to deter potential aggressors.

It follows, then, that our basic disagreements derive in part from basic foreign policy assumptions of the current Administration and in part from the assumptions the Secretary of Defense uses to justify his force structure projections.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It is the belief of the undersigned that certain basic changes have taken place in the defense policy of the United States since 1961. These changes need immediate evaluation by this impartial Blue Ribbon Commission. Among the changes we would list the following as particularly significant:

(1) a changed attitude toward the cold war and, as a result, a different assessment of the potential and current threat;

(2) a changed attitude toward the desirability or necessity of pursuing advanced weapons development as vigorously as possible; and

(3) a changed attitude toward those areas of defense and defense planning which should receive priority.

In the intervening five years, we have had an opportunity to observe the consequences of these and the other changes that have been introduced. Based, therefore, upon actual experiences and not merely upon theoretical musings, there is, in our view, substantial reason to question both the correctness and the effectiveness of the new approach.

In foreign policy, the basic assumptions upon which this Administration appears to base its defense strategy include the following:

(1) that there has been in recent years a reduction in tensions between the free world and the Communist bloc (except China) and that further accommodations in the future can be anticipated and should be encouraged;

(2) that our military force structure should be related primarily to the "visible" threat posed by potential adversaries;

(3) that nuclear war is as unthinkable to the Communists as it is to the United States and the free world and that therefore, the balance that has been achieved between the Soviet Union and the United States with regard to strategic forces should not be upset;

(4) that the United States should continue to assume a posture of response both in the area of "crisis control" such as Vietnam and in the area of weapons development; and

(5) that the threat from World Communism has, in fact, eased during the course of recent years and, therefore, any attempt to maintain a decisive superiority in the years ahead would reverse this trend.

In Defense policy, the basic assumptions would include:

(1) that the aggressive pursuit of advanced weapons development such as the Antiballistic Missile System (ABM) or the Advanced Manned Strategic Aircraft (AMSA) would lead to a "reaction" on the part of the Communists that would accelerate the "arms race" and that, therefore whenever, possible, such decisions should be stretched out, studied to death, or postponed.

(2) that the level of effort in new weapons systems should be tied, predominantly, to what the potential enemy is doing and that the determination of what "the other side is doing" must be based on "visible" information; and

(3) that the defense establishment must be prepared to execute and implement a strategy of "flexible response," one that permits the United States to gradually escalate any conflict and that will not force us into the dilemma of "humiliating retreat or nuclear war."

It is the belief of the undersigned that many of these assumptions that guide our foreign and defense policy are largely unrealistic and incorrect and that the experience of the past five years bears out this contention. The importance of a complete evaluation of these assumptions cannot be underestimated.

We believe that there has not been a reduction in tensions but rather a reduction in our desire to recognize Communist actions for what they are.

We believe that our military force structure should not be related to the "visible" threat but rather to the capabilities of the Communists and to the fulfillment of our own national objectives.

We believe that nuclear war should be "unthinkable" to the Communists but that this country should not base its plans on that illusive hope.

We believe that the strategy of response both with regard to crisis situations and with respect to weapons development should give way to a strategy of initiative. We would define a "strategy of response" as one in which this nation permits a situation to become so serious that it must take extraordinary steps even to return to the status quo, and a "strategy of initiative" as one in which this nation, when it first sees the possibility of a situation developing, will take steps to prevent its becoming a crisis situation either with respect to potential conflicts or to new advances in weapons development.

We believe that the threat from World Communism has not eased and that, therefore, it is of the utmost importance that this nation maintain a *decisive superiority* in offensive and defensive weapons.

We believe that the Soviet Union is not "leveling off" its effort in advanced weapons development and that it is, as a matter of fact, aggressively pursuing new developments both in outer space and inner space.

Finally, we believe that under the policies of the past five years, rather than escape the dilemma of "humiliating retreat or nuclear war," we have actually enlarged that possibility by, in effect, adopting policies that have reduced rather than increased our options.

To reverse this situation, four basic requirements are necessary:

(1) A more objective and realistic assessment of the threat coupled with a thorough re-evaluation of our foreign policy;

(2) A return to greater participation by and acceptance of military judgment in what are predominantly military affairs;

(3) A more aggressive pursuit of research and development especially in the area of advanced weapons; and

(4) A reassessment by the Congress of its own role in the area of national security.

There is, in our judgment, little possibility that these requirements can or will be fulfilled unless the initiative comes from the Congress. It is for this reason that the undersigned have called for and strongly support the establishment of a Blue Ribbon Commission of military and civilian leaders to reassess and reevaluate the defense posture of this nation now and for the future.

Only in this way can the American people be reassured that this nation is buying the very best defense consistent with the long-term best interests of the United States.

EXECUTIVE-CONGRESSIONAL RELATIONS

The Constitution provides that the "Congress shall have Power To . . . provide for the common Defense . . . to raise and support Armies . . . to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces . . ."

In today's complicated age of sophisticated weaponry and continual tension, Congress can only discharge its duties under the Constitution when it enjoys confidence and candor from the Executive Branch.

Recent reports of various Committees of the Congress in both Houses have raised serious questions about the Executive's willingness to present the full facts to the Congress concerning our defense establishment.

Without cooperation, candor and the realization that both branches of our government should be working for the same worthy goals, it is not possible for the Congress to assure itself that its actions will, in fact, provide the maximum insurance for the security of this nation now and in the future.

The 1966 fiscal year budget

That relations between the Executive and Congress are breaking down and that, as a result, the best interests of the United States suffer accordingly, can be seen in the experience of the fiscal year 1966 Defense Budget.

That budget as originally submitted to the Congress was grossly inadequate. It appears a truism to make that statement today. Yet, a brief review of last year's experience will demonstrate that the dominant tendency in the Executive Branch appears aimed at misleading rather than fully informing the Congress about Defense matters.

In Additional Views submitted by the undersigned to the fiscal year 1966 regular defense appropriation bill, we said:

"It is our judgment, based on the testimony before this Committee, that the fiscal year 1966 budget request reflects inadequate funding for the Vietnamese effort." (H. Rept. 528, 89th Cong., 1st sess.)

We then went on to recommend that—
 " . . . the President should immediately revise this fiscal year 1966 defense budget with a view toward requesting the Congress to provide for the unplanned and unprogrammed expenditures which have resulted from his decision to assume a greater role in Southeast Asia."

This the President and the Secretary of Defense refused to do. Instead, elaborate attempts were made to leave Congress with the impression that all the funds needed for fiscal year 1966 were contained in the original budget submission. The Secretary of Defense, in a letter to the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee which was read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD June 23, 1965 during debate on the bill, stated in part:

" . . . the fiscal year 1966 defense budget request now before the Congress would provide *all the funds we need* at this time to continue the strengthening of our overall military posture and to carry out whatever combat operations our forces are called upon to perform during the next 12 months." [Emphasis added.]

The fallacy of that prediction in both of its main elements has long since become apparent not only to the American people but to our adversaries as well.

Within two months after that letter was written, the Administration submitted to the Senate an amendment to the Defense Appropriation bill requesting an additional \$1.7 billion for Southeast Asia activities.

Just five months later, in January 1966, another supplemental request totalling some \$12.3 billion was submitted to the Congress for Southeast Asia activities. This came after an extended pause in the bombing of North Vietnam had been well underway. Such a "pause" should have reduced rather than increased our anticipated needs if the Secre-

tary's assertion that the 1966 original budget contained "all the funds we need at this time . . . to carry out whatever combat operations our forces are called upon to perform during the next 12 months" was a valid one.

In still another supplemental for fiscal 1966, an additional \$900 million to finance the military pay increases enacted the year before was submitted.

In short, the original 1966 defense budget was underestimated by some \$15 billion—hardly an error that could legitimately be attributed to bookkeeping mistakes or to a drastic change in the requirements that was unforeseen six months before.

The second fallacy in the Secretary's letter was his assertion that the 1966 defense budget as originally submitted contained "all the funds we need at this time to continue the strengthening of our overall military posture."

In our Additional Views last June, we cautioned very strongly that equipment and material priorities for Vietnam must not be permitted to so deplete active force inventories as to impair the readiness of our forces not committed to Vietnam.

It has since become public knowledge that our ability to sustain combat operations in the Vietnamese theatre over the past 18 months was in part at the expense (both in material and trained men) of other forces not committed to Vietnam.

Rather than strengthening our overall military posture, the untimely delay in requesting needed funds for Vietnam in fiscal years 1965 and especially 1966 has resulted in a substantial weakening of our overall military posture.

The Secretary of Defense himself—after repeated indications to the contrary—reluctantly admitted in a press conference on March 31st that four Army Divisions here in the United States, the 4th Infantry Division, the 5th Infantry Division (Mechanized), and the 1st and 2nd Armored Divisions, are currently being used as training divisions and that they are not in fact "combat-ready." (Transcript, Department of Defense news briefing by Sec. McNamara, March 31, 1966.)

In addition, Committee reports, newspaper accounts, statements by Defense Department officials and testimony during our own Committee hearings, bear out the contention that our readiness to meet other contingencies should they arise has been impaired, among other reasons, by the Executive's reluctance to make hard and politically unpalatable decisions regarding the full funding of our defense establishment in a timely manner.

The undersigned believe, as they did last year, that the Defense budget for fiscal 1967 is also underfunded by a substantial amount and that supplemental requests will be forthcoming in late Fall or early in the next Session of the Congress.

Indeed, during mark-up of the present bill, it was necessary to add to the regular appropriation request for personnel alone some \$569 million to cover deficiencies in the 1967 budget. If the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee cannot believe the President's budget on personnel needs, this certainly casts a cloud over what estimates and contentions are believable in the rest of the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I believe most Members of Congress would agree that the present Secretary of Defense is a brilliant administrator. It has, in fact, occurred to me on more than one occasion that some thought should be given to the establishment of a new, separate office within the Executive Office of the President for overseeing the administrative practices of all Government departments and agencies. The first Director of such an

office could, in my judgment, be the eminently qualified current Secretary of Defense.

With regard, however, to establishing the defense policy of this country and to planning for the future maintenance of a decisive superiority in order to insure peace and deter aggression, the present Secretary of Defense has not demonstrated a similar brilliance.

AN UNEQUALED RECORD OF MISTAKES

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the two fallacies we point out in our "Additional Views" which are contained in Secretary McNamara's letter to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee are by no means isolated instances of statements or predictions which later events have shown to be ill founded.

It is an unfortunate fact but an indisputable one that the Secretary of Defense has amassed an astonishing record of gross mistakes in his public assessments of the threat we face, his predictions of events to come and his assertions of our defense capabilities.

The brief compilation of such mistakes that follows is deemed necessary not out of any desire to publicly embarrass the Secretary of Defense but because it is essential that the American people understand that the present occupant of the Office of Secretary of Defense is indeed fallible and that, therefore, there is legitimate basis for discussing and debating the merits of his proposals for insuring the future security and integrity of this Nation. It is in this spirit that the following examples are offered:

On October 2, 1963, the Defense Secretary predicted that the major part of the U.S. military task could, in his judgment be completed by the end of 1965 "although there may be a continuing requirement for a limited number of U.S. training personnel." At that time, the United States had some 16,000 "advisers" in Vietnam. Today, that figure has risen to well over 260,000 and is still growing.

On January 27, 1964, Secretary McNamara told the Nation that the successor to the Diem government "has considerably more popular support than its predecessor." Two days later, that government was overthrown.

On his return from each of several trips to Vietnam in the past 2 years, Mr. McNamara gave glowing, optimistic reports of the situation which left the American people tragically unprepared for the bitter realities of the present situation. In many cases, his own later statements as well as those of other administration officials contradicted the earlier optimistic reports.

Mr. McNamara has repeatedly told our committee and other committees of Congress that we had 16 Active Army divisions, fully equipped and ready for sustained combat. The hollowness of these statements has since become apparent from the Army's struggle to maintain and support what amounts to less than four divisions in the field in Vietnam, not to mention the fact that the four divisions referred to earlier have been relegated to the status of training divisions and are not, in fact, combat ready.

After repeated assurances that the combat readiness of U.S. forces was extremely high and that the United States was capable of conducting a stepped-up war in Vietnam without seriously interfering with the readiness of the strategic reserve, Mr. McNamara has seriously impaired the readiness of combat forces within the United States, and now as an example, must withdraw at least 15,000 highly skilled and/or experienced troops from Europe both to train what supposedly were combat ready troops in the United States and to bolster our forces in Vietnam.

Mr. McNamara overrode the recommendations of the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, the Chief of Naval Operations, and four source selection boards on the question of the TFX award. Apart from the conflict of interest questions that have been raised regarding this award, there are now serious doubts that the aircraft can meet the needs of both the Air Force and the Navy at the same time and there is substantial evidence that the cost of the aircraft will greatly exceed the original estimates.

The Secretary's continual refusal to push ahead with development of a follow-on strategic bomber to replace the aging B-52's and B-58's which are being phased out has compelled him to place first reliance on a bomber version of the F-111—TFX. Most military experts who testified on this subject saw the FB-111 as, at best, an interim, stopgap bomber.

The Secretary's delay in acceding to the Navy's requirements for nuclear-powered ships such as the aircraft carrier and the guided missile frigate (DLGN) has made it impossible for the Navy to develop and deploy the type of surface ships it has considered essential. Two years ago he sought and obtained authorization to construct a conventional carrier, the *John F. Kennedy*. His present request for three nuclear-powered aircraft carriers to come into the inventory at a later date indicates that he has belatedly recognized the correctness of the Navy approach; however, the decision was overdue and means that the Navy will be given a capability several years later than was deemed necessary, not to mention the fact that the United States is saddled with a second-best, conventional carrier.

With regard to air and sealift capabilities, the Secretary was quick to criticize what was available when he took office and has since claimed that he effected a 100-percent increase in airlift capacity but is notably silent on what increases, if any, have occurred in amphibious Marine Corps or general sealift capacity. Unfortunately—considering the demands of Vietnam and the potential of other contingencies—the real increase in airlift capability lies in the future, notably the C5A and the remainder of the C-141's while the sealift capability remains unsatisfactory.

In the fiscal year 1966 budget, the Secretary denied that the important C-141 cargo aircraft was underfunded—yet within months he reprogrammed additional funds for the C-141.

Mr. Speaker, a most disturbing feature of these mistakes is that they are all one-

sided. They are dominated by reductions in our military capability, by a downgrading of military expertise which leads to low morale, and by the imposition of civilian judgment and power.

In testimony before this committee on the fiscal year 1966 defense bill, the Secretary assured our committee that—

While our fiscal year 1966 budget request does not include all of the forces or force modernizations recommended by the military departments and individual Service chiefs, the Joint Chiefs of Staff agree that the program supported by this budget will increase our overall combat effectiveness and will provide effective forces in a high state of readiness for the defense of the vital interests of the United States.¹

Many of the foregoing points refute this statement.

Mr. Speaker, in our "Additional Views" we also pointed out that—

It is certainly true that the fiscal year 1966 regular and supplemental budget requests contained more bullets, more aircraft, more quantities of material in certain categories than the previous budget. The same is obviously true of the fiscal year 1967 budget.

What needs to be determined in assessing a defense budget is not "how many more numerically" but whether the budget accounts for an increase in our ability and our preparedness as they relate to the needs of the day and the needs of the future.

In the light of the foregoing, what assurance can be placed on the validity of the Secretary's present statement defending the fiscal year 1967 requirements especially when the military is instructed to support the Secretary's position rather than giving its own views of the requirements.

Admiral Rickover, in testimony before this Committee on May 11, 1966, had this comment to make:

"Once again, the military who should have been the very first to request good weapons—the latest and best ones—sat here complacently and told you it was not necessary for these ships to be nuclear powered. They sat and followed the party line.

"Mr. FLOOD. I don't know how complacent they were, but they sat here.

"Admiral RICKOVER. If a man sits here and tells you something, you have to assume that is what he believes. You cannot enter his mind.

"Mr. FLOOD. I did. They didn't believe it.

"Admiral RICKOVER. You may try to enter his mind, but if he has been instructed how to testify, he will do it according to instructions." (Department of Defense Appropriations Hearings for 1967, Pt. 6, P. 70.)

Later on, in the same hearing, Admiral Rickover made the following comment:

"This is the difficulty of working in a large organization. This is why it is so important that Congressional Committees ask people to express their own opinions. Otherwise, predigested information—a party line—is presented. The theory is that "mother knows best"; that Government departments are best able to judge issues, setting up a party line, and telling Congressional committee: "This is it. We know the story, and there is no use going into it."

"The witnesses you call before your committee must then talk in accordance with the party line. That makes it very difficult for Congressional committees to get the full story, except by backdoor methods, and nearly all of these loopholes have now been plugged. You will find that it will become

¹ Hearings, Department of Defense Appropriations for 1966 before the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, Part 3, Page 5-6.

increasingly difficult to uncover the real pros and cons that are considered—or not considered—in arriving at the decisions presented to you for ratification. In other words, Congress is merely to listen to the official position. This is tantamount to saying that the Department is capable, but Members of Congress are not capable, of judging the issue; that the Department must do Congress' thinking for it; that the Department can make a better decision than Congress is able to. Now, most Members of Congress are lawyers or experienced professional and business people. I am sure you have enough wit and intelligence to judge things for yourselves."

And, then again, in answer to a question, Admiral Rickover testified:

"Isn't it essential if Congress is to do its job properly that you have presented to you all the relevant information? You may not choose to use all this information, but should it not be possible for you, at any time, to obtain the free opinion of any government servant? Unless you maintain this right by exercising it, it will be lost—and I am afraid it is being lost. I am sure you are aware of the decline of parliamentary systems all over the world. I hope our Congress will take steps to prevent such a decline in the United States. We were the first to establish representative democracy in modern times; let us be the last to permit its decline."

Under the classification "For Official Use Only," Deputy Secretary of Defense Cyrus Vance issued a memorandum dated January 11, 1965 which illustrates the kind of restrictions imposed on Defense Department witnesses appearing before Congressional Committees. It is reproduced below in its entirety.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

THE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., January 11, 1965.

Memorandum for:

The Secretaries of the Military Departments.

The Director of Defense Research and Engineering.

The Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff.
The Assistant Secretaries of Defense.
The General Counsel.

The Assistants to the Secretary of Defense.
The Directors, Defense Agencies.

Subject: Congressional Appearances by Department of Defense Witnesses.

I have been asked by prospective witnesses to provide guidance for the benefit of personnel of the Department who, in the course of Congressional hearings, are required to give their personal opinions on matters concerning which a Department of Defense position has been established by the Secretary of Defense with the approval of the President. If pressed for his personal opinion, the witness should make clear:

1. that his personal views were expressed (if such be the fact) to appropriate authorities within the Defense Department before the departmental position was established;
2. where his views are not in accord with the departmental decision, that, notwithstanding his personal views, he has accepted and will abide by the departmental position; and
3. the considerations or factors which support the decision; in other words, the pros and cons on the issue involved.

(Signed) CYRUS VANCE.

This memorandum is just one of several instances which illustrate the Executive branch's obvious reluctance to present a full and frank picture to Congress. It is just one more indication of the continuing breakdown in relations between the Executive and Legislative branches of our government.

It is no longer possible for Committees of the Congress dealing with defense matters

to rely on the testimony of any Executive branch witnesses knowing that "unless pressed" these witnesses are constrained to voice not their own considered opinions but those which have been officially established at the highest level in the Department of Defense.

Such a procedure calls into serious question under present circumstances the utility of having any witnesses other than the Secretary of Defense appear before Committees of Congress on the budget and programs of the Department of Defense.

The guarantee of the development of good programs for the defense of this country has always lodged in the free exercise by responsible and knowledgeable men of rational debate and frank discussion of these programs. Subsequent to such a confrontation of ideas has come the consensus on which course to follow.

Enforced consensus—which is nothing more nor less than conformity—represents a step backward that is dangerous to the security and future well-being of this country in these troubled times.

As Admiral Rickover told the Committee, " * * * if you believe everyone in the Defense Department who has a valid opinion and the requisite knowledge on a given subject is heard before a 'consensus' is reached, you are mistaken. * * * If you are working on the basis that a decision of the Department of Defense is truly a consensus, then you are not right. * * * Bureaucracies do not make decisions on the basis of consensus. They decide them at top levels. In some cases, decisions appear to have been made ahead of time and subsequently justified."

REPROGRAMMING ACTIONS

A further example of the growing disregard evidenced on the part of the Executive branch toward Congress and especially toward the appropriations process is the whole area of reprogramming actions. As we said in our Additional Views to the Report on the Supplemental Defense Appropriation Bill, 1966,

"A reprogramming action, in essence, is a procedure which bypasses the Congress. The reprogramming process is recognized by the undersigned to be a useful and necessary procedure for meeting emergencies and unusual unforeseen situations. What is of concern is the tendency on the part of the Defense Department to use what is essentially an emergency tool on a more regular and frequent basis than the situations warrant.

"It is in fact becoming altogether too frequent a practice for the Defense Department to come to this Committee with reprogramming requests that were not anticipated during the regular hearings on the Defense budget."

There is no evidence that the Defense Department, since the submission of those views, has altered its frequent practice of using the Emergency Fund as a reprogramming tool rather than for its intended purpose—emergencies.

The growing frequency of the use of reprogramming requests on the part of the Department of Defense to, in effect, bypass Congress makes a mockery of the appropriations process and represents a significantly greater erosion of Congress' responsibility and authority over the defense establishment of this country.

Mr. Speaker, what follows is an attempt to explore in detail some of the major assumptions which, in my view, underlie this administration's foreign and defense policies.

BASIC ASSUMPTIONS—FOREIGN POLICY

As we stated in our "Additional Views," the defense posture of a nation is largely determined by the foreign policy of that nation. Secretary McNamara has been

very free to admit this in testimony before our committee.

No one would question the validity of the President's instructions to Mr. McNamara to "Develop the military force structure necessary to support our foreign policy without regard to arbitrary budget ceilings" and to "procure and operate this force at the lowest possible cost."²

Two questions need to be examined regarding the President's instructions. What basic assumptions with regard to foreign policy appear to govern the thinking of Mr. McNamara in his assessment of the force structure necessary for the security of the United States; and has he, in fact, adhered to the President's guidelines?

In his testimony on the fiscal year 1967 program, Secretary McNamara insisted that in carrying out the President's instructions "our military strategy and plans should be related to the threat, that the forces to be acquired and maintained should be related to the strategy and the plans, and that the forces should be adequately supported, not only with men, equipment, and facilities needed in peacetime, but with war reserve stocks as well, so that they could engage in combat for sustained periods of time."³

Mr. Speaker, these are commendable objectives as far as they go. They were not created by Mr. McNamara, but are a part of the traditional philosophy of the Department of Defense and have been supported historically by the Congress of the United States.

The weakness of Mr. McNamara's statement is contained in what he omitted; not what he said.

ASSESSMENT OF THREAT

In relating strategy and plans primarily to the threat as he views that threat and not to the fulfillment of national objectives, Mr. McNamara has committed himself and the United States as well to an essentially defensive and reactive philosophy.

American purposes thereby become secondary and American strategic posture depends primarily upon what Mr. McNamara actually sees the enemy is prepared to do against the United States rather than what that enemy is capable of doing.

This procedure is fraught with hazards. The Soviet Union—and for that matter, Communist China—are closed societies and take elaborate steps to prevent outside observation of what is being developed.

A. INTELLIGENCE

In discussing intelligence activities as they relate to the defense posture of this Nation, it would be well at this point to express my deep concern over the growing centralization of intelligence activities that has been fostered by the Secretary of Defense during the past 5 years. This centralization has taken three main forms:

First. The reduction of responsibility and authority of the separate intelligence groups under the direction of the services and their virtual integration into a single

² Hearings, *ibid.* (1967), Part 1, P. 8.

³ *Ibid.*

unit, the Defense Intelligence Agency—DIA—under the direction of the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

An obvious effect of this centralization has been to reduce dissent and rational debate within the Department and increase the incidence of conformity with, in some cases, preconceived or predetermined conclusions.

Second. The large numerical increase in the number of personnel, primarily civilian, in the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

Third. The growing practice at the highest levels of a situation in which the Joint Chiefs of Staff are less in evidence at policy conferences with the Commander in Chief on highly sensitive issues. In effect, the Chief's recommendations more and more often are filtered up to the Chief Executive via the Secretary of Defense.

With these factors in mind, it is of particular interest that Secretary McNamara appears consistently to have taken the position that the intelligence information upon which we should base our defense planning must be in the form of "hard" or "visible" information.

There are two basic pitfalls in this posture.

On the one hand, the "visibility curve" on hard intelligence is a fluctuating factor. Like any other scientists in any country, Soviet scientists are prone to publish their findings and theories in scientific journals. These indications of Soviet future potential capabilities are "visible" to U.S. intelligence analysts.

However, after a decision is taken to go into the more advanced research and development phase in the Soviet Union or any other "closed" Communist society, an "iron curtain" descends over such activity and is not lifted in most instances until after the system reaches the hardware stage, when it may be displayed to the world during, for example, May Day celebrations or tests.

If at that stage, the system in question was not anticipated or "seen" by U.S. intelligence analysts and acted upon by the proper officials, the United States could find itself years behind in the development of a system to counter the Soviet system.

Such could well be the case with respect to the antiballistic missile, a follow-on strategic bomber, military systems for use in outer space, and quantum advances in the uses of inner space such as undersea technology.

B. SUBJECTIVE POLITICAL ANALYSIS

The other pitfall is the tendency on the part of Secretary McNamara and other high administration officials to "mix" hard intelligence analysis with subjective political analysis.

The assessment by high administration officials during the Cuban missile crisis of 1962 is a case in point. At that time, for several weeks prior to the official announcement by President Kennedy that there were indeed missiles being placed in Cuba, intelligence information was received and analyzed which indicated the very definite probability that missile components were being shipped into Cuba.

The political judgment of the highest administration officials was apparently interjected for a period of time to the effect that the Soviets would not, during this era of reduced tensions, be engaged in the introduction of such missiles into Cuba.

In short, intelligence estimates often appear to be developed with a view toward supporting predetermined conclusions and policies.

U.S. OBJECTIVES SHOULD GOVERN

By relating the development of our country's strategies and plans primarily to the "visible" threat, and not to the capabilities of the potential aggressors in accord with the fulfillment of national objectives, Mr. McNamara, as has been said, has committed himself and the United States to an essentially defensive and reactive philosophy.

In this sense, Mr. McNamara has given away the initiative and has in effect permitted the Communist world to occupy the driver's seat.

America's interests and those of our free world allies should be the guiding force behind the development and maintenance of our military posture. This does not mean the adoption of a policy of militancy and aggressiveness. It would, however, indicate that the United States has legitimate interests and intends to use its military power in the defense of those interests whenever they are endangered.

The evaluation of the threat; that is, the military capabilities of potential enemies to thwart achievement of national objectives, is certainly an integral part of the determination of military needs but not the whole of it as Mr. McNamara's statements and actions would seem to indicate.

A reorientation of strategy would place the potential aggressor on the defensive, would limit his freedom of movement and initiative, would inhibit his willingness to take risks, and would restore the initiative to the United States and free world interests.

U.S. PREPAREDNESS TODAY

The Secretary of Defense in his testimony before our committee, hurls a charge against the defense posture of earlier years that much more aptly describes the situation facing the United States today after 5 years of allegedly correcting these deficiencies:

For many years our military plans far exceeded the forces available to support them, and even the forces available were not in proper balance with one another. There was not enough tactical air power to support the existing number of Army divisions. In addition, although the concept of a mobile central Reserve had been generally accepted, the airlift required to move these forces was completely inadequate, and there was not enough amphibious lift to move the Marine Corps forces. Although a great deal of attention had been paid to nuclear weapons, stocks of ammunition and other combat consumables required for non-nuclear war were grossly deficient in many categories.⁴

What is relevant here is that the exigencies of an actual conflict situation have put Mr. McNamara's theories to the

⁴ *Ibid.*

test and they have been found wanting in several major respects. For example, our airlift capacity is strained heavily at the present time. Air Reserve and National Guard aircraft are being utilized. Virtually every bit of commercial aircraft presently available to the Department of Defense has been contracted for to increase our capability. All of this was necessary to sustain what is really a relatively small conflict—Vietnam—to which we have committed so far the equivalent of less than 4 of the 16 standing Army divisions.

As to stocks of ammunition and other combat consumables, the picture is clear and disconcerting. What is of particular concern to the Congress in addition to the temporary shortages that have arisen and will arise in Vietnam is the serious drawdown of our worldwide inventory which would be crucially needed if 1 of our more than 42 other commitments around the world should require American military assistance in a conflict situation.

The relevant question is whether Mr. McNamara's "new" military posture is adequate to support U.S. objectives and to stay ahead of the Communist efforts to nullify those objectives.

A more fundamental question—whether Mr. McNamara is really qualified to act as the final arbiter of U.S. military strategy, using the much-celebrated technique of cost-effectiveness as the criterion—must also be asked and answered. A corollary of this is whether and to what extent Mr. McNamara has used the cost-effectiveness argument as a means of misleading Congress and American opinion on the true reason for some of his decisions. A possible example would be his decision 2 years ago to buy a conventional rather than a nuclear powered aircraft carrier.

Admiral Rickover phrased it very well in his discussion of the advantages of a nuclear powered surface ship over conventionally powered ones:

The cost analysts do not see that a nuclear surface warship is not the same as an ordinary surface warship. Members of this Committee can see it, the public can see it, but the cost analysts cannot see it because they only deal in things that can be put in numerical form. They only consider those features they can quantify. . . .

In every cost-effectiveness study I have seen, far more effort is spent on studying the cost than is devoted to determining the true military effectiveness.⁵

Should cost-effectiveness determine strategy, or should cost-effectiveness be the servant of strategy? Are there elements of the situation which Mr. McNamara is overlooking, deliberately or otherwise, and if so what are the risks that the United States is therefore taking?

These are legitimate questions for a Blue Ribbon Commission to appraise objectively, thoughtfully, and deeply.

CHINESE: GREATER THREAT?

Though Mr. McNamara does not make any comprehensive comparison between the Chinese and Soviet threat, his view

⁵ Quoted in House Report No. 1536, 89th Congress, 2nd Session, P. 49.

by implication at least is that the Chinese and Asian Communists impose a greater threat than the Soviet Union.⁶ The reasons for this assessment can be found in his opinion that the Chinese are more militantly carrying out the Communist doctrine of "wars of national liberation" and secondly, the Chinese are aggressively seeking a nuclear weapons capability.

Both actions stem from a complex set of circumstances intimately involved with the newness of the Chinese revolution with the Soviet Union for leadership in military success and its need to compete the Communist world. While no one would accuse Mr. McNamara of denying that the Soviet Union constitutes a major continuing threat, it is obvious that to him the Soviet threat now is growing less and less immediate. He believes that—

The Soviet leaders appear to share with us a desire to avoid wars which might lead to a direct U.S.-U.S.S.R. military confrontation.⁷

Moreover, with respect to the United States and the Soviet Union, "the threat of nuclear war, and even of large-scale conventional wars, has become more latent."⁸

In effect, Mr. McNamara claims that U.S. posture vis-a-vis the Soviet Union is relatively satisfactory in that the United States is deterring the Soviet Union. At the same time, he implies that the U.S. posture vis-a-vis the Chinese Communists has not yet reached a satisfactory state, since the Chinese have embarked upon a policy of expansion in southeast Asia in particular, but not limited to that area.

The tendency on the part of Mr. McNamara to "play down" the Soviet threat has led to policy and program decisions that could have dire consequences if his assessment proved at some point in the future to have been incorrect. This is particularly serious since the Secretary's assessment seems to be based upon a subjective interpretation of intentions rather than an objective assessment of capabilities.

For example, even in the face of a growing Soviet capability in submarine warfare, Mr. McNamara has decided to retire the straight-decked aircraft carrier, the *Lake Champlain* from the Atlantic and to pull one other angled-decked carrier out of the Atlantic. This has severely reduced our ASW capability in the Atlantic and coupled with other actions in the ASW field displays a complacency on the part of the Secretary of Defense regarding the need for a superior ASW capability.

If his assessment of the Soviet threat is valid, his actions could certainly be justified; if wrong, they may prove to be irretrievable mistakes.

COMMUNIST OBJECTIVES

Mr. McNamara's point of view seems to assume that the Soviet and Chinese objectives are not sufficiently related in any real sense. More fundamentally, it

assumes that the Soviets and the Chinese are pursuing different objectives and will continue to do so. For him the two Communist powers are engaged in inter-necine competition and hostility in which the Soviet Union has found itself unable to work cooperatively with the Chinese in the question of support of revolutionary wars in southeast Asia at the same time it was attempting to improve relations with the West.

WARS OF NATIONAL LIBERATION

Moreover, in the United States-Communist confrontation, Mr. McNamara prefers to emphasize the Chinese commitment to "wars of national liberation." As a result, in his view, the war in South Vietnam has become "a test case of the Chinese Communist version of the so-called wars of national liberation, one of a series of conflicts the Chinese hope will sweep the world,"⁹ in which the Soviet Union is playing a secondary role and in which Soviet involvement has been limited to demonstrating "that Peiping's charges of Soviet 'capitulationism' and 'connivance with U.S. imperialism are false.'"¹⁰

Because of this secondary involvement, the United States must "expect a harsh anti-American tone in Soviet policy pronouncements"¹¹ and in the absence of any statements to the contrary, no direct support of the Soviets to the non-Chinese Communists in Vietnam and elsewhere in the Far East.

Were it not for the Chinese Communists' "wars of national liberation," one might conclude from Mr. McNamara's statement that communism would not constitute a major problem for the United States or the free world. Only Chinese-Soviet competition for primacy in the world Communist movement forces the Soviet Union to engage in any such wars, for it is "the pressure of competition from the Chinese Communists (that) drives the Soviet leaders toward a cold war approach to foreign policy questions, leads them to give high priority to military programs, and, thus, to compound further their chronic economic problems."¹²

B. SINO-SOVIET IDEOLOGICAL GOALS

Mr. McNamara's view of Soviet-Chinese relations fails to give proper appreciation to the overall identity of Soviet and Chinese ideological goals and concentrates upon tactical differences which have arisen in the Soviet and Chinese choices of the paths which best lead to the ideological goals. He fails to take into account the special relationships which would exist between the Soviet and the Chinese in the event of nuclear war between the United States and the Soviet Union, or between the United States and China. Such an interpretation enables the Secretary of Defense to decide against developing a posture which would or could save millions of casualties in a nuclear exchange between the United States and the Soviet

Union, were this to occur, and on the other hand to consider favorably for future deployment a less costly system which would protect against estimated Chinese capabilities in the 1970's. This decision is defended in terms of cost-effectiveness language, but the under-lying assumption appears to be that the Chinese threat is more likely to materialize; for Mr. McNamara the Soviets are more rational than the Chinese. Otherwise, one would be forced to conclude that Mr. McNamara is placing the cost bility of saving U.S. lives.

C. NUCLEAR WAR UNTHINKABLE

A corollary of this appears to be Mr. McNamara's assumption that nuclear war is as unthinkable to the Soviet Union as it is to the United States and the free world. Thus, because the Soviet Union, unlike the Chinese, is "rational," it has a common interest with the United States in seeing to the prevention of a nuclear exchange.

We can certainly hope that this is the case but wishing it so will not necessarily make it so if the Soviet Union finds itself one day in a decisively superior strategic position to the United States. To base defense structure decisions for the future on such a "hope" would be dangerous in the extreme. And though the Secretary of Defense will deny that the U.S. force structure of the 1970's and beyond has been planned with this unverified "hope" in mind, the evidence, in my view, is heavily weighted in that direction.

PRINCIPAL ASSUMPTIONS: FOREIGN POLICY

As we point out in our "Additional Views," the principal foreign policy assumptions upon which defense policy seems largely to be guided are as follows:

- (1) That there has been in recent years a reduction in tensions between the free world and the Communist bloc (except China) and that further accommodations in the future can be anticipated and should be encouraged;
- (2) That our military force structure should be related primarily to the "visible" threat posed by potential adversaries;
- (3) That nuclear war is as unthinkable to the Communists as it is to the United States and the free world and that therefore, the balance that has been achieved between the Soviet Union and the United States with regard to strategic forces should not be upset;
- (4) That the United States should continue to assume a posture of response both in the area of "crisis control" such as Vietnam and in the area of weapons development; and
- (5) That the threat from World Communism has, in fact, eased during the course of recent years and, therefore, any attempt to maintain a decisive defense superiority in the years ahead would reverse this trend.

If these premises are valid, then the defense posture of the United States today, and more especially as envisaged for the future, contains all the necessary elements for insuring the safety and integrity of this country and the free world.

If invalid, a series of Soviet or Chinese Communist technological "surprises" in the years ahead would place the United

⁶ Ibid., P. 12.

¹⁰ Ibid., P. 17.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Ibid.

⁶ Hearings, op. cit., Part 1, P. 12-15.

⁷ Ibid., P. 38.

⁸ Ibid.

States in an untenable position from which it is doubtful it could recover.

BASIC ASSUMPTIONS—DEFENSE STRATEGY

In all areas of potential conflict—whether of a general or limited war nature—there is cause for concern.

In this complicated technological age, a nation's ability to sustain its preparedness depends in large measure on that nation's commitment to continued advanced developments in the areas of weapons systems and their potential uses.

It should be clear that there is no substitute for military superiority as the best insurance against aggression or the possibility of a nuclear exchange. To build our future defenses on the imagined good will of the potential adversary or on the belief that he shares a common interest with the free world in avoiding a nuclear exchange at all costs is, it seems to me, a grave mistake that gambles with the future security of the United States.

It is, of course, possible that such reasoning is valid. But the mere possibility that it is not demands that our future force structure not be governed by such a rationale.

Nevertheless, it seems clear that the present leadership in the Department of Defense bases many of its decisions on just such a rationale.

NATO

The crisis that envelops NATO at the present time and the deterioration of that alliance which has been obvious and growing for several years is very directly related to any consideration of a Defense appropriation bill.

Many feel that the public statements and often surprise actions of the Secretary of Defense in the past 5 years have been a significant contributory factor to NATO's deterioration and to the recent unfortunate decisions on the part of the De Gaulle regime.

As the Secretary pointed out in his statement, concerning NATO, "in the military area, the principal issues revolve around nuclear policy and the future organizational structure of the Alliance."¹³

One of the primary roles of a Blue Ribbon Commission studying the Defense Posture of the United States would be a thoroughgoing review of how and to what extent the changed strategy on the part of the United States with regard to our commitment to NATO has contributed to or exacerbated the crisis in that Alliance today.

NATO is of paramount importance to the future security of the free world and I hope to see the problems of NATO given major attention by the Blue Ribbon Commission.

THE PROBLEM OF GENERAL WAR

The McNamara concept of general war breaks down into two basic requirements or strategies for the United States: deterrence of a nuclear attack upon the United States and its allies by possessing the ability under all circumstances of inflicting an unacceptable degree of damage upon the attacker; and secondly, in the event of an attack, to

limit damage to the population and industrial capacity of the United States.¹⁴

In McNamara's view the level of the Soviet threat is such that—

It will be virtually impossible for us to be able to insure anything approaching complete protection for our population, no matter how large the general nuclear war forces we were to provide including even the hypothetical possibility of striking first.¹⁵

Any one of the Soviet offensive systems in itself can inflict severe damage on the United States; thus a defense against only one type of weapon system is of limited value. Further:

The Soviets have the technical and economic capability to prevent us from achieving a posture which could keep our fatalities below some tens of millions; they can increase their first strike capabilities at an extra cost to them substantially less than the extra cost to us of any additional damage limiting measures we might take.¹⁶

From an economic standpoint, Mr. McNamara believes that the greater the attempt to improve our damage limiting posture, given a certain level, the less effective and therefore more costly is each successive addition to the posture.

Under the circumstances existing between the United States and the Soviet Union, the McNamara strategy has been to develop a strike force which would be able to absorb a first strike from the Soviet Union and still respond with unacceptable damage to the Soviet Union. In McNamara's opinion:

Even if the Soviets in the 1970 period were to assign their entire available missile force to attacks on our strategic forces (reserving only refire missiles and bomber-delivered weapons for urban targets) * * * a very large proportion of our alert forces would still survive.¹⁷

Even then, "one-fifth of the surviving weapons on Soviet cities would destroy about one-third of the total population and half of the industrial capacity of the Soviet Union." McNamara does not indicate what destruction use of all the United States' remaining capability would bring upon the Soviet Union, however, he admits that—

Our strategic offensive forces are far more than adequate to inflict unacceptable damage on the Soviet Union * * * Indeed it appears that even a relatively small portion of these forces would furnish us with a completely adequate deterrent to a deliberate Soviet nuclear attack on the United States or its allies.¹⁸

Mr. McNamara's criticism of U.S. military posture at the time of his assumption of the Office of Secretary of Defense was that U.S. forces available were not sufficient to meet planned requirements and that the forces available were not in proper balance with one another.

Yet, Mr. McNamara claims that the strategic offensive forces for assured destruction today far exceed what is needed even under the most austere circumstances—that of a surprise attack by the Soviet Union—a view that we can

perhaps accept as it pertains to U.S. capabilities in the immediate future. That many of us are concerned about our continued capability for the longer-term future has already been made abundantly clear.

MISSILE TECHNOLOGY

Both in offensive and defensive missile systems, it is my belief that the Secretary of Defense has, in his more recent budgets, determined that the level of effort in missile technology should not be pushed much above a subsistence level.

A. ASSURED DESTRUCTION CAPABILITY

The Secretary of Defense claims a substantial buildup of forces particularly in the area of nuclear warheads for the "assured destruction mission," of U.S. forces. However, primary reliance is now placed upon ICBM's, the actual reliability of which fortunately have not been fully tested under conditions of combat. It is certainly possible that the increase in nuclear warheads under Mr. McNamara's term of office does not represent as large an increase in assured destruction as he anticipates, especially if the Soviets proceed with an effective antimissile defense system. Intelligence on the Soviet antimissile system points to some deployment of the system, and if there is validity to the indications, a continuous improvement and deployment of the Soviet system over the next 5 years could degrade the United States assured destruction capability considerably, if not to the point that the Soviets would consider the damage acceptable, then at least to the point where they might feel that their society might ultimately be able to be revived. In such a situation they could feel that should a general war occur their relative chances of survival after an attack would be better than those of the United States.

B. NEED FOR A "MIX" IN STRATEGIC SYSTEMS

Those who argue for placing primary reliance in the strategic field on our missile capability rather than a "mix" of manned and unmanned strategic systems would do well to recall the early experience of the Sidewinder air-to-air missile in its first combat tests in Vietnam.

After several initial "failures" in encounters with Soviet Migs, it was reported in the press that the Air Force had launched an investigation to determine the reason for Sidewinder's apparent failure in combat operations. Fortunately, there was both time and alternative systems available to accomplish our operational requirements in Vietnam.

In the context of a nuclear exchange at some possible future date, there will be no time for an investigation, should one prove necessary, of the "failure" of our ICBM's to operate effectively and reliably.

It seems to me that the offensive missile systems developed and deployed by the United States will, in the unhappy event it becomes necessary, prove both reliable and effective and that they will accomplish their programed objectives based upon available evidence.

At the same time, it should be apparent, I believe, that to rely solely or pre-

¹⁴ Ibid., P. 41.

¹⁵ Ibid., P. 42.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Ibid., P. 44.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹³ Ibid., P. 34.

dominantly on one particular type of system for such a crucial mission is to gamble recklessly with the future security of this country.

C. AMSA

The Secretary of Defense has consistently held that the manned bomber has now become a supplementary capability in the assured destruction mission and because of this "large expenditures on the development and production of a new advanced strategic aircraft (AMSA) do not appear to be warranted at this time."¹⁹ Instead he proposes to procure "a force of 210 (U.E.) FB-111A's configured as closely as possible to the fighter version so that it would, indeed, be a dual purpose aircraft—strategic and tactical—and this is what we propose to do at a total investment cost of about \$1.9 billion."²⁰ He fails to point out that what he is proposing is an interim, stop-gap bomber, a combination of the F-111A and B, that his early cost estimates turned out to be quite wrong, that the overall TFX program requires additional funds, and that precisely because he cannot foresee with assurance the Soviet threat to the future, the development of a supersonic heavy strategic bomber should be accelerated.

D. DAMAGE LIMITING CAPABILITY

The damage limiting capability of the United States includes that portion of the strategic offensive forces which are not used to perform the assured destruction mission, the U.S. area defense forces, terminal defense forces, and passive defense. The role of the strategic offensive forces is to "contribute to the damage limiting objective by attacking enemy delivery vehicles on their bases or launch sites, provided that our forces can reach them before the vehicles are launched at our cities."²¹

According to McNamara the area defense forces—composed of manned interceptors, longer range anti-ballistic-missile missiles, and antisubmarine warfare forces—and the terminal defense forces—antibomber surface-to-air missiles and shorter range anti-ballistic-missile missiles—would be unable to protect the United States against a determined attack, since the United States now has "no defense against the major threat of Soviet ICBM's and our anti-bomber defenses alone would contribute very little to our damage limiting objective and their residual effectiveness after a major ICBM attack is highly problematical."²²

One might add that the antisubmarine warfare forces are underdeveloped and would not in all probability prevent the Soviet Union from delivering SLBM's—submarine-launched ballistic missiles—against the United States.

In spite of Mr. McNamara's somewhat esoteric references to "assured destruction" and "damage limitation," he is talking about the offensive capabilities of the United States to destroy the Soviet Union and the defensive capabilities of

the United States to lessen casualties and damage to the United States in the event the Soviet Union attacks. What he has said is that the United States now must rely almost entirely for its defense on the hope that the United States will deter the Soviet Union from attacking because it possesses the capability of massive retaliation. Under the posture developed by McNamara if the Soviet Union should attack, the United States now has no alternative than to suffer tens of millions of casualties and to destroy the Soviet Union in return.

E. NUCLEAR DETERRENCE

When first enunciated, the doctrine of nuclear deterrence of the United States was a workable strategy, primarily because the Soviet Union had only a limited nuclear capability against the United States. In addition the Soviet delivery system consisted primarily of aircraft against which the United States had deployed an extensive air defense system. The strategy recognized that the air defense system would not be able to insure anything like complete protection of our population. But it did insure considerable protection and made the Soviet problem of attack doubly difficult. The Soviets could not guarantee that they could strike a telling blow against the United States with the forces they had available to penetrate our defenses, and, secondly, they could not protect themselves with their own defense system against the forces the United States had available.

The Soviet deployment of an ICBM system against the United States and IRBM's against Europe radically changed the balance and gave the Soviets a much stronger position. To counter the ICBM's the United States under McNamara has deployed a much larger ICBM system against the Soviet Union. However, it was not lost upon major European allies that the IRBM threat to Western Europe was not countered directly, but that total reliance was placed upon the U.S. capability to deter the Soviets.

F. MISSILE DEFENSE

An additional flaw in the present American strategy is the lack of aggressiveness in the development of an antiballistic missile defense system—ABM—to counter Soviet ballistic missiles and lessen the number of casualties the United States might suffer—the ultimate reason for having a defense system. At present and for the foreseeable future the military posture adopted by Mr. McNamara relies almost completely upon offensive strategic missiles to deter a missile attack launched by the Soviet Union. The development and deployment of an antimissile defense system remains a matter for the future, in spite of the fact that recent gains in ballistic missile defense capabilities have made the deployment of such a system technically feasible. It is for this reason that the Defense Appropriations Committee included additional funds in the bill for preproduction activities for the antiballistic missile system, the Nike X. Utilization of these funds would shorten by at least a year the time necessary for deployment

of the system once that decision is reached.

In Mr. McNamara's discussions about the deployment of the ABM, he points out that the possibility of developing an area missile defense has been enhanced. However, his considerations about the development and deployment of such a system are primarily in terms of meeting a potential Chinese Communist attack, rather than gearing the defense to the present and probably continuing major threat, the Soviet Union. Mr. McNamara's decision not to request deployment of an ABM system rests on uncertainties about a complete defense—uncertainties that stem in part from the anticipated Soviet reaction to an American all-out damage limiting effort, in part again from the technical and cost problems of such a development. Yet, the question at issue should not be the Soviet reaction nor the cost involved in terms of dollars, but the fact that even a modest capability in ballistic missile defense could save millions of American lives. The additional fact that significant developments have resulted from a limited effort to solve the problem is overlooked. These developments should be taken as an indication that very great improvements could be made were a major effort put into the program.

Mr. McNamara's decision to continue funding the development of the ABM at a relatively low level insures that rapid progress will not be made. Funding at a much higher level could materially limit damage to the United States and were a workable system deployed, it could be used also for the defense of Europe, where the credibility of American intentions to defend both Europe and the United States is being seriously questioned. If his concern is primarily China—which it should not be in this time frame—even then his posture is questionable, for early deployment of the ABM against China could convince the Chinese that the development of an ICBM capability against the United States was not worthwhile, because of the added difficulty in penetrating American defenses.

Secretary McNamara has made clear his belief that even though recent developments have made deployment of such a system feasible and even though there are indications the Soviets have begun deployment of such a system in Russia, this country will not press forward at this time with deployment of the ABM system. Indeed, in testimony before our committee, the Secretary of Defense insisted:

With respect to the antiballistic missile system, I would not recommend deployment of such a system directed against the Soviet threat even if the Congress were to approve a full fallout shelter program.

Mr. LIPSCOMB then commented:

I do not believe people understand if we can save millions of American lives, why we do not go ahead with a system that would accomplish this. They believe we are just not doing it because of the costs involved.

Secretary McNAMARA. We are not doing it for the two reasons I gave. Regardless of cost, whether low or high, to us, the Soviets can offset the additional protection we buy,

¹⁹ Ibid., P. 53.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Ibid., P. 42.

²² Ibid., P. 58.

whatever it may be, at but a small percentage of the cost of that protection to us * * *.

The second reason I would recommend against it is not simply that it is costly, although it is, but rather that, after having expended the funds we would still face the prospect of some 50 million or more fatalities.²³

On the question of fatalities, the Secretary in his prepared statement gave the following assessment of what the Soviet Union could do to the United States in a nuclear exchange:

The ranges of fatalities estimated in the table reflect some of the possible variations in Soviet targeting doctrine * * *. The higher end of the ranges of fatalities shown for each case represents the full damage potential (a well-planned, well-coordinated attack to maximize fatalities) under the assumed conditions. The lower end of the ranges of estimates represents possible degradations in execution and targeting.

The first line on the table shows the Soviet damage potential against the currently approved U.S. program in 1970. It illustrates the projected performance of the currently approved bomber defenses, the civil defense program and the strategic offensive forces. Without these programs, the damage potential could be 160 million or more U.S. fatalities in a mixed Soviet attack on military and civilian targets * * *.

As shown on the second line of the table, the situation is not substantially changed by the assumed Soviet build-up (Threat I) between 1970 and 1975. A full fallout shelter program, at a cost to the Government of about \$3.4 billion, would reduce fatalities by about 15 to 20 million in both cases. Damage-limiting posture A (cost \$22.5 billion) might reduce fatalities to somewhere between 80 and 95 million and posture B (cost \$30.1 billion) to between 50 and 80 million in an early urban attack. But the benefits of these damage-limiting programs could be substantially offset, especially in the case of a Soviet first strike, if the Soviets were to increase their offensive forces to the levels assumed in Threat II.²⁴

It seems clear from Secretary McNamara's statement that the deployment of an effective ABM system would probably result in the saving of tens of millions of American lives in the event of a nuclear attack.

It would seem that the potential saving of such a vast number of American lives in the event of a nuclear attack would warrant pushing ahead with development and deployment of the ABM system. The fact that our committee and the Armed Services Committee of the House included additional funds for preproduction items would seem to bear out the strong feeling of Congress in this respect.

MILITARY USES OF SPACE

In our "Additional Views" last year we said:

Testimony on the military use of space revealed a lack of positive direction. The Committee was told that military applications of space were being pursued, but at the same time it was said that many of the military requirements in space had not been established. As a result, there was considerable evidence of delays in programs, a hesitation to start others, and an overall reluctance to pursue this new field vigorously.

As an expression of concern that the military uses of space are not proceeding at an

expeditious pace, the Committee placed a limitation on the funds for the Manned Orbital Laboratory Program. This limitation provided that the funds would not be utilized for any other program. Far too many delays have already been incurred in getting this program started, particularly considering that it is the only major program directed toward utilizing the military man in space.

The overriding concern in the space field should be to overcome the military lag in space technology.²⁵

When the President announced to the world on August 25, 1965, just 2 months after these additional views were submitted, that he had authorized the Department of Defense to proceed with development of the MOL, he indicated his awareness of its importance. In assigning MOL to the Air Force, he said:

We fight Communism by maintaining superiority in every field of science and technology which does or can affect the security of our Nation. This applies to the exploration of outer space. We dare not leave this area of our universe to become a monopoly in the hands of those who would destroy freedom. We must therefore obtain and maintain a leadership for the free world in outer space and we are trying to do that.²⁶

Unfortunately, the President's words went unheeded by the Secretary of Defense, for the funds allocated for MOL in fiscal 1966 went largely unutilized.

One can only deplore the complacency with which the leadership in the Department of Defense appears to view the necessity for making significant strides in the military applications of space.

ANTISUBMARINE WARFARE (ASW)

As was the case last year, witnesses this year again told the committee that the ASW budget was very tight and that the emphasis once again has been very much at the operational level.

Rear Adm. E. W. Doble, from the Office of the Deputy Chief of Naval Operations—Development—was asked the following question by Mr. LIPSCOMB:

Is this \$355.4 million budget a tight budget for ASW?

Admiral DOBLE. It is very tight.²⁷

It is a recognized fact that one of the most critical and difficult areas that faces this country in the years ahead is antisubmarine warfare both offensively and defensively.

As we said last year:

We . . . have a situation where, in one of the most difficult and critical areas, the Research and Development budget is both "tight" and emphasizes primarily operational improvements. Although we do need improvements on existing operational systems, an evaluation of the threat clearly shows our needs become even more crucial in the late 60s and early 70s, for which we need new concepts and new systems. A "tight" approach does not permit the flexibility to explore potential concepts that might provide some of the solutions being sought. We are not implying that money should be wasted on projects that are not needed, but when faced with problems in an area that is both crucial and extremely complex, new ideas and new programs cannot be strait-jacketed by either a lack of funds or a lack of encouragement to explore new avenues.²⁸

Our views have not changed since last year's report. In fact, concern has been increasing; for another year has, in effect, been lost in a period when the Soviet Union is clearly placing great emphasis on developments in the ASW field.

In addition, there should be some concern about the reduced ASW capability that has arisen in the Atlantic as pointed up by the following colloquy:

Mr. LIPSCOMB. What is happening to our ASW capability? We are taking this straight deck (Carrier, *Lake Champlain*) out of the service, and we have also transferred another one of our ASW angle deck ships (Carrier, *Intrepid*) to another area. What happens to our ASW capability?

Admiral McDONALD (Chief of Naval Operations). Our ASW capability as far as the hunter-killer force in the Atlantic is concerned, is reduced by two-fifths.²⁹

There is a clear and growing threat posed to this country in the area of anti-submarine warfare capabilities. Certainly, a much greater level of effort in the research and development aspects of ASW must be pursued if this country is to sustain its ability to fulfill in the future the five basic purposes for U.S. anti-submarine warfare forces that were defined for this committee by the Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. David L. McDonald:

To defeat enemy submarines.

To reduce the direct threat to the United States from enemy missile-launching submarines.

To prevent isolation of the United States or its possessions from vital overseas resources.

To allow U.S. Forces to operate freely on the seas in support of U.S. policies.

To maintain inviolable our Nation's ability to supply all military forces deployed overseas, and to support our allies in accordance with treaty obligations.

This involves the transport of vast quantities of material overseas by ship. Over 98 percent of the equipment and provisions required by our forces in Vietnam has gone by sea.

As Admiral McDonald said:

The Soviet Union has a total force of about 400 submarines, more than half of which are modern, long-range types, including a steady increasing percentage of nuclear powered units. The Chinese Communists have over 30 available submarines, the vast majority being diesel submarines of the older W type.

The only available counter to the submarine threat, in any of its forms, is our ASW forces.

Russian submarines have begun deploying in ever increasing numbers throughout the world. Worldwide "unidentified" submarine contacts, that is, out-of-area type contacts, have more than doubled in the past 2 years.³⁰

Clearly, the United States cannot afford to be complacent about the growing threat from the sea. Only by placing high priority emphasis on new programs and new ideas in the area of ASW can the United States hope to maintain its superiority in this critical area of our country's defense.

NUCLEAR CARRIERS

The Secretary of Defense discusses Navy attack carrier forces under the general purpose forces without bringing

²³ House Report No. 528, op. cit., P. 64.

²⁴ Quoted in House Report No. 1536, op. cit., P. 20.

²⁵ Hearings, op. cit. (1967), Part 5, P. 342.

²⁶ House Report No. 528, op. cit., P. 64.

²⁷ Hearings, op. cit. Part I, P. 675.

²⁸ Ibid., P. 595.

²⁹ Ibid., P. 114-15.

³⁰ Ibid., P. 48.

to the fore the role such forces would have in the strategic offensive mission. In fact he removed carriers from the strategic mission category. He has been opposed for some time to the development of additional nuclear-powered aircraft carriers on the basis of their additional cost. Yet the Navy has shown that the dollar cost of nuclear-powered carriers is more than compensated by the additional mobility and operational characteristics such carriers possess. In the present program, Mr. McNamara has requested authorization of one such carrier with two more follow on carriers later. Mr. McNamara's failure to understand Navy strategic requirements has delayed the building and deployment of this system unduly.

SOVIET FUTURE CAPABILITIES

Mr. McNamara's treatment of the general war problem assumes that the Soviet Union will remain relatively static in its posture. He makes no adequate provision for the possibility that the Soviets are pressing for a breakthrough, or even that the Soviets will radically improve their present ballistic missile capabilities. His reliance is entirely on the credibility of the American nuclear deterrent with respect to the Soviet Union.

U.S. POSTURE TOMORROW

The future of the American posture as projected by McNamara will consist in technical refinements of the present missile systems—development of decoys, better penetration aids, more reliable command and control structure, perhaps better intelligence though this is not stressed. The posture follows more or less a gradual improvement curve without anticipating any unusual developments. Implicit in his considerations is that the United States and the Soviet Union have reached a technological plateau in which no unforeseen changes will change the balance as has happened with extreme regularity during the past 25 years.

Much of the confidence which Mr. McNamara has in the American posture stems from his feeling that the Soviet Union has reached a point of being a satisfied nation and that therefore the possibility of general war has become more remote.

Given these assumptions, Mr. McNamara is willing to gamble in areas where the United States possesses relatively little information—the future long-range development plans of the Soviet Union. To do so however entails high risk, for war always contains the elements of surprise and uncertainty, just as Mr. McNamara has most recently been finding out in Vietnam where "material is being used in ways and quantities which were never anticipated."³¹

In all of these areas—missiles technology, strategic bombers, military uses of space, surface, and undersea technology—it seems to me clear that the present leadership of the Department of Defense has curtailed rather than encouraged a level of effort that would insure the maintenance of U.S. superiority in the years ahead.

It is my further belief that much of the motivating factor which lies behind this situation stems largely from the basic assumptions I have attempted to explore in these remarks both as regards foreign policy and defense strategy.

Rather than relying upon his own intuition and the slide rule to determine how much his posture will cost, Mr. McNamara could well afford to be guided by the experience of his military advisers who have learned from hard experience how expensive surprise can be. If he were to do this, he would place a very high priority on the antiballistic missile system, accelerate the AMSA program, and devote considerably more energy to and support for the research and development program.

THE PROBLEM OF LIMITED WAR

Mr. Speaker, in this section, it is merely my intention to raise certain basic questions with regard to the administration's assumptions concerning limited war. It is particularly important, in my view, that the Blue Ribbon Commission study very carefully the apparently different attitude of this administration toward deterring the Soviet Union on the one hand and Red China on the other. The importance of clearly establishing what our posture and our policies are toward these two Communist nations cannot, in my judgment, be overstressed.

Mr. McNamara quite correctly points out that—

The distinction between general nuclear war forces and limited war forces is somewhat arbitrary in that all of our forces would be employed in a general war, and certain elements of our strategic offensive-defensive forces could be employed in a limited war.³²

One can agree with Mr. McNamara that the requirements for limited war demand the creation and maintenance of highly mobile forces and that "the ability to concentrate our military power rapidly in a threatened area can make a great difference in the size of the force ultimately required and, in some cases, can serve to halt aggression before it really gets started."³³

DETECTING THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. McNamara evidently believes that American and European posture with respect to the Soviet Union is sufficient to deter the Soviets from initiating limited war using either their own forces or those of other countries, or some combination of them. He believes also that with respect to the Far East "our present nuclear predominance combined with a strong conventional defense posture in the area is now and should continue to be fully adequate to deter deliberate Soviet aggression, nuclear or nonnuclear."³⁴

DETECTING CHINESE COMMUNISM

But American capabilities to deter the Chinese Communists presents an entirely different picture for him:

The full implications of this new threat in the Far East are as yet far from clear, and the question of what our theater nuclear posture in the Far East should be in the future will require continuing study. In this connec-

tion, there is one lesson that we can draw from our experience in Europe, and that is to avoid a strategy which relies almost wholly on the use of tactical nuclear weapons to cope with the enemy's "massive" ground forces.³⁵

Mr. Speaker, the comparison of the situation in Europe and in the Far East given by Mr. McNamara is grossly misleading. In other places Mr. McNamara has made it quite clear that American and European posture in the NATO area depends upon a combination of forces: strategic nuclear, tactical nuclear, and conventional. This combination has effectively deterred the Soviet Union so far from initiating limited wars in the European area, and Soviet realization that limited wars in that area would incur a very high risk to the Soviet heartland may well have been the primary consideration for the Soviet caution in applying active military pressure against the United States and Europe. Soviet moves in Europe have been consistently below the level of actual military engagement with NATO forces because of the level of risk such military engagements involve.

The same situation does not pertain in the Far East. According to Mr. McNamara, Soviet actions in the Far East would incur the same penalties, but the formula has not and still does not apply to Chinese or Chinese-sponsored wars of national liberation in the Far East. Where the United States with regard to Europe has given the impression it is willing to impose severe penalties upon the Soviet Union for aggression, it has not given that same impression with regard to the Chinese Communists. It is little wonder then that the Chinese Communists have found the formula, "despite the enemy strategically, respect him tactically," successful in their Far Eastern military policy.

The conduct of the war in Vietnam so far has not been designed to impress the Chinese and the Vietnamese Communists that so-called wars of national liberation can be taken only at high risk. In no case over the past 25 years has Red China been made to suffer militarily for aggressive military actions. In the present situation in Vietnam, the worst event that the Chinese can expect by an American victory is that they suffer a temporary setback in their plans for wars of national liberation; the question of direct military punishment for supporting such wars is not part of their problem. To a large measure the same type of risk confronts the North Vietnamese. In neither case is the prospective amount of gain proportionate to the risk, simply because the United States has failed to confront them with high risk.

In spite of the fact that the "U.S. Government had made it known for many years that it would view with the greatest concern any Communist attempt to seize the territory of South Vietnam by force of arms,"³⁶ U.S. response to that attempt has been piecemeal. From 1960 to 1964 Mr. McNamara underestimated both the number of forces and the time that it would take to restore order in South Vietnam. Although the South

³² Ibid., P. 130.

³³ Ibid., P. 131.

³⁴ Ibid., P. 132.

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ Ibid., P. 12.

³¹ Ibid., P. 9-10.

Vietnamese consistently lost ground during that period, the level of American assistance was never great enough for the South Vietnamese to gain the initiative. Even though it was recognized that the Vietcong could not conduct a war without North Vietnamese and ultimately Chinese and Soviet assistance, American military action was not addressed to the latter forces.

American intercession on a greater scale did not occur until it became overwhelmingly clear that the Vietcong were on the verge of success and that further delay would allow South Vietnam to slip into the hands of the Communists. Heavy deployment of U.S. forces at a much earlier period could have checked the Vietcong at a lower level of success and could have precluded or substantially reduced the present need for expanded deployment. The tactic of a "pause" at the time the United States and the South Vietnamese had regained the initiative permitted the North Vietnamese to beef up logistics and reinforce the Vietcong at quite a high rate, and at the same time did not make manifest to the Communists that there would be any additional penalty for refusing to accept opportunity to negotiate which the pause offered.

If "Vietnam is also a test case of the Chinese Communist version of the so-called wars of national liberation, one of a series of conflicts the Chinese hope will sweep the world," will U.S. willingness to accept negotiations with the Communists at a point short of their military defeat, convince the Chinese in particular that wars of national liberation are not a successful path for expanding communism? It hardly seems so.

Furthermore, will not American willingness to negotiate a settlement with the Vietnamese Communists before it is made abundantly clear that their behavior is punishable and that the United States has the means and the will to inflict heavy penalties for such behavior, act as an incentive for the Soviet Union to become much more active in its support of revolutionary war? If the Chinese can get away with it there is no valid reason why the same rules should not apply also to the Soviet Union. In fact, perhaps more so, because the risk of Soviet involvement appears already to have been the governing factor behind U.S. reluctance to quarantine Haiphong or to attack Soviet-manned SAM sites at an earlier date.

In such a circumstance, American defense policymakers must ask themselves whether American conventional forces, no matter how mobile and how large, will in the end be sufficient to meet the variety of threats the Soviet and Chinese Communist doctrine of "wars of national liberation" can create. It should not be forgotten that at the recent tricontinental Communist conference in Cuba, the highest priority was placed upon fomenting additional "wars of national liberation" around the globe.

ASSUMPTIONS

In Mr. McNamara's presentation of the case of Communist aggression in

South Vietnam several assumptions are implicit. From his testimony one is led to believe that only the Chinese Communists and their helpers, the North Vietnamese, are supporting the Vietcong to any meaningful extent. Conversely, the impression is given that the Soviet Union's assistance is limited and unwillingly given. Yet Soviet assistance there, granting the truthfulness of Soviet statements, is on the order of a billion and a half dollars or more.

The further impression is given that stopping communism in South Vietnam will have a reverse domino effect, that is, by halting a war of national liberation in one state, the Chinese Communists will be shown that they cannot be successful in others. While this is a possibility, it is based on the assumption, perhaps erroneous, that Chinese and Soviet plans require that South Vietnam be made totally Communist, without entertaining the possibility that simply forcing the United States to come to an accommodation is in itself a victory in Vietnam just as it was in Laos and that the stopping of American forces short of victory will be a stimulus and an encouragement for national movements to take the initiative elsewhere, not to mention the heavy drain on U.S. resources that such wars impose.

The assumption is made that communism is a permanent phenomenon in the Far East, that once it is introduced into an area it will remain. The possibility that defeat in Vietnam would create other reversals is not part of McNamara's estimate of the situation; on the contrary, the assumption is implicit that a Vietcong defeat in South Vietnam which also brought down the Viet Minh in North Vietnam would bring the United States into full military conflict with China. As a corollary, the assumption is that the United States would be involved in a "ground" war in China and that in this case, the war would either be excessively costly in terms of manpower and physical resources or would escalate into nuclear war involving the Soviet Union. Neither of these assumptions is necessarily true.

Acceptance of such assumptions effectively limits the conduct of U.S. operations in the Far East, but allows the Chinese, in particular, a freedom of action which is denied to the United States. It also increases substantially the risk of future wars. In the meantime building resources in terms of high percentage increases of tactical nuclear weapons which do not serve as deterrents, and deliberately restricting United States initiatives which prohibit the United States from inflicting heavy penalties on North Vietnam, is hardly good military policy or effective cost control.

TEST OF U.S. CAPABILITY

The war in South Vietnam is not only a test case of the Communist doctrine of wars of national liberation, it is more particularly a test case of the U.S. capability of preventing them from occurring and of defeating them decisively should they occur. To date the American experience in Vietnam has revealed that the defense posture adopted by Mr. McNamara is

inadequate in both respects. Moreover, since the expansion of the American commitment to South Vietnam has given that conflict the character of a limited conventional war, it is also a test of the U.S. capability to engage in one limited war and to maintain at the same time sufficient reserve strength to engage in others should the need arise. In this latter situation, the indications are that American defense posture suffers from serious deficiencies. It is evident that the number of trained units available for deployment is insufficient, that the rates of consumption of ordnance were misjudged, and air and sealift necessary to support the forces abroad are inadequate.

Mr. McNamara has repeatedly assured the Nation that the U.S. commitment to Vietnam had not extended U.S. conventional capabilities, that the readiness of the forces in the United States had not been impaired, that the forces in Europe were at a high degree of readiness, and after having done this, subsequently admitted that American forces in the United States required more training before they could be committed. Whereas the forces in the United States were claimed to possess a higher experience factor because of the return of troops having been in combat in Vietnam, the actual state of affairs was that the depletion of U.S. units to meet Vietnam requirements reduced their combat effectiveness to the point where they could not be deployed without further training and additional material. Not only did the Vietnamese returnees not satisfy the training requirements, it was found necessary to bring back from Europe thousands of troops with experience or specialized skills both to train unskilled recruits and to deploy to Vietnam. While such a move may satisfy immediate needs in the United States, it robs the European theater and creates a shortage there.

Such a situation is destabilizing apart from the lack of confidence it has created in Mr. McNamara's statements to the press. The potential impact on European trust of American intentions is much more serious, since the move was made without prior consultation, and gives further credence to French charges that American commitments to the Far East outweigh American responsibilities to Europe.

The combat ready forces in the United States at the time of the expanded commitment did not include sufficient engineer and port battalions to construct, maintain, and manage the port facilities necessary to support the deployment. While South Vietnam may have presented an unusual problem of logistic support, the United States has been active in the area for several years and should have been aware of the difficulties a larger commitment would cause. Given this situation, elementary prior planning for a larger commitment required increased engineer and port troops in the U.S. force, or a callup of selected Reserve units which specialize in this type of activity. Failure to preplan either of these alternatives delayed the full impact of American power in South Vietnam and may have made a larger

commitment of force impossible while at the same time, it may have contributed to a longer, drawnout war than would otherwise have been necessary.

While Mr. McNamara has told the Congress that he has adjusted a supposed imbalance in the force structure by adding to the conventional strength of the services, this additional strength which he has developed is itself out of balance, particularly in the amount of conventional ordnance available to it. The excuse that the forces have used more ordnance than he had expected is not sufficient: the failure was a lack of understanding of conventional warfare in a given tactical situation. This failure has put the United States in the embarrassing situation of having to buy and borrow back ordnance which it had either sold or committed to its allies. Not only is it an embarrassment to the United States, it was a costly error in terms of dollars, and costly again in that the ordnance taken from Europe and other areas limits the combat readiness of the troops in those areas. The net result is that shortages of conventional ordnance now exist overall.

AIR AND SEALIFT

In the matter of air and sealift Mr. McNamara said in 1961 and repeated again in this year's testimony that the airlift capability when he assumed office was completely inadequate and there was not enough amphibious lift to move the Marine Corps forces. He then noted that he has since brought about a 100-percent increase in the airlift capacity.³⁷ Significantly he did not mention any increase either in amphibious Marine Corps or general airlift capacity. However, the real increase in airlift capability still lies in the future, notably the C5A and the remainder of the C-141's, while the sealift capability has remained unsatisfactory. The fact that it has remained so lies in part in Mr. McNamara's decision to opt for a very fast reaction time which airlift can give and in part in his lack of understanding of the very heavy transport requirements that limited war can bring. This conclusion has certainly been borne out by the Vietnam experience where, according to the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral McDonald, "over 98 percent of the equipment and provisions required by our forces in Vietnam have gone by sea."³⁸

The escalation in Vietnam caught the United States in the position of being short both in air and sealift capacity. Mr. McNamara's decision that the United States had all the merchant marine lift necessary for any foreseeable military emergency has meant that no real modernization of the merchant fleet has taken place, and the United States has been forced to break out well over 100 ships from the World War II fleet. Even though Mr. McNamara has claimed that these are adequate for the situation, the United States has been forced to use non-American carriers as well as overage carriers which have

not been properly refitted. And, in addition to the ships themselves, the problem is compounded by the lack of experienced personnel.

The net result of Mr. McNamara's airlift has been the preponderant carrier of troops and supplies to Vietnam, and secondly, the United States has been unable to pick up cargo from U.S. ports to deliver it to Vietnam in the quantities and with the speed necessary. Furthermore, the lack of trained port and logistic personnel in Vietnam has compounded his mistake, since the offloading of cargo and equipment that does arrive has been unduly delayed.

CONCLUSION

The test of Mr. McNamara's program by the trial of combat confirms the doubts Congress has had about his ability both to develop the strategic concepts necessary to support a firm American policy and then to integrate the forces and equipment necessary to carry out those concepts.

The evidence seems clearly to support this conclusion especially with regard to the problems of limited war for they have been put to the test of combat in that context and have been found wanting.

It is certainly my devout hope that this test will never be made with regard to the problems of general war. The best way to insure that that test will never come is to return the United States to a full commitment behind the maintenance of a decisively superior defense posture.

That Congress has had continuing doubts about the defense posture being developed for the future security of the United States, is in my view, no longer subject to serious question. Virtually every major committee dealing with defense matters and a large cross-section of individual Members of Congress, during the past 5 years, have expressed concern about one phase or another of our defense policy.

Consider:

The unanimous report of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in December 1963 with regard to nuclear propulsion for naval vessels, stated:

The committee concludes that the decision announced by the Secretary of Defense on October 25, 1963, against the utilization of nuclear propulsion in the next aircraft carrier, CVA-67, was incorrect. If this carrier, with a life expectancy of up to 30 years, is built with conventional power, it will reduce its capabilities from now until the 21st century. . . . It is fundamentally illogical and wasteful to fit our new first line warships with power plants that are, perhaps, already obsolete.³⁹

The report of the House Armed Services Committee's Subcommittee No. 2 concerning the bomber version of the TFX:

Regrettably, the statistics used by the Secretary of Defense to illustrate the claimed superiority of the FB-111A over the B-52 C

to F series and B-58 aircraft were based upon markedly different nuclear bomb loadings which had the net effect of significantly misrepresenting the comparative capability of these aircraft.⁴⁰

Representative H. R. Gross, of Iowa, quoted Adm. Arleigh Burke, former Chief of Naval Operations, on the TFX contract. Speaking on the floor of the House Mr. Gross called attention "to the warning by Arleigh Burke that the TFX warplane contract investigation discloses practices that could result in the 'destruction or political perversion' of our entire military procurement system."⁴¹

Report of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, concerning the award of the X-22 V/STOL research and development contract. Under "Summary of Major Findings," the report contained the following:

We conclude from the evidence that:

(a) Convincing and compelling reasons did not exist for overturning the source selection recommendation in the X-22 case.

(b) Secretary Gilpatric (Deputy Secretary of Defense), in making the ultimate decision, acted prematurely and at a time when he was not in possession of all material, pertinent and important information.

(c) In this case there was a reversal of the source selection recommendation without full, thorough, and adequate consultation and without knowledge by the decision-maker of all material and important facts. Reversals under such circumstances threaten and jeopardize the integrity of the source selection system.⁴²

The 1961 report of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee of the House was critical of general practices in the Defense Establishment:

The Committee, as it has reviewed defense operations over the years, has become increasingly concerned with trends in management, organization, and procedures toward more and more centralization of authority for decision making on minute details. This tendency has slowed up decision making, established an intermediate layer of paper shuffling, and otherwise resulted in delays, which it is believed are seriously endangering many of our vital defense programs.⁴³

In regard to the "Muzzling of the Military" controversy in 1961, a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, said on the Senate floor:

Mr. President, my review of the speeches submitted by the Department of Defense has substantiated the fact that penetrating statements about communism, particularly communist ideology and methods, are either deleted or softened. I have noted sufficient of the censorship actions in these speeches to substantiate this beyond equivocation.⁴⁴

Senator STENNIS, in commenting upon the instruction by the Defense Secretary to a subordinate not to reveal the names

³⁷ Report No. 60, 89th Congress, 2nd Session, P. 6557.

³⁸ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 109, pt. 10, p. 13855.

³⁹ Report, Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of Senate Armed Services Committee, Jan. 31, 1964.

⁴⁰ House Report No. 574, 87th Congress, 1st Session.

⁴¹ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 107, pt. 15, p. 19983.

³⁷ Ibid., P. 8.

³⁸ Ibid., P. 595.

³⁹ Report, Nuclear Propulsion for Naval Vessels, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, 88th Congress, 1st Session, Dec., 1963, P. 3.

of those who actually censored the speeches, reportedly said:

I do not think an executive officer, even a member of the Cabinet, can stop a legislative inquiry merely by saying he takes full responsibility.

Senator SALTONSTALL, ranking minority member of the Senate Armed Services and Senate Appropriations Committees, was reported to have said that Mr. McNamara's move "extends executive privilege way beyond what I thought it was."⁴⁵

Senator RUSSELL, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee during debate on the Defense appropriation bill for fiscal 1963, said:

My only regret in this matter is that I fear that the Department (of Defense) will not spend the money. We appropriated the money last year, and they did not spend it. I regret very much that they did not spend it.

I told the distinguished Secretary of Defense, for whom I have great and unbounded admiration, that no man has yet been born of woman who cannot make some error of judgment. I think an error has been made in regard to the decision not to prosecute development of this manned bomber.⁴⁶

The House Armed Services Committee has raised several serious questions regarding the future posture of this country with particular reference to AMSA, a nuclear Navy, and the ABM. The committee commented:

Too often, it is feared, the almost obsessional dedication to cost effectiveness raises the specter of a decisionmaker who, as it has been said, knows the price of everything and the value of nothing. In a matter of such great moment as our military posture, the very key to our survival, the Congress must not be a who-body; something halfway between a nobody and a somebody. It must call the shots as it sees them.⁴⁷

The House Armed Services Committee's Subcommittee No. 2 reporting on the "Department of Defense Decision To Reduce the Number and Types of Manned Bombers in the Strategic Air Command" was sharply critical of this decision and urged that "plans for the phaseout of the B-58 bomber be immediately abandoned."⁴⁸

Senator GORDON ALLOTT, of Colorado, in discussing Vietnam on the Senate floor, July 25, 1962, said:

Mr. President, yesterday, Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara returned from yet another Pacific conference, and said he is encouraged over progress of affairs in South Vietnam. Mr. President, I wonder just what Mr. McNamara means by progress.⁴⁹

On November 6, 1963, Representative MELVIN PRICE, of Illinois, was reported as saying that development and research programs have been marked by a lack of meaningful objectives, poor estimates of costs, and ill-defined management responsibilities. In the New York Times account, PRICE cited the Defense Department and its refusal, "despite over-

whelming weight of evidence" to equip the next aircraft carrier with nuclear power. "To me," he said, "this is like the board of directors of Union Pacific Railroad deciding to purchase a steam engine despite the proven experience with diesels."⁵⁰

On February 5, 1963, Representative F. EDWARD HÉBERT, of Louisiana, was reported in the New York Times in reference to the manner in which Secretary McNamara overrode a majority of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the Skybolt missile and the RS-70 bomber, as saying he fears Congress has given the Secretary of Defense too much power to override generals and admirals and might have to take back some of this authority.⁵¹

The Military Operations Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee, in a 1964 report, called McNamara "too timid and uncertain" in exploiting satellite technology for military communications.⁵²

In remarks on the House floor on June 14, 1966, Representative WILLIAM BATES, of Massachusetts, said:

Despite the constitutional power of the Congress "to provide and maintain a Navy," the Department of Defense has refused to consider the positions which the Congress has set into law. In our opinion, this is a serious matter.⁵³

Admiral Rickover, in testimony before the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee on May 11, 1966, commented regarding a nuclear surface Navy:

Our country is rich, and can afford it, if the errors we make are merely in wasting money. But when an error in our national defense is made, money cannot undo it. There is then a period of years during which the mistake cannot be corrected by merely appropriating money.⁵⁴

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, following their hearings on nuclear propulsion in surface ships, issued a special report in December 1963 in which they recommended:

That the United States adopt the policy of utilizing nuclear propulsion in all future major surface warships.⁵⁵

In its hearings on January 26, 1966 on naval nuclear propulsion program, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy pointed out:

If the two conventional aircraft carriers and the nine conventional frigates authorized since 1960 had been provided nuclear propulsion, the United States would now have in being or under construction three nuclear-powered carrier task groups instead of only one. These nuclear-powered task groups would have given the United States a much stronger Navy with which to face the uncertain and perilous future that lies ahead.⁵⁶

⁴⁵ New York Times, Nov. 6, 1963.

⁴⁶ New York Times, Feb. 5, 1963.

⁴⁷ "Satellite Communications," Military Operations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, 89th Congress, 2nd Session, October, 1964, P. 105-6.

⁴⁸ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 89th Congress, 2nd Session, June 14, 1966, P. 13060.

⁴⁹ Hearings, op. cit., Part 6, P. 83.

⁵⁰ Report, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, op. cit., P. 5.

⁵¹ Hearings, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, 89th Congress, 2d Session, on "Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program," Jan. 26, 1966, P. V.

The Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee reported on the combat readiness of certain Army divisions.

In his letter of transmittal, the chairman of the Preparedness Subcommittee, Senator JOHN STENNIS, of Mississippi, said:

I would like to take this occasion to express a few personal thoughts with respect to the problems which have confronted us and will confront us with respect to the war in Vietnam and the demands which it has imposed upon our military Armed Forces.

First, I am convinced that time has worked for us and been a saving factor in this matter. As pointed out in the subcommittee report on Army readiness, dated July 27, 1965, there were then serious deficiencies and inadequacies in Army readiness which could be corrected only by increased funding and additive procurement.

Fortunately, we have had the time to do this. During the interim, even though our fighting men have been called upon to engage in sharp and bloody fighting, and have responded magnificently, the fact is that the nature of this war is such that we have not been faced with large scale and sustained ground combat as was encountered in past land wars such as World War II and Korea. Thus, we have had the time to gear up our production facilities, let contracts and obtain deliveries of vitally needed equipment, repair parts, and supplies, and to acquire and train additional manpower. We might have been in grave difficulty if this time had not been available.

Second, I believe there is a lesson to be learned from our commitments in South Vietnam. The requirements of Vietnam have shown how delicately we are balanced between military strength and weakness in the light of our worldwide commitments.

The fact that a relatively small and underdeveloped country such as North Vietnam has been able to tie us down and make necessary such a substantial commitment of our military resources should show us what we can and must expect if similar wars of aggression against small and helpless nations should occur at other points around the world. . . .⁵⁷

The committee report itself states that "the four divisions covered by this report are not combat ready today," and reiterates the difficulty committees of Congress have experienced in "obtaining requested material."⁵⁸

Senator STENNIS, in a speech on March 30, 1966, made the following comments:

While the present unsatisfactory combat readiness condition of the only four full divisions that would be available for commitment in other emergencies was brought about, at least in part, by the decision not to call selected reserve units, nevertheless the Congress and the public were repeatedly reassured that these divisions were combat ready.

On August 4, 1965, the Secretary of Defense assured the Senate Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations that "all divisions are ready to go to combat. We have 16."

The four divisions now in question are part of the 16.

⁵⁷ Report on the "Combat Readiness of the I. 4th Infantry Division, Fort Lewis, Wash.

II. 5th Infantry Division (Mechanized) Fort Carson, Colo.

III. 1st Armored Division, Fort Hood, Texas.

IV. 2nd Armored Division, Fort Hood, Texas."

89th Congress, 1st Session, P. 111.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, P. 2.

⁴⁵ New York Times, Feb. 2, 1962.

⁴⁶ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 8, p. 10377.

⁴⁷ House Report No. 1536, 89th Congress, 2nd Session, P. 9.

⁴⁸ Report No. 60, op. cit., P. 6588.

⁴⁹ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 11, p. 14696.

He was further asked if the divisions "have all they need." His answer was "Yes, Sir; without any qualification whatsoever."

The investigation conducted by the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee showed that at the time that statement was made one of the four U.S. divisions was at barely 55% authorized strength and another was barely more than 70% of authorized strength. I am certain that the Secretary had not been advised of the actual condition of these divisions when he made the statements quoted above.⁶⁰

The report of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee "on the personnel, training, equipment, and readiness status of Army Reserve components" stated, among other "findings and recommendations" that:

One available solution to the problem of the untrained REP (Reserve Enlistment Program) backlog would be the calling of the USAR training divisions to active duty. Calling such training divisions to active duty would not only assist in eliminating the REP training backlog (some 127,400 on June 30, 1966), but would reduce the overload upon the Active Army training centers and relieve the Active Army combat divisions from their current basic training missions.

The action by the Secretary of Defense in disestablishing, in defiance of the resolution unanimously adopted by the Senate Committee on Armed Services, approximately 750 USAR units, including all six USAR combat divisions, has resulted in a needless loss of trained manpower from a paid drill status, has resulted in an excessive assignment of displaced personnel to other units as over-strength, and has made it difficult, if not impossible, for the USAR to achieve the congressionally mandated strength of 270,000 at the end of fiscal year 1966 in a meaningful and realistic manner. (Emphasis added.)⁶¹

The House Armed Services Committee in discussing civil defense fallout shelters in 1965, commented:

The committee was faced during its hearings with somewhat of an anomaly with respect to civil defense fallout shelters. Repeatedly throughout the testimony of Secretary of Defense McNamara, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Wheeler, and Deputy Secretary of Defense Vance, references were made to fallout shelters as being a top priority program. On the other hand, the program being presented to the Congress this year cuts down radically from last year the amount of funds being requested for this purpose. Indeed, no specific legislation such as was submitted in the 88th Congress for fallout shelters is even being proposed this year. So we are faced with a "top priority" fallout shelter program with neither budget requests nor other legislation to support it.⁶²

The House Armed Services Committee discussing strategic bombers for the future, commented in 1964:

Suffice it to say that our bomber force will be very substantially reduced in the not very distant future.

It should be borne in mind also that the last deliveries of the B-52 and B-58 bombers were in October of 1962. No new bomber has been designed, much less in the process of production, and it is a simple and

easily understood fact that we will have no bombers if we do not start on the road toward bomber production at this time.

The B-52's and the B-58's will fly for some time to come but common sense tells us that they will wear out. This is inevitable.

There is a strange anomaly in this situation. Although there are no definite plans for a new bomber, Mr. McNamara in his statement before the committee said:

"We plan to continue a mixed force of missiles and manned bombers throughout the entire planning period, fiscal years 1965-69. Although most of the aiming points in the Soviet target system can be best attacked by missiles, the long-range bombers will continue to be used in the followup attack, particularly against hard missile sites and against the targets which need not be attacked within minutes, for example, weapon storage sites."

The committee is constrained to ask what the plan will be should war not occur during the life of the B-52 and B-58 bombers. What, then, will be used, under present planning, to attack hard missile sites and weapon storage sites?⁶³

Representative F. EDWARD HÉBERT, of Louisiana, commenting on the need for development of AMSA:

Secretary McNamara has carefully attempted to leave the impression that the Joint Chiefs of Staff, including the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, are part of the "we" who today "still cannot see a clear need for a new strategic bomber." That impression is not only misleading but completely untrue.

The American public has a right to know what recommendations have now been made by the Joint Chiefs of Staff on this vital question—the Secretary of Defense has himself raised this issue—let him therefore resolve it by releasing to the American public the precise language used by the Joint Chiefs of Staff in expressing their current position on this controversial question.

If the Secretary refuses to accept my challenge to release the present position of the Joint Chiefs on the question of the advanced manned bomber, then the American public will know who has distorted the facts.⁶⁴

Report of House Armed Services Committee discussed the authorization for a nuclear frigate—DLGN:

Although the Congress last year authorized a nuclear-powered, guided-missile frigate and appropriated \$20 million for this frigate as one escort ship for one of the nuclear-powered carriers, and although the Navy requested permission to proceed with this ship, the Department of Defense has never released the funds for this frigate. Nor would the Department of Defense permit the Navy to request any new nuclear-powered frigate this year.

Responsibility for this loss of time and experience must rest solely with the Secretary of Defense.⁶⁵

Representative HÉBERT, commenting on the difficulty of getting complete information:

Never in the course or history of my service have I found it so difficult to get full and complete answers as I have since you have been Secretary of Defense.⁶⁶

Newspaper comment on congressional reaction to Army Reserve reorganization:

Congressional leaders are furious with Mr. McNamara for defying their wishes on the Army Reserve reorganization. In the face of their specific rejection of his plan to merge the Army National Guard and Reserve, he went ahead with a plan that accomplished much of his purpose.⁶⁷

Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, of Virginia, commenting on the Secretary's refusal to spend appropriated money:

Mr. President, the computers used by our brilliant Secretary of Defense in arriving at military decisions do not give the National Guard, the Army Reserve, or the ROTC units a high rating. He, therefore, desired to curtail all of those activities in a major way. Congress, however, was not willing to put all of its defense eggs in the one professional military basket and, therefore, continued to appropriate sums for the full continued operation of all three activities. But the Secretary of Defense in his rapid climb to power learned some years ago, in refusing to carry out the congressional mandate to continue the production of long-range bombers, that he could strangle and gradually kill any particular program merely by refusing to spend what the Congress had appropriated for its operation. He has applied that technique to the ROTC units in preparatory schools or junior colleges.⁶⁸

Remarks of Representative THOMAS PELLY, of Washington:

Of course the Secretary of Defense has done more to confuse the American people as to the true situation in Vietnam than almost seems possible.⁶⁹

Remarks of Representative DURWARD HALL, of Missouri:

There is not better testimony to the Secretary's success in the Public Relations field, than the fact that the image still has credibility, in spite of the overwhelming evidence to the contrary. If any military commander—serving under Mr. McNamara—had been proved so wrong, so often, by so far, he would long since have been kicked upstairs, or put out to pasture.⁷⁰

Statement of Representative HÉBERT:

I am gratified that the Secretary of Defense, at his press conference on May 12th, conceded that the confusion in the public's mind over the Joint Chiefs of Staff's position on a future manned bomber was caused by misleading documents emanating from his office.

It is clear now that there was no "shockingly distorted" picture given to the public by my subcommittee's report. I take the Secretary's statement on May 12th as a willingness to admit he was wrong. I excuse his earlier excess of language.⁷¹

Additional views of minority members of House Defense Appropriations Committee, 1965:

In light of the President's decision to escalate the war in Vietnam in recent months, the Defense Appropriations Committee interrogated witnesses on the adequacy of the fiscal year 1966 budget request. The questions were primarily directed at the effect of the Vietnam situation on the budget request

⁶⁰ New York Times, Nov. 22, 1965, P. 12 (Column by Jack Raymond).

⁶¹ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 111, pt. 7, p. 10021.

⁶² CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Jan. 17, 1966, p. 466.

⁶³ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Jan. 27, 1966, p. 1392.

⁶⁴ Ibid., P. 12461.

⁶⁵ Statement issued by Senator STENNIS, March 30, 1966.

⁶⁶ Report of Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee, May 12, 1966, PP. 2, 3.

⁶⁷ House Report No. 271, 89th Congress, 1st Session, April 29, 1965, P. 60.

⁶⁸ House Report No. 1138, 88th Congress, 2nd Session, Feb. 16, 1964, P. 6.

⁶⁹ Quoted in House Report No. 1536, op. cit., P. 21.

⁷⁰ Ibid., P. 31.

⁷¹ Hearings, Military Posture and H.R. 4016, House Committee on Armed Services, 89th Congress, 1st Session, P. 279.

for such items as Procurement, Operations and Maintenance, Personnel, and other areas.

Subcommittee questions, in one form or another, sought to determine *whether or not the fiscal year 1966 budget request was adequate in view of the escalated activities in Vietnam*. In response after response from principal witnesses, the devastating point was made that the budget was inadequate, that it did not take into consideration the increased activities in Vietnam, and that no budgetary adjustments occurred after the escalation began. This means that while our international prestige and thousands of American servicemen were committed in this area of the world, the fiscal requirements to back them up were not forthcoming.⁷¹

ADVANCED DEVELOPMENTS

Of particular concern in our defense posture is the level of effort in advanced developments. Military effectiveness is largely determined by the state of scientific and technological advancements. New weapons systems must be aggressively pursued, based upon both the assessment of the threat and the pace of technology. Testimony during the course of the hearings reflect an approach falling far short of what we believe must be done in this vital area.⁷²

In the same report, the following comment was voiced:

Secretary McNamara's policy produces a minimum force structure and a less vigorously pursued research and development effort in the area of advanced weapons developments. Under this approach, there is a greater risk that we will face future challenges without adequate means to deter aggression or prevail in any conflict that might develop.⁷³

The following was contained in the House Armed Services Committee report for fiscal year 1967:

Whether in the enumerated field of base closures, deferral of construction, nuclear propulsion, or an aircraft such as AMSA, the committee asks whether there are not instances in which what are called military decisions are actually judgments colored by a certain intransigence, an intransigence which holds that a decision made cannot be changed; a stubbornness which refuses to concede the possibility of error. This naturally raises the question as to whether the strong hand at the helm is also a deft hand. Does it hold a course in the trough of the waves when a change of a few degrees would give greater assurance of the ship's safe passage? These are questions that the committee intends to ask again and again until it has received satisfactory answers.⁷⁴

The committee also said:

The committee is disturbed because the manner of the Department of Defense's presentations indicated startlingly that the program is not properly related to the future needs of the Defense Establishment and the support of defense systems for the long haul.⁷⁵

In debate on the defense authorization bill for fiscal year 1965, Senator JOHN TOWER, of Texas, had this to say:

The facts of the case are that the current administration has apparently decided to depend entirely upon missiles to protect America. It has embraced a "uni-weapon"

concept that totally departs from all the lessons of military history. It acts as if Americans should accept such a radical plunge with obedience and with silence. Everyone with the audacity to challenge the administration's dependence on missiles alone has been duly chastised in public.

But the administration cannot expect silence from concerned Americans. The administration wants to depend solely upon missiles, and we have a right to question the wisdom of that dependency. We have a right to question it before our manned air force is completely phased out.⁷⁶

Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, in discussing nuclear propulsion for naval vessels, commented:

The Department of Defense has vacillated and procrastinated, studied and restudied nuclear power for surface warships in what appears to me and to many of my fellow Members of Congress to be an attempt to kill nuclear power for the Navy by studying it to death.⁷⁷

Senator STUART SYMINGTON, commenting on the effectiveness of limited bombings in North Vietnam:

There is a consensus of opinion all over South Vietnam today, in all the military forces, not just the Air Force, or naval air or Marine air, everywhere, and also in the civilian setup, that if we don't eliminate this target limitation, it isn't right to send these men (air crews) out to risk their lives in an expensive airplane, to bomb just an empty barracks or a bus.⁷⁸

Representative LESLIE C. ARENDS, of Illinois:

Of course, no law will be satisfactory unless it is administered in accordance with the intent of Congress. I am not at all sure the present Secretary of Defense cares what Congress intends. He and his civilian aids presume to know all the answers, military as well as economic.⁷⁹

Hearings on U.S. Army combat readiness, May 1966. Senator STENNIS, in commenting on these hearings, said:

1. General Johnson confirmed that the Joint Chiefs of Staff on three occasions unambiguously recommended calling certain segments of the Army Reserve and Army National Guard forces to active duty as the escalation of U.S. forces in South Vietnam increased and the pinch on U.S. forces at home became more acute. The Joint Chiefs made such recommendations in the spring of 1965, in the fall of 1965, and early in 1966. As a result of the failure to call the reserves, the active Army in the United States suffered substantial turbulence in order to provide General Westmoreland with the necessary combat forces and the logistic, combat support, and service support units to back them up and support them in the field.

2. The testimony established that the active Army alone did not have 16 combat divisions which were capable of sustained combat, even though the Congress had been frequently so advised in the past without any qualifications being put upon it. The statements that there were 16 combat ready divisions, General Johnson said were based on

⁷⁶ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 110, pt. 3, p. 3834.

⁷⁷ Remarks by Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, at keel ceremony for USS Narwhal SS(N) 671, January 17, 1966.

⁷⁸ Hearings before Subcommittee on Department of Defense and Committee on Armed Services on Appropriations on S. 2791, 89th Congress, 2nd Session, P. 151.

⁷⁹ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 109, pt. 7, p. 9615.

certain assumptions, including the time of deployment, the availability of shipping, and, more importantly, a declaration of emergency and an extension of terms of service of personnel. . . .

3. Testimony by General Johnson revealed that the Army may be encountering shortage of funds despite the \$12.7 billion supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 1966 approved by the Congress earlier this year. The record shows that the Army has estimated an additional requirement from \$900 million to \$1 billion to carry on its operations for FY 1966. At the present time the Army and the Department of Defense are currently reviewing this matter.⁸⁰

The above are but examples of the deep concern expressed by individual Members or by the committees of Congress charged with the responsibility of authorizing, appropriating, and overseeing the continued maintenance of a defense posture equal to the obligations and requirements of this country now and for the future.

The Congress, through one forum or another has consistently warned the Nation that Mr. McNamara's programs could lead to trouble. The heart of the trouble lies in Mr. McNamara's basic foreign policy assumptions, his disregard of the professional military advice available to him and in his reliance upon his own judgment reinforced by the recommendations of his cost-effectiveness-oriented civilian advisers.

Some obvious results of Mr. McNamara's program are serious deficiencies in personnel and equipment: up until just recently nearly all Regular Army units were unprepared for combat and are, in effect, training units; few of the National Guard or Reserve units are ready for combat; serious shortages in supplies and equipment have developed; some equipment cannot be used because trained maintenance personnel are missing; sortie rates of combat aircraft are cut because aircraft lack suitable ordnance; deployment of troops and equipment has become unbalanced in Alaska, Europe, and elsewhere. Similar deficiencies in both the Navy and the Air Force might well be uncovered should the Congress turn its attention to these forces as well as to the Army situation.

The steps taken by Mr. McNamara have not been sufficient to maintain a strong and strategic Ready Reserve. U.S. military posture has suffered both at home and abroad. Recognition that the United States will respond piecemeal without punishing the sources of external aggression has encouraged dissidents to take the initiative for they know they do not suffer the risk of grave losses. The show of weakness rather than strength has undermined the confidence of the allies, and forced them to consider alternatives unpalatable to the United States and eventually contrary to their own best interests.

Mr. McNamara has had well over 5 years to learn that the economics of war differ in many significant respects from the economics of industry. Perhaps the lessons of Vietnam and of NATO will have their effect: the cost of his education is still too high.

⁸⁰ Senator JOHN STENNIS, News Release, June 20, 1966.

⁷¹ House Report No. 528, 89th Congress, 1st Session, June 17, 1965, P. 60.

⁷² *Ibid.*, P. 63.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, P. 68.

⁷⁴ House Report No. 1536, op. cit., P. 14.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, P. 60.

As we said in our "Additional Views":

We believe there is no question about the need for the immediate establishment of an impartial, objective Blue Ribbon Commission to review and evaluate the defense structure of this country both as to its effectiveness and capability today but far more importantly, as we face the future in an uncertain and troubled world.

In our Additional Views last year, we said: "On the basis of the information and the testimony generated during the hearings, we have serious doubts about the premise that changes in policy, capability or defense efforts have taken place in the Communist bloc (that) would warrant reductions or a general leveling of our defense effort.

"Available evidence strongly indicates that the Soviet Union and the Communist bloc as a whole are not reducing their efforts.

"We must cease, therefore, viewing conditions in the world as we would like them to be, and view them as they are.

"We must view the world realistically, recognizing that an aggressor does exist, who seeks to dominate the world, and is building up a capability to do so. This recognition demands an approach which dictates superiority—military, economic, technological and political.

"To do less, based upon the progress of events in the world, would be to invite disaster rather than assure peace.

"Our primary concern at this time involves the late 1960s and early 1970s. It is during that time period and beyond that the effects of today's decisions will be felt. It is up to our leaders today—in foreign and defense policy—to make realistic assessments of the needs of tomorrow. It is up to Congress to see that they do."

Mr. Speaker, there is obviously a clear need for the immediate establishment of a blue ribbon commission. Its importance at this critical juncture cannot be overstressed. I therefore commend it to the urgent attention of my colleagues.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Speaker, having been elected chairman of the Committee on Armed Services by the House, and having 2 weeks ago received the most resounding endorsement of this body on our conduct in running the Armed Services Committee, I think I can make the record straight on an article appearing in the Washington Post this morning. A lot of people just read headlines who did not have time to read the entire article. Here is the headline which says: "RIVERS Drops Fight for A-Power Frigate."

Nothing could be further from the truth. Nothing on earth could be further from the truth. RIVERS has not dropped anything. RIVERS never drops anything when he is ahead, and, believe you me, in this controversy he is ahead. It says further that:

RIVERS has raised a flag of truce to force the Johnson Administration to speed up construction of a nuclear-powered surface Navy.

RIVERS has not done any such thing. I submit the article:

RIVERS DROPS FIGHT FOR A-POWER FRIGATE
(By John G. Norris)

Rep. L. MENDEL RIVERS, (D-S.C.) has raised a flag of truce in his battle to force the Johnson Administration to speed up construction of a nuclear-powered surface Navy.

The South Carolinian, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, said yes-

terday he and other House conferees on the \$17 billion-plus defense authorization bill have agreed to drop an amendment he sponsored ordering the Pentagon to build two atomic-powered frigates.

Senate members of the joint conference committee objected on the grounds that issuing such a mandate to the Executive Branch of the Government may be unconstitutional and would invite a Presidential veto.

RIVERS said he hoped the joint conference committee could agree on substitute language which would forcefully express Congressional intent on building nuclear rather than conventionally propelled warships, without raising constitutional questions.

He said he was trying to arrange another meeting of the conferees on Wednesday to complete action on the measure. The dispute on language authorizing the A-frigates has delayed final passage of the authorizing bill and may postpone consideration of the defense appropriation bill, scheduled in the House today, until after the July 4th recess.

The conference committee has agreed on almost every other disputed proviso of the authorization bill. Senate conferees, RIVERS said, have accepted a House amendment voting extra funds for starting development of an advanced long-range manned bomber.

Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara has opposed such a bomber decision, as well as objecting to construction of nuclear-powered escort ships for an atomic-propelled aircraft carrier he asked for this year.

McNamara's cost-effectiveness studies convince him that an A-carrier is worth the extra costs, but not A-frigates or A-destroyers to escort it. Congressional leaders back the Navy's view that the increased combat performance of nuclear ships is well worth the additional cost.

The Administration recommended funds this year for two conventionally powered destroyers and has refused to spend funds voted last year by Congress to build a nuclear frigate. The Senate in May voted to reauthorize such an A-frigate, and the House, at RIVERS' instigation, voted for two with mandatory language saying that McNamara and the Navy "shall" lay down such craft.

Congressmen expect that an agreement, when reached, will call for the construction of the two frigates, unless President Johnson notifies Congress otherwise. The conferees already have agreed on compromise language of a House amendment requiring the Secretary of Defense to notify Congress 90 days before he orders the phaseout of a "major weapons system" like the B-58. Under the compromise, the Secretary must notify Congress but no time limit was provided.

The Senate accepted a House amendment providing for a 3.2 per cent pay increase for servicemen beginning July 1, and the House dropped amendments voting for additional aircraft for medical evacuation and TV broadcasts in Vietnam.

I recognize the facts of life. The copy desk was instructed to take this story that John Norris wrote. John Norris called me and asked me if we had come to an agreement.

I said, "Substantially."

He asked, "What is the agreement?"

I said, "I am not at liberty to tell you, but we are rewriting my proposal to my satisfaction."

That is what I told John Norris. I told him we had already agreed to increase the pay for the GI's, and we had agreed to one or two other things.

If Members will read the story, they will find it is loaded with inaccuracies.

They wrote another headline on the inside. They were not satisfied to mis-

represent on the first page. It says, "Bill's Wording Sinks RIVERS Frigate Hopes."

Nothing could be further from the truth. I understand that when a paper opposes a man because of the area he represents and opposes a committee because this man happens to be the head of it, the headline writers are instructed to make him and his committee look bad. This is what happened.

I will stay in that conference until hell freezes over, until I get the two nuclear frigates, believe you me.

I am raising no white flag. Where I come from people do not raise white flags. We were in a war at one time. We have never raised that white flag, and we are not going to raise a white flag on this, and I do not care what a newspaper writes.

I am not letting the House down. The conferees know what I am talking about. Ask PHIL PHILBIN, MEL PRICE, EDDIE HEBERT, BILL BATES, LES ARENDS, and AL O'KONSKI. We are going to come back with what we sought, the two nuclear frigates, or the conference will be in session until there is frost on the pumpkin.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1180) was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may sit while the House is in session today during general debate.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 14050) to extend and amend the Library Services and Construction Act, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 5, line 14, strike out all after "share" down to and including "plan" in line 18 and insert "which for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, shall be 100 per centum of the total sums expended under such plan (including costs of administering such plan), and for any fiscal year thereafter shall be 50 per centum of such sums".

Page 14, strike out lines 4 to 11, inclusive. Page 14, line 12, strike out "(f)" and insert "(e)".

Page 14, strike out lines 15 to 18 inclusive. Page 14, line 19, strike out "Sec. 12. (a)" and insert "Sec. 11".

Page 14, strike out all after line 21 over to and including line 2 on page 15.

Page 15, line 3, strike out "Sec. 13." and insert "Sec. 12."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFER OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order for today for 1 hour. I ask unanimous consent that the special order for today be vacated, and that it be made in order for tomorrow instead.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

MEDICARE WILL BE KEPT UNDER CONTINUOUS REVIEW BY THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on this Friday, July 1, 1966, the first phase of medicare becomes effective. This is a bold new venture into the field of human welfare. As one of the cosponsors of the law authorizing this program, I have long been convinced of its need. In my opinion it is long overdue.

Through medicare we have established a national policy which states clearly that our senior citizens are entitled to medical assistance under conditions which will not wipe out their life savings because of unavoidable illness and hospital expenses. That policy also lifts the heavy burden of medical bills for the elderly from the shoulders of their children and grandchildren.

These policy objectives will not be accomplished by waving the law like a magic wand. It will take the capable cooperation of the entire medical profession, hospital administrators and personnel.

There have been early rumblings and claims that serious problems, such as shortages of hospital beds and nursing personnel, may develop very quickly. No doubt there will be problems after the program gets underway.

For these reasons, I have recommended to the able chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, our colleague from Arkansas, that steps be taken to keep developments in the medicare program under constant scrutiny. Our colleague has informed me that the members and the staff of his committee will undertake this work. Through this means Members of Congress will be kept abreast of the facts and advised on the need for remedial action to meet any serious problems that may develop.

I am confident this development will serve well the public interest and I thank

the chairman for his initiative and cooperation.

CREDITING INACTIVE RESERVE SERVICE FOR ENLISTED PERSONNEL

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 895 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 895

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5256) to amend title 10, United States Code, to change the method of computing retired pay of certain enlisted members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except on motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. Sisk] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Latta] and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 895 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 5256, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to change the method of computing retired pay of certain enlisted members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps.

The purpose of H.R. 5256 is to authorize career enlisted personnel to credit non-Active Reserve service for retired pay and retainer pay purposes to the extent such service would be creditable under section 1333 of title 10. This section provides credit on a point basis in computing service for retired pay for non-active-duty Reserve service.

The bill would allow enlisted men to credit their Inactive Reserve service, regardless when accrued, in the same manner that officers can count such service accrued since June 1, 1958.

The personnel who will benefit from enactment of the legislation must first qualify for retirement. The service creditable under the bill may not be used to qualify for retirement, but only in determining service creditable for the retired pay multiplier. Enlisted personnel who retire for length of service, must for practical purposes have a minimum of 20 years' active duty in order to qualify for retirement.

The estimated cost for the first fiscal year following enactment is \$1,687,025.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that House Resolution 895 be adopted.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. SISK. I am glad to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I renew my unanimous-consent request that the Committee on the Judiciary may sit while the House is in general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CREDITING INACTIVE RESERVE SERVICE FOR ENLISTED PERSONNEL

Mr. Latta. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to authorize career enlisted personnel to credit non-Active Reserve service for retired pay and retainer pay purposes. Currently only commissioned officers are entitled to do so, while enlisted men are limited to "active service in the Armed Forces" in determining their retirement pay multiplier.

The bill will permit enlisted men to count in their service time all time credited to them under the provisions of this bill from June 1, 1958, on, the same date which this right was granted to commissioned officers.

The bill does not permit time in the non-Active Reserves to be used to qualify for retirement benefits, but if an enlisted man qualifies, such time can be used to determine how much his retirement pay shall be. Twenty years of active duty is still the minimum requirement for one to receive any retirement pay.

The estimated cost for the first fiscal year is: Air Force, \$350,000; Army, \$860,000; Navy, \$455,425; and Marines, \$21,600.

The committee supports the bill unanimously. The DOD and the Bureau of the Budget support the bill.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I was disturbed a couple of days ago when I read the headlines and the articles that appeared in all of the daily papers which proclaimed that the American Communist Party has revived itself and has held a meeting in the city of New York. They reorganized the party boldly in the face of the laws that we have in this country and have elected two well-known active and working old

Communists who head the new American Communist Party. I assumed that the Department of Justice or somebody would say something about that, but I have not heard a whisper.

Now let us stop, look, and listen for a minute. The Communist Party is dedicated to the destruction of this country by force and violence and always has been and always will be, and you know it. Why are we fighting Communists in Asia and permitting that same conspiracy dedicated to the destruction of democracy boldly and openly to reorganize their party and start this conspiracy all over again?

I just wonder, have we gone completely asleep? Do we not know that the great menace to this country now is due to the fact that Russian spies in America stole the secret of the atomic bomb which we alone possessed? One of them was found guilty and executed.

Mr. Speaker, I know that we are busy here and that we have a lot of things on our minds. However, I cut this article out of the paper and I want to refer to it. I shall place it in the RECORD in its entirety.

Mr. Speaker, in 1940, you know, we passed, over the strenuous opposition of 80-odd Members of this House, the so-called Smith Act of which I was the author, under which Communists were prosecuted in a long trial in New York at which 11 of them were convicted. They appealed the case to the Supreme Court of the United States on the question of its constitutionality.

Mr. Speaker, that great Chief Justice at that time, Justice Fred Vinson, after much deliberation, affirmed the constitutionality of that act and those people served their prison sentences.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this Communist convention in New York elected two well-known Communists, Gus Hall and Henry Winston as chairman and secretary, both of whom have been convicted and have served time under our laws, for their Communist activities.

Mr. Speaker, this chairman of the American Communist Party which was reorganized in New York last week was prosecuted under the Smith Act and served 11 years in the penitentiary for his conspiracy to overthrow the U.S. Government by force and violence. His sentence was commuted on account of his health and all of a sudden as soon as it was commuted, he took off for Russia. His name is Henry Winston.

Mr. Speaker, this Gus Hall—everyone who has followed the Communist conspiracy in this country knows about Gus Hall. He was elected an officer in this conspiracy that went on in New York in broad daylight.

Mr. Speaker, Gus Hall was imprisoned under the Internal Security Act, which was passed by this Congress and, yet, they have revived the Communist Party and they are operating openly in this country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, are we going to sit silent and let them build up this conspiracy, or will our agencies that are supposed to do something about it wake up and do something about it?

Mr. Speaker, if not, is Congress going to do something about it? What will become of the Smith Act under which these people were prosecuted in times when we were not so lenient about these things?

Mr. Speaker, what has become of the Internal Security Act passed later under which this Gus Hall ran out of the country to avoid prosecution?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired. The gentleman is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. It is about time that we wake up before this conspiracy gets going in full bloom again as it did at one time in this country, as you all know, when it became necessary to pass laws to deal with this problem.

What has become of the Smith Act? Has the Supreme Court repealed the Smith Act completely? What has become of the Internal Security Act? Has the Supreme Court repealed that act too?

What has become of the Department of Justice which is charged with the duty to prosecute these violations and this treason?

Mr. Speaker, the following is the newspaper article to which I referred:

OLD-LINE COMMUNISTS ELECTED BY U.S. PARTY
(By Myron Feinsilber)

NEW YORK, June 26 (UPI).—Gus Hall and Henry Winston, two old-line Communists who once served prison terms, were elected the top leaders of the American Communist Party Sunday and called upon the American people to "defend our right to function."

Titles were restored to the leaders of the Party for the first time since it went into a shadow existence in 1961 in order to avoid prosecution under the Internal Security Act. The move today could open the way for federal prosecution of Hall and Winston as agents of the Soviet Union.

But Hall announced at a news conference afterward: "I do not anticipate arrest."

Hall, 55, was named general secretary of the Communist Party, USA. Winston, 42, a blind Negro, was elected national chairman.

Hall's title was his old one, but he had dropped it and became known merely as "Party spokesman" to avoid prosecution.

Winston, who delivered a speech with tears in his eyes at the convention's start Wednesday, was convicted under the Smith Act in 1949 and received a presidential commutation in 1961 after refusing to undergo surgery for a brain tumor while in prison.

After his release, an operation left him nearly blind and he toured the Soviet Union depicting his blindness as the result of police brutality.

He is fond of repeating the line he used when he left prison: "I have lost my sight but not my vision."

Hall, a native of Cherry, Minn., is the son of a Communist. He joined the Party in 1927, he attended the Lenin School in Moscow in 1931 and once declared he would take up arms against the U.S. government "when the time comes."

Hall fled to Mexico to escape imprisonment for conspiracy but was captured there in 1951 and imprisoned at Leavenworth until 1957.

Hall said today: "We are going to push for Communist candidates." But he called again for an independent leftist—but not necessarily Communist—candidate to oppose President Johnson and the Republican candidate in the 1968 presidential election.

He would not name the 80 newly chosen members of the Party's National Committee. He said it would meet in a few months to elect an Executive Committee, which would then elect a Secretariat.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from Virginia for the statement he has just made and say to him that apparently the Department of Justice is too busy rummaging through its files to find evidence that the telephone lines of Bobby Baker or Fred Black were bugged—digging up this information to defeat the Government's case later on with respect to the prosecution of this scandalous Baker character. Apparently, as the gentleman suggests, they are too busy with this and similar activities to do the job that they ought to be doing in connection with the Communists.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I, too, want to express my appreciation to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia for bringing this matter to the attention of the House today, especially in view of the editorial contained in this morning's Washington Post wherein this editorial writer had much to say about the fact that the Communist Party U.S.A. posed no threat to this country and that they were only annoying the people of the United States of America as they reorganized. Any group which is dedicated to the overthrow of our Government poses a threat, in my opinion.

I disagree, as usual, with the Washington Post and as usual agree with the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with our other colleagues in commending the distinguished chairman of our committee for his statement regarding the threats and dangers of communism.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING REIMBURSEMENT FOR COSTS INCURRED UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES FOR THE COST OF PARKING FEES, FERRY FARES, AND BRIDGE, ROAD, AND TUNNEL TOLLS

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 896 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 896

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that that House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12615) 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. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA], pending which I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 896 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 12615, a bill 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.

The purpose of H.R. 12615 is to bring up to date, basic statutes covering reimbursement for expenses incurred by a member of the uniformed services for travel performed while conducting official business and for other authorized travel. The bill will equalize entitlement in this area between civilian and military personnel by authorizing members of the uniformed services to be reimbursed under certain circumstances for the actual cost of parking fees, and so forth.

The estimated cost of the legislation is \$5,291,000 annually.

The legislation is recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Defense.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 896 in order that H.R. 12615 may be considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA].

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the statement just made by my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, relative to House Resolution 896.

House Resolution 896 makes in order the consideration of H.R. 12615 under an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

The purpose of the bill is to bring up to date, the basic law covering reimbursement of travel expenses by a member of the uniformed services who is traveling on official business.

Under current law, civilian Government employees are reimbursed for general travel expenses incurred on official

business trips. Military personnel are similarly reimbursed. However, military personnel are not reimbursed for such items as tolls on roads, bridges and tunnels, fees on ferries, and for parking.

Enactment of this bill will provide that such travel expenses will be reimbursable for servicemen as well as civilian Government employees.

The estimated cost of the legislation is \$5,291,000 annually. The DOD and the Bureau of the Budget both support the bill, which was reported unanimously by the Committee on Armed Services. I know of no objection to the rule, and urge its adoption.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARINE CORPS GENERAL OFFICERS

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 897 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 897

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14741) to authorize an increase in the number of Marine Corps officers who may serve in the combined grades of brigadier general and major general. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the able gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA], and myself such time as I shall consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 897 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 14741, a bill to authorize an increase in the number of Marine Corps officers who may serve in the combined grades of brigadier general and major general.

The purpose of H.R. 14741 is to increase general officer grade limitations presently applicable to the Marine Corps in order to meet increasing requirements for general officers in that service. These increases have stemmed in part, from the increasing complexities involved in the duties and responsibilities of officers in the field, on joint staffs, and in Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps. This situation has become more acute with the commitment of Marine Corps combat forces in Vietnam.

The bill involves a reduction in the proposed table of authorization for general officers as recommended by the Department of Defense and would substitute a new table of authorization for general officers for that contained in present law. This new table would authorize a total of 79 general officers for the Marine Corps during fiscal year 1967 based upon anticipated officer strength.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the magnificent record of this dedicated and courageous branch of our armed services, the Marine Corps, I certainly think all of us will agree that we should consider the bill H.R. 14741. I hope the rule will therefore be adopted.

I yield to the able gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the statement just made by the able gentleman from Florida.

House Resolution 897 makes in order the consideration of H.R. 14741, which authorizes the increase in the number of general grade officers for the Marine Corps from the current 60 to 79. It provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

In the DOD, the overall ratio of general grade officers to men is 4.8 to 10,000; in the marines it is 3 to 10,000. The situation could become serious, particularly in view of the expanding war effort in Vietnam.

The original request was for 94 general grade officers. The Committee on Armed Services found that all were justified either for necessary future expansion or to meet enlarged current needs. The committee cut the total from 94 to 79, but made clear before rules that the original request was a true projection of current and future needs. The bill as reported completely provides for current requirements but leaves the question of future needs open.

The projected cost of the legislation on an annual basis is \$199 million.

The Committee on Armed Services recommends the bill unanimously. I know of no objection to the rule, and urge its adoption.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVING INEQUITIES IN THE ACTIVE DUTY PROMOTION OPPORTUNITIES OF CERTAIN AIR FORCE OFFICERS

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 898 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 898

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 15005) to amend title 10, United States Code, to re-

move inequities in the active duty promotion opportunities of certain officers. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the able gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTI], and pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 898 provides an open rule with 1 hour general debate for consideration of H.R. 15005, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to remove inequities in the active duty promotion opportunities of certain officers.

H.R. 15005 would provide for a permanent change in the grade tables which specify the number of Air Force officers on active duty in the grade of lieutenant colonel and colonel, and would also provide temporary authority for additional numbers of officers in the grades of major and lieutenant colonel for a 6-year period.

The effect of the bill will be to allow the Air Force to carry out a long-term promotion program enabling their officers to be promoted at approximately the same time in service as members of the other branches of the Armed Forces.

Enactment of this legislation is estimated to result in an increased cost of \$17,600,000 in fiscal year 1967, which cost is not included in the fiscal year 1967 budget; however, the Bureau of the Budget has no objection to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we should accede to this request of this splendid branch of our Armed Forces. I urge the adoption of the rule, House Resolution 898, so that H.R. 15005 may be appropriately considered and I hope enacted by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the able gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTI].

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 898 makes in order the consideration of H.R. 15005, providing for the promotion of certain active duty Air Force officers. The rule is an open one, providing 1 hour of general debate.

H.R. 15005 makes a permanent change in the number of Air Force officers on active duty in the grades of lieutenant colonel and colonel. It also provides, for a period of 6 years, a temporary additional increase in the grades of major and lieutenant colonel.

The bill will enable the Air Force to conduct a long-term officer promotion program, permitting it to promote its officers at approximately the same service time as do the other armed services. In some grades the Air Force is promoting its men as much as 4 years behind other branches of the military. The currently authorized strengths of some Air Force grades are not large enough to promote all qualified personnel. The aim

of the bill is to ease over a temporary bottleneck during the next 6 years, and to provide a long-term solution both as to the number of officers in various grades, and their promotion at approximately the same rate as is now the practice in other branches of the military.

The cost of the legislation is estimated at \$17,600,000 for fiscal 1967. This is not in the budget, but the Bureau of the Budget has not objected. The DOD supports the bill, which was reported unanimously by the Committee on Armed Services. I know of no objection to the rule and urge its adoption.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

I move the previous question. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The previous question is ordered.

The resolution was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING PROVISIONS OF TITLE III OF THE FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ACT OF 1950, AS AMENDED

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Armed Services, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 13125) to amend the provisions of title III of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection. The Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 13125
Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 307 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2297), is further amended by striking out the date "June 30, 1966" and inserting in lieu thereof the date "June 30, 1970".

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 13125 is to provide for the continuation of the President's current standby authority to deal with the effects on an enemy attack upon the Nation.

Under section 307 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, these emergency powers would terminate on June 30, 1966. Each 4 years since 1950 the Congress has extended the President's power for another 4-year period.

Briefly stated, the powers which the President has under this law is to direct that any Federal Department provide personnel, materials, and facilities to the Director of Civil Defense, for the aid of the States, to build emergency shelters, arrange for clearing debris and wreckage, repair utilities, hospitals, transportation facilities, and all other activities of this general nature which would be necessary in the event of an imminent or actual attack on this country.

I will point out that the committee report includes all of title III of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended. All of the powers of the President during a civil defense emergency situation are set out in detail in the law itself.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CREDITING INACTIVE RESERVE SERVICE FOR ENLISTED PERSONNEL

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Armed Services I call up the bill (H.R. 5256) to amend title 10, United States Code, to change the method of computing retired pay of certain enlisted members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, and ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection. The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5256
Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3925(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) For the purpose of determining whether a regular enlisted member of the Army may be retired under section 3914 or 3917 of this title, his years of service are computed by adding all active service in the armed forces and service computed under section 3683 of this title. For the purpose of computing his retired pay under section 3991 of this title, his years of service are computed by adding—

"(1) his years of active service in the armed forces;

"(2) his years of service computed under section 3683 of this title; and

"(3) the years of service, not included in clause (1) or (2), with which he would be entitled to be credited under section 1333 of this title, if he were entitled to retired pay under section 1331 of this title."

Sec. 2. Section 6330 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out the words "the number of years of active service in the armed forces" in the first sentence of subsection (c) and inserting the following in place thereof:

"the total of—

"(1) his years of active service in the armed forces; and

"(2) the years of service, not included in clause (1), with which he would be entitled to be credited under section 1333 of this title, if he were entitled to retired pay under section 1331 of this title";

(2) by striking out the words "purposes of subsections (b) and (c)" in subsection (d) and inserting the words "purpose of subsection (b)" in place thereof; and

(3) by inserting the following new sentence after the first sentence of subsection (d):

"For the purpose of computing total years of service under subsection (c), after years creditable under clauses (1) and (2) have been added together, a part of a year that is six months or more is counted as a whole year and a part of a year that is less than six months is disregarded."

Sec. 3. Section 8925(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) For the purpose of determining whether a regular enlisted member of the Air Force may be retired under section 8914 or 8917 of this title, his years of service are computed by adding all active service in the

armed forces and service computed under section 8683 of this title. For the purpose of computing his retired pay under section 8991 of this title, his years of service are computed by adding—

"(1) his years of active service in the armed forces;

"(2) his years of service computed under section 8683 of this title; and

"(3) the years of service, not included in clause (1) or (2), with which he would be entitled to be credited under section 1333 of this title, if he were entitled to retired pay under section 1331 of this title."

Sec. 4. No person is entitled to an increase in retired pay, retainer pay, or retirement pay, because of this Act for any period before its enactment.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 4 delete lines 3 through 5, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 4. This Act is applicable to enlisted members heretofore or hereafter retired or granted retainer pay. However, no person retired or granted retainer pay before the effective date of this Act is entitled to a retroactive increase in retired pay or retainer pay because of this Act."

Add a new section 5 as follows:

"Sec. 5. To accrue rights under this Act, a person who is entitled to retired or retainer pay on the effective date of this Act must file an application with the Secretary of the military department concerned."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5256 would allow career enlisted men who have completed 20 years' active duty to receive credit in computing their retired pay for any time they might have spent in nonactive Reserve duty status. That is all it does. It affects only career enlisted men.

The bill was passed by the House in the 88th Congress, but received no action in the Senate. The bill was unanimously approved by our committee. I know of no opposition to it.

Enlisted men now receive no credit in their retirement multiplier for inactive Reserve service. Officers do receive credit for such service and this has created a morale problem with enlisted personnel.

Officers who have completed 20 years receive full credit in their retirement multiplier for pre-1958 Reserve service. That is, they receive 2½ percent per year for each year Active or Reserve. In 1958, Congress changed this to say such officers could only receive credit according to the point system normally used for those citizen-soldiers who achieve Reserve retirement at age 60.

H.R. 5256 gives to enlisted men credit according to this point system for any nonactive Reserve duty time.

We did not try to give enlisted men the full credit for prior 1958 service that officers get because the administration refuses to support such a bill. We proceeded in the belief that one-sixth of a loaf is better than none.

There are two minor amendments suggested by the Defense Department. One rewords section 4 to make sure there are no retroactive payments, while at the same time assuring retired men that they will get credit for past Reserve service following enactment of the bill. The other amendment requires those al-

ready retired to make application to have their Reserve time credited to save Defense the administrative costs of screening all retiree records.

H.R. 5256 would normally work to give a man about one-sixth of the credit for his Reserve time as he gets for his active duty time, depending on the points that he had earned during his Reserve service.

H.R. 5256 would extend this point system to nonactive Reserve service of enlisted men by letting them credit such service under section 1333 of title 10.

It should be kept in mind that the personnel who will benefit from this legislation must first qualify for retirement. The service creditable under H.R. 5256 may not be used to qualify for retirement, but only in determining service creditable for the retired pay multiplier.

Now, what happens when he has qualified for retirement? To illustrate, let us take a man who has 20 years active duty and who had 5 years nonactive Reserve service. He gets 2½ percent retired pay for each year of active service. So that is 50 percent. In figuring his Reserve service, he gets 15 points for being a member of the Reserve; he receives 1 point for each drill attended up to a combined total of 60 points. In addition, he gets one point or 1 day of credit for each day of active service during those inactive Reserve years. Now, let us say he has 15 days active duty a year. That would give him a total of 75 points. Now, he adds his total number of points—if he had 75 points a year for 5 years, his total is 375. He then divides by 360. This gives him 1 year and 15 days.

While he uses section 1333 in determining service creditable for retirement, his actual retired pay is still computed under the active duty retirement laws. So he does not get fraction of credit for Reserve service. He uses the active duty computation provision which says that any service of less than 6 months is disregarded and any service of more than 6 months is counted as a full year.

In the case of our example here, the extra 15 days would be discarded and the man would get 1 year additional credit in his retired pay multiplier.

So instead of multiplying 20 times 2½ he would multiply 21 times 2½ and his retired pay would be 52½ percent of the basic pay of a man of his grade with 25 years of service for pay purposes at the time of retirement.

Notice I said 21 years for pay purposes and not 20. The enlisted man already gets credit for his Reserve service for pay purposes.

It is estimated that the bill will cost \$1,687,025 per year.

There would be no retroactive payments as result of the legislation. But those now retired who have a sufficient number of points to earn additional credit in their multiplier would have their retired pay adjusted upward in the future.

I would like to point out that in computing points under section 1333, a man is assumed to have 50 points for each year of nonactive Reserve service prior

to July 1, 1949. This credit was gratuitously given by the Congress to everybody who was in the Reserve prior to July 1, 1949, although the great majority of those in the Reserve at that time would not have participated sufficiently to earn 50 points.

The Department of Defense has taken the position that the present bill is as much as can be given to enlisted men because the Congress eliminated the idea of full credit for Reserve service in 1958. Officers with Reserve time since 1958 have received credit according to the point system I have just described. Officers with Reserve time prior to 1958 continue to receive full credit for such time because the Congress in 1958 did not want to retroactively take away something they had been led to expect. The committee has received numerous communications from enlisted personnel pointing out that the present legislation does not give them full equality with officers and that if officers receive full credit for Reserve service prior to 1958, then enlisted men should as well. I can only point out that they are sending their letters to the wrong place. This committee has passed this legislation in prior Congresses. It has received no action in the Senate. The present bill is absolutely as much as the administration will support. In the face of this opposition, the committee, as I mentioned, has taken the approach that one-sixth of the loaf is better than none.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 5256, is an attempt to give enlisted men some credit for their inactive Reserve service in computing their retirement. We have an unfortunate and unfair situation in the Armed Forces where officers get credit for their Reserve time and enlisted men do not. It is grossly unfair to the enlisted man.

The law says an enlisted man can only include "active service in the Armed Forces" in his retired pay multiplier. Officers, however, are allowed credit for their inactive Reserve service.

For service before May 31, 1958, officers are allowed full credit—because back in 1946 a line was put in the law which said officers could count "all service for pay purposes." That meant that up until 1958, an officer who completed 20 years active service and qualified for active duty retirement could then get an additional 2½ percent retired pay for every year of inactive Reserve service. This was true even if he was not participating in drills, even if he was merely on the rolls as a Reserve officer.

In 1958, the Congress said that was too much credit for such service and that henceforth Reserve time for active duty retirees could only be credited in the same way it is credited for nonactive duty Reserve retirees—that is, according to the point system of section 1333 of title 10. This is the point system for computing retirement for those reservists who are essentially civilians, but who contribute enough Reserve service to earn some retirement pay at age 60.

Congress, however, could not be in a position of eliminating retroactively a benefit officers had been led to expect by law. So officers continue to receive full

retirement credit at 2½ percent per year for inactive Reserve service prior to May 31, 1958. For inactive Reserve service since May 31, 1958, such officers get credit according to the point system of section 1333 of title 10.

It should be pointed out that officers so retired begin to get the retired pay their points have earned them as soon as they retire, regardless of age. They do not have to wait until age 60 as the nonactive duty reservist does. The same would be true of enlisted men if H.R. 5256 passes—he would get the credit as soon as he retires regardless of age.

It should also be pointed out that both officers and enlisted men can now credit their Reserve service for pay purposes. The disparity comes in crediting service for retirement.

To illustrate the situation graphically, I would like to place at this point in the Record examples of the different way inactive Reserve service is credited by personnel who have earned retirement after 20 years of active duty.

Let us take individuals who have 20 years of active duty and 5 years in the Reserve.

First, an officer with 5 years Reserve service prior to June 1, 1958: He credits his Reserve time the same as active time in his multiplier; thus, he multiplies 25 times 2½, or 62½. So his retired pay is 62½ percent of the base pay of an officer of his grade with 25 years of service for pay purposes.

Second, an officer with 5 years Reserve service subsequent to June 1, 1958: Assume that he has earned 60 points a year as a reservist 15 free points and 45 points for attending drills. He adds all of his points and gets 300—5 times 60. He then divides by 360. This gives him less than 1 year's credit, but more than 6 months. Since everything less than 6 months is disregarded and everything more than 6 months counts as a full year, he adds 1 year to his retirement multiplier. Thus, he multiplies 21 times 2½, or 52½. So his retired pay is 52½ percent of the base pay of an officer of his grade with 25 years of service for pay purposes.

Third, an enlisted man at present: He receives no credit for Reserve service in his multiplier. So he multiplies 20 times 2½, or 50. Therefore, his retired pay is 50 percent of the base pay of an enlisted man of his grade with 25 years of service for pay purposes.

Fourth, an enlisted man under the bill with 5 years Reserve service at any time: Computed in the same way as the officer in the second above, his retired pay would be 52½ percent of the base pay of an enlisted man of his grade with 25 years of service for pay purposes.

In most cases under the bill, the extra retired credit earned would be the equivalent of 1 or possibly 2 years additional retired pay. It would be rare for a man to be able to earn more than that.

For the average enlisted man affected, the bill would mean about a \$10 a month increase in his retired pay. For example, an enlisted man with 20 years active duty and 5 years Reserve service, that is, 25 years of service for pay purposes, who retired as an E7—master sergeant or

chief petty officer—after 20 years active duty now receives \$227.50 a month in retirement pay. If he got 1 year's additional credit under this bill, it would be a \$11.37 a month increase in his retirement pay—up to \$238.98 a month. If he got 2 years additional credit under this bill, it would be a \$22.75 a month increase in retirement pay. E7 is the grade in which most enlisted men retire. For those who make E8 or E9, the increase would be slightly higher and for those who retire as E5 or E6, the increase would be slightly less.

For the average retired enlisted man, an additional \$10 a month in retired pay is a big difference and it is only fair and equitable to give him credit for service where officers receive credit.

The bill is the same as legislation passed by the House in the 88th Congress except for two minor amendments added at the suggestion of the Department of Defense. The first is merely a clarifying amendment to make sure there will be no retroactive payments as result of the legislation, but that those already retired will get credit for their past Reserve service in their future retirement checks.

The other amendment requires those already retired who have service creditable under the bill to make application in order to have their service credited to their pay account. The purpose of this is merely to preclude the necessity for costly processing of all retirees' records by the military departments.

Finally, I want to emphasize once again that the committee reported this bill because it felt it was the most we could get for the enlisted man. I originally introduced legislation some years ago to provide exactly the same credit for enlisted men as officers receive. But we found the Defense Department was adamantly opposed to such a proposal and we found that in the last Congress the Senate would not even act on a proposal as modest as the present legislation. Therefore, we have approved a compromise bill with the hope that this much equity for the enlisted man at least will gain approval in the Senate and have the support of the administration. If I thought there was a chance of getting full credit for enlisted men for their prior 1958 service as officers get, I would fight for such a bill. But I would rather get something for our enlisted men by using the present approach than to make a grand gesture and see them get nothing.

I hope all Members of the House will support the legislation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARINE CORPS GENERAL OFFICERS

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Armed Services I call up the bill (H.R. 14741) to authorize an increase in the number of Marine Corps officers who may serve in the combined grades of brigadier general and major general, and ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 14741

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5443(a), title 10, United States Code, is amended by deleting in the table contained therein all tabulated numbers under the heading "Brigadier general and major general" and substituting in place thereof the following numbers:

"69
73
77
81
85
90
92
94
96
98
100".

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the Act of August 3, 1961, Public Law 87-123 (75 Stat. 263), is repealed so far as it applies to the readjustment of authorized numbers of brigadier generals and major generals in the Marine Corps.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and substitute the following:

"That section 5443(a), title 10, United States Code, is amended by deleting in the table contained therein all tabulated numbers under the heading 'Brigadier general and major general' and substituting in place thereof the following numbers:

"58
62
69
72
75
79
82
84
85
87
89."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the Act of August 3, 1961, Public Law 87-123 (75 Stat. 263), is repealed so far as it applies to the readjustment of authorized numbers of brigadier generals and major generals in the Marine Corps.

SEC. 3. Section 5902(c) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) An officer of the Marine Corps Reserve whose name is on a promotion list established under this chapter is eligible for promotion to the grade for which selected when the officer who is to be his running mate in the higher grade becomes eligible for promotion under chapter 545 of this title. When promoted, he shall be given the same date of rank as that given to his running mate in the grade to which promoted."

SEC. 4. Section 5902(d) is repealed.

SEC. 5. Section 5902(e) is redesignated 5902(d)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 14741 would, if enacted into law, authorize an increase in general officers in the Marine Corps by the end of fiscal year 1967 to 79.

JUSTIFICATION

The Marine Corps has been faced with a steady increase in its requirements for

general officers but has found it impossible to satisfy these requirements primarily due to statutory limitations in existing law.

Under existing law, section 5443(a) of title 10, United States Code, the Marine Corps has a total present authorization for 62 general officers. By virtue of the planned increase in Marine Corps strength, this statutory authorization for general officers will increase to 64 by June 30, 1967. This latter increase is predicated upon a planned increase in Marine Corps strength by June 30, 1967, to 287,000 personnel, including 24,067 officers. However, due to an administrative ceiling established by the other body, the Marine Corps presently is limited to 60 general officers.

Notwithstanding the slight increase in statutory authorization in general officer strength, which would occur as a result of an overall strength increase, the Commandant of the Marine Corps has advised the Committee on Armed Services that there will exist, by June 30, 1967, a genuine requirement for 94 general officers in the Marine Corps. The Marine Corps with the blessing of the Department of Defense and the administration had, therefore, requested the enactment of H.R. 14741 as originally recommended by the Marine Corps. This legislation would have provided an increase in Marine Corps general officers to the estimated 94 required by the end of fiscal year 1967.

BACKGROUND

The Committee on Armed Services, after a thorough hearing on this proposal and after its subsequent analysis in executive session, concurred in the necessity for an increase in the authorized number of general officers in the Marine Corps. However, the committee believed that the request, as submitted by the Department, could with justification be adjusted downward.

The committee reviewed each of the general officer billets included in the 94 identified by the Commandant. This analysis revealed that of the additional 34 generals required by the Marine Corps only 19 represented an immediate requirement. The remaining 15 billets represented possible future anticipated requirements.

The Commandant of the Marine Corps acknowledged that an increase in general officer strength to 79 by the end of fiscal year 1967 would fully meet the immediate requirements of the Marine Corps.

As a consequence of the foregoing information and study, the committee was reluctant to approve the higher authorization figure recommended by the Department and therefore recommended a new amended authorization which would completely satisfy immediate Marine Corps requirements. The committee points out that in the event future circumstances justify a further increase in Marine Corps general officer strength above that included in the amended committee table, the Congress will be in business in years to come, and the committee

will then be able to take such corrective action as is indicated.

The Commandant of the Marine Corps has advised the Committee on Armed Services that the amended table as recommended by the committee is completely satisfactory to meet Marine Corps requirements through fiscal year 1967. Consequently, the committee recommended enactment of the legislation with an amended table which would authorize 79 Marine Corps general officers rather than 94 at the end of June 1967.

The cost of the legislation is very slight since it involves only the increased pay differential for 15 officers. This pay differential is estimated to amount to a total of \$45,000 for the first full year for all the officers affected.

The increased authorization as requested by the Marine Corps and as amended and approved by the committee is completely and thoroughly justified. The House, I am sure, agrees with the committee's recommendation and will pass this legislation without a dissenting vote.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 14741, as amended, and strongly recommend favorable action by the House.

This bill as amended by the Committee on Armed Services would authorize a relatively modest increase in general officers strength in the Marine Corps. The hearings on this legislative proposal and the report clearly justify the proposed increase.

Prior to the Vietnam buildup—June 30, 1965—the Marine Corps ratios of generals to total officers and to total strength—based on 60 generals—were 1 to 261 and 1 to 3,170, respectively, while the overall DOD ratios were 1 to 257 and 1 to 2,124.

In fiscal year 1967 the ratios of generals to total officers and total strength—based on an authorization of 64 generals—will be 1 to 348 and 1 to 4,347, respectively, while the projected overall DOD ratios will be 1 to 272 and 1 to 2,326.

If the revised H.R. 14741 is enacted, the ratios of generals to total officers and total officers and total strength in fiscal year 1967—based on 79 generals authorized—will be 1 to 281 and 1 to 3,521, respectively, compared with the projected overall DOD ratios of 1 to 272 and 1 to 2,326.

Stated another way, despite this proposed increase in general officer strength, the Marine Corps will continue to have an overall ratio of general officer strength lower than that projected for the Department of Defense.

The Marine Corps is in every sense of the word a combat organization. If it needs these additional general officer billets, and the Committee on Armed Services believes it does, I am sure the Congress will, without the slightest hesitation, give its unanimous stamp of approval.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVING INEQUITIES IN THE ACTIVE DUTY PROMOTION OPPORTUNITIES OF CERTAIN AIR FORCE OFFICERS

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Armed Services, I call up the bill (H.R. 15005) to amend title 10, United States Code, to remove inequities in the active duty promotion opportunities of certain officers, and ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8202 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by amending the columns headed "For colonels" and "For lieutenant colonels" of the table in subsection (a) to read as follows:

"For colonels	For lieutenant colonels
3,500	6,500
3,859	7,706
4,218	8,911
4,577	10,116
4,936	11,321
5,295	12,527
5,654	13,732
6,013	14,937
6,372	16,142
6,730	17,348
7,089	18,553
7,449	19,758
7,807	20,963
8,166	22,169

SEC. 2. For a period of six years after the effective date of this Act, the authorized strengths prescribed by section 8202 of title 10, United States Code, may be exceeded (1) by 1,000 for the grade of lieutenant colonel; and (2) by the following numbers for the grade of major:

Fiscal years following enactment:	Number to exceed authorized strength
First.....	9,500
Second.....	7,917
Third.....	6,334
Fourth.....	4,751
Fifth.....	3,168
Sixth.....	1,585

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 15005 is a bill whose fundamental objective is the elimination of existing inequities in the active duty promotion opportunities of officers in the Air Force.

Every Member of the Congress has undoubtedly received many letters from his constituents in the Air Force who, by virtue of existing restrictions on promotion opportunity, have been unable to achieve the same relative promotion opportunity as their contemporaries in their sister services.

Since 1959 the Congress has recognized that the provisions of the Officer Grade Limitations Act—Public Law 349, 84th Congress—have been too restricted. As a consequence, the Congress has periodically extended to the Air Force temporary authority to exceed the statutory grade limitations provided in the Officer Grade Limitations Act. This authority was

last given in 1966 with the enactment of Public Law 89-157 which provided temporary authority until June 30, 1966, to exceed these statutory limitations.

The failure of the Congress to take positive action in this area will therefore preclude any promotion program in the Air Force for commissioned officers during the coming fiscal year. In short, congressional action is urgently required.

JUSTIFICATION

The proposed legislation has two major objectives:

First, to provide a permanent increase in the number of Air Force officers authorized on active duty in the grades of lieutenant colonel and colonel.

This objective is embodied in section I of the bill which would permanently increase the numbers of lieutenant colonels and colonels authorized based upon assigned officer strength. The number of authorized majors would remain unchanged.

Second, to provide temporary authority for additional numbers in the grades of major and lieutenant colonel for the initial adjustment of Air Force officer promotion service points.

This temporary authority would permit the Air Force to exceed the permanent limitations on numbers for officers in these grades for a period of 6 years.

Section 2, therefore, provides a blanket increase of 1,000 for the grade of lieutenant colonel during the 6-year period and an increase in authorized strength in the first year of 9,500 officers in the grade of major with a gradual reduction thereafter to the sixth year when such authorized numbers in the grade of major can only be exceeded by 1,585 officers. The temporary authority provided in section 2 for extra majors will permit the promotion of 85 percent of the 12,000—approximate—Air Force captains with over 10 years of active commissioned service for the foreseeable future, and at the same time permit establishment of desired promotion service points to the other commissioned grades.

The proposed legislative changes would, according to the Department of the Air Force, enable the Department of Defense to promote qualified officers at the following service points:

Colonel: 22d year; Navy 21st year; Army, 22d year.

Lieutenant colonel: 17th year; Navy, 15th year; Army, 16th year.

Major: 11th year; Navy, 9th year; Army, 9th year.

At the present time, the promotion opportunity and promotion service points of the Air Force as compared with the other Departments are as follows:

Fiscal year 1966

Grade	Promotion opportunity (in percent)			Promotion service points (by year of service)		
	Army	Navy	Air Force	Army	Navy	Air Force
Colonel or captain	49	44	45	22d	21st	22d
Lieutenant colonel or commander	88	75	75	16th	15th	17th and 18th
Major or lieutenant commander	93	90	85	9th	9th	12th and 13th

NOTE.—Opportunity is presented by dividing selections by 1st time eligibles. The promotion service point is the year of promotion list service or active commissioned service in which the mode of officers in each category was promoted.

EFFECT OF THE BILL

The effect of this legislation will be to enable the Air Force to conduct a long-term officer promotion program which eventually will enable officers in the Air Force to be promoted at approximately the same promotion service points as their contemporaries in the other military Departments. Similarly, this legislation will also provide Air Force officers, both Regulars and Reserves alike, with approximately the same promotion opportunities as are available to their colleagues in the sister services.

ADEQUACY OF NUMBERS AUTHORIZED

The present permanent officer limitations applying to the Army, Navy, and Air Force in the grades of colonel, lieutenant colonel, and major are shown in the following table:

[In percent]

	Army	Navy	Air Force
Colonel or captain	4.8	5.5	4.1
Lieutenant colonel or commander	12.0	10.8	8.3
Major or lieutenant commander	16.6	18.4	18.3

Enactment of this legislation would increase Air Force permanent limitations applying to the grades of colonel and lieutenant colonel. The permanent limitations applying to major would not be changed. The following table reflects the increases in percentages which would obtain:

[In percent]

Colonel	4.9
Lieutenant Colonel	12.4

As indicated in the preceding table, the new percentage distribution authority for officers in the grade of colonel and lieutenant colonel in the Air Force would compare very favorably with that presently authorized for officers in the other services. Therefore, enactment of this legislation will not serve to provide the Air Force with advantages in promotion opportunity that are not now already available in the other services.

CONSEQUENCES OF FAILURE TO ENACT THIS LEGISLATION

If no legislative relief is provided the following consequences will ensue:

First. There will be no active duty—temporary—promotion program for officers to the grades of major, lieutenant

colonel, and colonel during the coming fiscal year.

Second. Air Force commissioned officer strength in the grade of lieutenant colonel will be required to be reduced by over 5,000 during fiscal year 1967.

Third. Air Force commissioned officer strength in the grade of colonel will be reduced by 1,000 during this same period.

Fourth. This reduction must be effected by either demotion or forced separation.

Fifth. The unfavorable disparity in officer promotion opportunity which exists between the Air Force and the other Armed Forces will grow. The Air Force promotes its officers from 2 to 4 years later than other Armed Forces in certain grades under current programs.

Sixth. No Reserve officers can be promoted to the active duty grades of major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel in the foreseeable future.

Seventh. The Air Force will be unable to plan or carry out an orderly officer career management program until legislative relief is obtained.

COST

Representatives of the Department of the Air Force have advised the committee that enactment of this legislation resulting in the promotion of officers to higher grades in the Air Force will result in an increase in cost of approximately \$17,600,000 in fiscal year 1967. Although this cost is not insignificant, it should not be viewed so much as an increase cost but rather as an equitable adjustment in pay scales long overdue these Air Force officers who have not had the promotion opportunity accorded their colleagues in the other services.

SUMMARY

This legislation, if enacted into law, will permanently correct the promotion problem for commissioned officers in the Department of the Air Force. It will preclude the necessity for the extension of temporary authority of this kind on a year-to-year basis. The legislation is strongly supported by the Department of Defense, and is in fact a Department of Defense legislative proposal.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised the committee that this legislative proposal is in accordance with the program of the President.

I have touched very lightly on some of the important elements of this legislation. However, for those Members who wish to inquire further into this matter, I would be delighted to respond to any questions. Also, I strongly recommend to the Members that they study the committee report which I believe will satisfactorily resolve any of the questions they may have on this important legislative item.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore trust that the House will approve this legislation without a dissenting vote.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 15005 and strongly recommend its approval by this body.

This legislation was thoroughly explained by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HEBERT], who, as Chairman of Subcommittee No. 2, presided over the hearings on this important legislation.

Therefore, I will not attempt to repeat the information already provided the Members of this body. However, I consider it important to emphasize that this bill was reported out by both the subcommittee and the full committee without a dissenting vote from either the majority or the minority.

The Congress must act on this legislation with a genuine degree of urgency since failure to act positively on this question would force the demotion or elimination from active duty of thousands of field grade officers, and would terminate the Air Force temporary promotion program in the grades of major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel.

As Members of this body are aware, the Department of Defense has submitted to the Congress a comprehensive legislative proposal embodying the so-called BOLTE recommendations which have as their general purpose a complete overhaul of the laws governing the procurement, retention, promotion, separation, and retirement of commissioned officers in all the services. Since the Committee on Armed Services has not had an opportunity to take action on this very complicated and comprehensive legislative proposal, the question naturally arises, will this legislation conflict with the provisions of BOLTE when and if it is later acted upon by the Congress.

The committee inquired into this matter and was advised by the representatives of the Department of Defense that the grade authorizations embodied in H.R. 15005 are for practical purposes, identical with those recommended by the BOLTE board. Therefore, enactment of this legislation will in no way complicate or contradict any future action the Congress may take in respect to the overall BOLTE recommendations.

In view of these circumstances, I join my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT], in strongly recommending the unanimous approval by this body of this legislation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in connection with the four bills just passed by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING REIMBURSEMENT FOR COSTS INCURRED UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES FOR THE COST OF PARKING FEES, FERRY FARES, AND BRIDGE, ROAD, AND TUNNEL TOLLS

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Armed Serv-

ices, I call up the bill (H.R. 12615) 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, and ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 12615

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 404(d) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by adding the following flush sentence: "In addition to the allowances authorized by this section, reimbursement may be allowed for the actual cost of parking fees, ferry fares, and bridge, road, and tunnel tolls."

SEC. 2. Section 408 of title 37, United States Code, is amended by adding the following sentence: "In addition to the fixed rate a mile authorized by this section for the use of privately owned vehicles, reimbursement may be allowed for the actual cost of parking fees, ferry fares, and bridge, road, and tunnel tolls."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

U.S. REDS TO MAKE BID TO DEMOCRATS

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on June 22 of this year I inserted in the RECORD extensive remarks concerning Communist subversion in the United States. It was pointed out that an excellent guideline for determining the sincerity or treachery of the Soviets was their violations of U.S. espionage statutes and the number of Soviet officials declared persona non grata in recent years. However, the issue of Soviet espionage must seem far removed from the everyday experiences of the normal American citizen. Much closer to reality for the majority of citizens is the arena of politics, with its periodic elections and involving issues which directly affect all of us. Consequently, when a member of the Communist Party, U.S.A., reportedly goes on record indicating party interest and plans for political action, this should be news to the voters of the Nation.

The New York Times of June 26, 1966, carried an article by Peter Kihss entitled "U.S. Reds to Make Bid to Democrats," which should alert voters of all political parties as to their plans in the field of political action. Forewarned is forearmed, and for this purpose I insert the

above-mentioned article in the RECORD at this point:

[From the New York Times, June 26, 1966]
U.S. REDS TO MAKE BID TO DEMOCRATS—CONVENTION TOLD OF REVOLT AGAINST JOHNSON POLICIES

(By Peter Kihss)

Communist leaders laid down a line here yesterday giving first stress to the need for political action "at present in and around the orbit of the Democratic party." A report at the 18th national convention of the Communist Party, U.S.A., said there was "an unprecedented revolt" in Democratic ranks against the Johnson Administration on foreign policy and inflation.

Mrs. Dorothy Healey, Southern California leader of the party, reported a political panel had told the convention "the ultra-right was able to consolidate its hold on the Republican party in many states" with the Presidential nomination of Senator Barry Goldwater in 1964.

Even though the Communists call for "breaking the illy-white character of the United States Senate," she said Edward Brooke, a candidate for the Republican nomination in Massachusetts and a Negro, "supports the Administration's position on the war in Vietnam and is therefore not acceptable to the advanced peace and freedom fighters."

The convention, in its fourth day at Webster Hall, 119 East 11th Street, announced it had adopted a highly critical report on the Communist party's own organization.

This called for "the increased public presence" of many more Communist spokesmen. The report complained that "our situation with respect to Negro and women cadre is especially weak above the club level." It decried "conservatism" and doubt about the advisability of recruiting and asserted that able comrades refrained from taking up full-time party work.

It found "a lack of initiative in mass struggles, a tendency to view the job of a Communist in mass organization as being exclusively support to existing programs."

It cited a tendency "to withdraw in the face of Red-baiting," and "a rather negative approach to left youth as being flighty and lacking in a working-class approach, not worthy of full trust, 'here today, gone tomorrow,' etc."

NEW LEFT MEMBER

But the organization report found improving attitudes toward the party. It said "a Communist speaker on campus can outdraw all other speakers." It also reported that "over 1-million pieces of Communist literature have been gobbled up in the last 18 months" and "Communist spokesmen participate in the National Coordinating Committee to End the War in Vietnam."

"Not so long ago," the report asserted, "most in the 'New Left' considered the Communist party irrelevant, but more recently large numbers of youth from this background have joined the party."

The report said the Communists proposed to concentrate cadre, literature and finances on Illinois, Michigan, Ohio and western Pennsylvania; on steel, auto and transportation industries; and on Negro areas in Harlem, south side of Chicago and the South.

BEHIND CLOSED DOORS

The convention remained behind closed doors, but Mrs. Healey told newsmen of the political panel report she presented. A petite, smiling figure in white-dotted green, with a twist necklace, Mrs. Healey is 51. She said she had been a Communist since she was 14. She polled 87,000 votes—6 percent of the total—for Los Angeles county tax assessor June 7.

As to working through Democratic party channels, she said the laws of many states made it difficult for independent or third-party candidates. The Communists, she said, consider that there might be a challenge to President Johnson's renomination even "within the Democratic establishment" in 1968, although she noted there "could also be an independent campaign."

The party's political action resolution said that "in Mississippi and one county in Alabama, the Negro people have developed political instruments independent of the two major political parties," which could be forerunners of a wider breakaway.

SYMBOL QUESTIONED

Nevertheless, James E. Jackson, a leading Negro Communist and president of the company that publishes *The Worker*, told newsmen he wished the Alabama group had chosen "a better symbol than the black panther." He said he would have preferred "an American eagle with black and white feathers."

In convention discussion on the Communist Party's draft program, Mr. Jackson said there had been a view that "the so-called 'black power' concept" currently put forward by the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee "seems in effect to challenge Negro-white unity."

Such statements, Mr. Jackson said, might be misunderstood.

Mr. Jackson said the convention had voted unanimously for a resolution hailing the draft program, but suggesting redrafting and looking to a special national conference on this problem.

He disclosed the draft program published last February had been "prepared by a small committee headed by Gus Hall, chairman of the party de facto." Those participating in its editing, he said, included Dr. Hyman Lumer, Carl Winter, Gilbert Green and himself, with Al Richmond, editor of *People's World* on the West Coast, as "finally chief editor."

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA: AMERICA'S GREATEST

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA] is recognized for 1 hour.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may have the privilege of revising and extending their remarks on this subject immediately after the remarks which I shall make.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor this afternoon to pay tribute to one of the world's greatest, most distinguished institutions of higher learning, the University of California. Sadly, I speak at a time when the university is under savage attack by extremists from both the right and the left who apparently seek to discredit it in the eyes of the public. For too many months now the university has been maligned and cursed as a subversive, destructive force within our society. Attempts have been made to focus the attention of the public exclusively on the political activities of a very small minority of students and nonstudents. Represented as typical of the campus scene, these activities have

been submitted as evidence of the decline and fall of the University of California. References are made to the "once great" University of California. Insinuations are spread that the university no longer ranks as a distinguished institution of learning, that the quality of the university—its students, its faculty, and its standards of instruction—has somehow drastically deteriorated.

These are the charges. They have been as a matter of fact inculcated into certain of the political aspects of campaigning for the governorship in the State of California. Now let us ask the critical question: Are they supported by the facts? Has the University of California somehow fallen from a position of eminence? Is it a destructive force within our society? On the evidence, Mr. Speaker, the answer must be a resounding "no." Directly to the contrary, the evidence clearly shows that the University of California today ranks with the world's greatest universities holding a position of distinction which cannot be seriously challenged. The accomplishments of the university, its faculty and its students are of international renown. Its leadership in many fields of education and research is unquestioned. Far from being destructive of our society, the university is one of its greatest sources of strength and progress. The university performs countless invaluable services for the people of California, the Nation, and the world. Its achievements as a great center for research and cultural activities, as a school for the education of our people—both young and old—and as a forum for the free exchange, expression, and development of ideas have been instrumental in making California the first State in the Nation and the United States of America the world's greatest nation.

This, then, is the true picture of the University of California, an institution of outstanding eminence in education, in research, in public service. Now, what is the picture that has been developed by recent activities on the campus. I suggest to you that these merely reflect the activities of what we have already stated to be a small minority of the students. Many of them have the best of intentions. Some of them reflect some of the most active, inquisitive minds that have come to the institution, but on the other hand there have been others that are not so well intentioned; they do not represent such a high quality of thinking. I suggest to you that a university, if it is to fulfill its role in society, is not going to be a haven against controversy. As a matter of fact, the great universities of the world have spawned much of the controversy of history and have been centers of conflict for centuries. And, Mr. Speaker, it is important that the university continue this role.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, in a society that claims to have an open society, we must encourage freedom of speech. It is a great concept of our democracy and should be encouraged among our young people.

But, Mr. Speaker, this is not the whole story.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that history will show that wherever there has been history of conflict, of confrontation, whether of a violent or nonviolent nature, there is a certain element within that society and in all societies who become so engrossed with conflict that they cannot find satisfaction with the ordinary course of life.

Mr. Speaker, these are the kind of people who became the crusaders when religion was the center of conflict. These were the kind of people who became the professional soldiers, mercenaries, when the proponents of nationalism held the world scene. These are the kind of people who will come forward this day in the great demonstrations that we will see, of both a violent and nonviolent nature. They are different and fall into the category of those who are committed to the life of conflict and who very unfortunately lose the sense of values to which they are dedicated.

Mr. Speaker, there is another aspect of this which I believe needs very critical thinking on the part of the young people who become involved therein.

Mr. Speaker, I have often turned for insight into the dynamics of history to Edmund Burke, who was one of the great legislators in the history of our Anglo-American tradition.

Mr. Speaker, I have recently reviewed the "Reflections on the Revolution in France" and the part of Edmund Burke in that period. In the introduction to that volume, he tells us this story:

That the great French revolutionaries thought they would find in Edmund Burke a great leader to storm the bastions of the English establishment, tear it out by its roots and bring in the new era. A great liberal, brilliant and courageous, Burke was a man who was incorruptible in private and public life, and who never had been properly rewarded by his own party let alone by the English Crown for his energy and his scholarship.

It seemed, therefore, to many of the leaders of liberal opinion in revolutionary France, that Burke, more than any other English political leader, was admirably calculated to head in Britain a radical movement of reform on French principles.

But, Mr. Speaker, the French liberals reckoned without their man. The spirit of the age of reason summoned forth Burke's indignation and contempt. Endowed with a prophet's genius, he clearly foresaw the whole tragic course of events which would follow upon the French attempt to reconstruct society after an abstract pattern. The Revolution, after careening fiercely through a series of stages of hysterical violence, would end in despotism; but by that time, it would have brought down in ruin most that was lovely and noble in traditional society. Burke resolved that England should not share in France's folly, and that the whole of the civilized world must be awakened to the menace of these abstractions of impractical speculators, which would expose mankind to the terrible cruelty of the boot that

lurks beneath our fallen human nature, instead of conjuring up the noble savage of romantic literature.

Mr. Speaker, he knew that all the advantages of civil social existence are the product of intricate human experience over many centuries, not to be amended overnight by some coffeehouse philosopher.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is what we have in the expression of much of the foment that we have seen on the University of California campus. We have seen the existentialist philosophy of the coffeehouse clique who have very little real sympathy for the continuity of society and for that which serves mankind in the established order of things.

And if they in their youth or in their inexperience and their naivete see in this only a barrier to what they would hope to have as their quick, expeditious realization of their aspirations, then they fail to know society for what it is and they fail to give worthiness and that kind of value which every society must want, for that which is the cement of society and which enables men to progress. Certainly, the activities of the few who hold these radical opinions should not be the measure of the university in its activity. It is to the credit of the university that it is able to encompass the opinions of many including those of the troublesome few and still maintain its fine service through our times and to continue the great concept of a seat of philosophy and at the same time that of a place of great learning.

Now, I would turn the attention of the people of the United States in general and the people of California in particular to the positive aspects of this great institution, the University of California, and how it has really been serving their needs, in the true tradition of the best of American universities.

Earlier this year, the prestigious American Council on Education released the report of its now well-known study assessing the quality of graduate education among the Nation's universities entitled appropriately enough, "An Assessment of Quality in Graduate Education." In the foreword to the report, American Council on Education president, Logan Wilson observes that "excellence, by definition, is a state only the few rather than the many can attain." Mr. Speaker, the findings of this famous study conclusively show that the University of California has clearly achieved its place among the few, nay the very few. Indeed the study indicates that the university is virtually unequaled in the excellence of its overall graduate program.

Specifically the American Council on Education study sought to evaluate the quality of the departments of 106 of the Nation's largest universities in 29 major fields of study. The actual rating was done by distinguished senior and junior scholars from each of the universities awarding degrees in the particular field in which that department was evaluated. These scholars were asked two basic questions:

A. Which of the terms below best describes your judgment of the quality of the

graduate faculty in your field at each of the institutions listed? Consider only the scholarly competence and achievements of the present faculty.

1. Distinguished.
2. Strong.
3. Good.
4. Adequate.
5. Marginal.
6. Not sufficient to provide acceptable doctoral training.

B. How would you rate the institutions below if you were selecting a graduate school to work for a doctorate in your field today? Take into account the accessibility of faculty and their scholarly competence, curricula, educational and research facilities, the quality of graduate students, and other factors which contribute to the effectiveness of the doctoral program.

1. Extremely attractive.
2. Attractive.
3. Acceptable.
4. Not attractive.

Thus, departments were rated on two points—first, the quality of their faculty; and second, the quality and effectiveness of their graduate programs.

Mr. Speaker, the results of this study clearly and loudly bespeak the greatness of the University of California. In 23 of the 29 fields, the faculty of the departments of the university awarding degrees in those fields rated as "distinguished," the highest possible rating. Those fields are English, German, Spanish anthropology, economics, geography, history, political science, sociology, bacteriology/microbiology, biochemistry, botany, entomology, psychology, zoology, astronomy, chemistry, geology, mathematics, physics, chemical engineering, civil engineering, and electrical engineering. In 26 out of the 29 fields, the university's graduate programs were rated as "extremely attractive," again the highest rating possible. Those fields are the classics, English, French, German, Spanish, economics, geography, history, political science, sociology, bacteriology/microbiology, biochemistry, botany, entomology, physiology, psychology, zoology, astronomy, chemistry, geology, mathematics, physics, chemical engineering, civil engineering, electrical engineering, and mechanical engineering.

The American Council on Education also rated universities on the quality of their faculty in each of the five general divisions of graduate study: humanities, social sciences, biological sciences, physical sciences, and engineering. Mr. Speaker, only the University of California, Berkeley, rated as "distinguished" in all five divisions, a finding which, as the author of the report observes, "supports the claim that it is the best balanced distinguished university in the country."

The last of the indicia of quality measured by the American Council on Education were the resources of the libraries of the universities. The University of California at Berkeley rated second in this category and UCLA fourth.

Mr. Speaker, this truly remarkable study, the most comprehensive of its kind ever attempted, graphically portrays the preeminent position of greatness held by the University of California among the Nation's institutions of higher education. Let those who would challenge this con-

temptation remember that the results of this study represent the combined, considered of hundreds of the Nation's best, most distinguished scholars. To me that amounts to a pretty compelling body of expert opinion.

The study stands as one persuasive indicator of the university's greatness today. There are many others. I need mention only a few.

The University of California is staffed by one of the world's most honored faculties. It leads all other institutions in the number of Nobel laureates on its staff. There are also more members of the National Academy of Sciences on its faculty than any other university.

The university's contributions to the world in education and research have been massive and far-reaching. Among its greatest contributions have been the alumni. Since its founding, the university has awarded well over a quarter million degrees. The number of alumni still living is estimated to exceed 225,000. These include leaders of national and international stature in all walks of life. In the area of research, the University has given to the world such famous scientific achievements as the invention of the first atom smashing cyclotron, discovery of all the artificial elements heavier than uranium, and the first isolation of the human polio virus. Instruction and research at the eight branches of the University today spans virtually every field of human knowledge.

The University of California has made outstanding contributions to international understanding and cooperation. One or another of its eight campuses offers instruction about almost every nation in the world and about most aspects of international relations.

The university's language-teaching program is extensive both in breadth and depth. Some 125 languages and major dialectical variations are taught either directly by the university or through special arrangements with the Defense Language Institute at Monterey, Calif.—thus making by a very large margin the richest such series of offering at any American University. Berkeley presently offers 24 Asiatic languages and Los Angeles offers 29 African languages. In 1962 the university established an education abroad program under which university students may now attend university centers at Bordeaux, Padua, Goettingen, Madrid, or Tokyo for a year's study.

Conversely, more foreign students enroll at the University of California than at any other university in the United States. In 1959 the Institute of International Education conferred its Distinguished Service Award on the university's foreign student program for "the most significant contribution to international understanding through support of educational exchange."

The University of California has served the people of California not only by educating their children but their adults beyond the formal classroom as well, enabling them to keep pace with the times by transmitting new knowledge through a highly developed extension service. Extension programs are now

offered in 249 locations throughout the State and through correspondence courses, films, television, and other media. The worldwide leadership of California agriculture owes a great debt to the extensive agricultural knowledge developed by the university and to the Agricultural Extension Service which transmits that knowledge through home and farm adviser offices in 56 counties who make approximately 3 million contacts with California families, farms, and industries each year.

Mr. Speaker, evidence of the greatness of the University of California would fill many volumes. Although my remarks have touched only on a few of the chapter headings, I believe the point has been firmly made. But I would like to discuss an aspect of the university's greatness which perhaps is one of its most remarkable; namely the remarkable ability which it has displayed in adapting to the almost continual state of change which California has undergone in the 98 years of the university's existence. Perhaps the secret of the university's spectacular success in this regard lies in the fact that it has always been future oriented. While dealing with the problems of the present it has also planned for those of the future. As California has grown so has its fabulous university struggling not only to keep pace with the present but the future as well. At the time of its founding, the university's "tiny bank of scholars" numbered 10 faculty with 38 students. Today the university has grown to an institution with 8 campuses with 7,245 full-time teachers and 75,672 full-time students. The Nation and the world are well familiar with the university's branches at Berkeley and Los Angeles. Now, I want to focus my remarks on a new branch of the university, a campus that is truly of the future, a campus that is assured of greatness in its own right, the University of California at Irvine.

June 20, 1964, will be a day the residents of Orange County, Calif., will long remember. On that day President Johnson officially dedicated the newest campus of the University of California.

It was a great honor for me to share the platform with the President that day. As former chairman of California's State Assembly Committee on Education I had long been acquainted with the importance of locating a branch of the university in populous Orange County. Careful and considered planning had gone into the selection of the site. Initial surveys began as early as 1958. This newest campus of the university was eventually to serve a population of more than 4 million residents in the Orange County-southeastern Los Angeles area.

After considering 23 alternative sites the regents selected a 1,000-acre section of the beautiful Irvine Ranch. The board of directors of the ranch voted the 1,000 acres as a gift to the university, and on July 22, 1960, the University of California at Irvine became a reality.

The next few years were excitingly busy ones. A master plan, both for the academic program, the physical plant had to be prepared. In 1961, 510 addi-

tional acres were added to the campus program. Daniel Aldrich, a renowned scientist with 20 years of experience with the operation of the University of California, was selected as UCI's first chancellor.

It was during these initial years that UCI was developing into more than a great institution of higher learning. Men with vision saw this latest addition to the University of California as an opportunity to create an integral college community. The recognition of the interdependence of "town and gown" encouraged the innovators to plan not just classrooms, laboratories, and libraries, but the foundations for a whole new city.

The idea of master planning a new center of learning with its own urban environment sparked the creative imagination of talented people throughout the Nation, and around the world. The pioneering University of California was about to embark upon another adventure. University of California once again was to lead the way in educational planning.

The program that has since developed has been titled the "inclusion plan." Envisioned is a community that will eventually service a student population of 27,500 and a city that will exceed 100,000 residents by the turn of the century. A large proportion of residents will be students, faculty, and staff. The facilities of the city will be designed to service the needs of the academic community.

Science oriented firms and craft industry will be encouraged to develop. Envisioned is the welding together of the university with industries that thrive and grow in an intellectually stimulating environment.

This new and exciting environment will eventually occupy 10,000 acres. Adjacent to the university core will be 2,000 acres of the central section of the university community. Some 660 acres will be devoted to neighborhood type living areas. Housing for students, faculty, and staff will be developed within this area.

As a focal point for social, civic, cultural, and commercial activity a town center of 105 acres is contemplated. The concept for the town center is patterned after the antique towns of Europe and America where shops, offices, civic facilities, and housing are closely organized in pedestrian scale. The town will be entirely oriented toward the campus facilitating strong physical ties.

Additional acreage for recreation facilities, commercial enterprise, high-density housing, residential housing, and fraternity housing are included in the plan.

The uniqueness of Irvine's physical environment reflects the campus' intellectual environment while the physical campus and related community are designed to put the modern scholar in perspective with the times. The academic program seeks to provide the intellectual tools necessary to put modern times in perspective.

A statement of principle reflecting a consensus of UCI's faculty begins:

The University of California at Irvine is a university for the modern man. It

confronts the prospects of the next century with enthusiasm. It regards the past with respect, but without nostalgia. It is unashamed of modern society; unintimidated by modern problems; stimulated by modern opportunities.

The challenge of the present, the provocative discoveries still in the future, and attention to the foundations of the past will be the environment of UCI. To charge and stimulate this environment a faculty of the highest quality is being carefully recruited.

Dr. Frederick Reiner, internationally renowned physicist, has been appointed dean of physical sciences. Dr. Reiner is principally noted for the discovery of the neutrino, the most elusive of elementary atomic particles.

Arnold Binder, professor of psychology, is a recognized authority on statistical and mathematical analysis of problem solving behavior, learning, and group leadership. From Trinity College, Oxford, England, comes the philosophy professor, Edward J. Lemmon. Professor Lemmon has been a consulting editor for the *Journal of Symbolic Logic* since 1958.

These men, and the many other prominent members of UCI's new faculty are not content with tired and stale methods of teaching. Their objective in developing the self-reliant, analytical, involved man, requires a special attitude toward the university by a special kind of faculty, organized into units promoting community, and using a variety of educational instruments.

Continuing, Dr. J. W. Peltson, in articulating the views of the UCI faculty writes:

We seek scholars and artists who view teaching and involvement in the life of an educational institution as means to support scholarship and creative activity rather than diversions from it. We reject the notion that those who have no interest in or capacity for scholarship are good teachers; and on the other hand, we reject the notion that a list of publications is all that one needs in order to evaluate their scholarship or suitability for membership in the Irvine academic community.

Irvine's embryonic faculty of 118 are determined to set patterns of standards that will influence the future character of the UCI community:

We imply a faculty, a student body and a state of mind that is not afraid to try.

To the 1,509 people who now compose the first student body the faculty has said:

Education wherever it is successful . . . requires that the student participate with the instructor in the essentially self-correcting applications of intelligence and thereby achieving self-reliance and wisdom in dealing with new problems . . . We shall provide opportunities for students to demonstrate their abilities, and will give academic credits for knowledge however it is acquired.

And the opportunities are being provided. The involved people of Irvine wasted no time in concerning themselves with the problems of their local environment. More than 130 students have volunteered their services to the Orange County neighborhood tutorial program

for disadvantaged students. These volunteers have been active in Santa Ana, Fullerton, and Placentia.

Eighteen UCI students are engaged in dealing with the practical problems of rapid urban growth. Working with officials of Tustin, Calif., and under the supervision of Dr. Gordon Fielding, of UCI's Geography Department, the students are analyzing the economic, cultural, and political factors influencing land use choices. Contemplated future studies will deal with transportation and sanitation systems, commercial structures of shopping centers, and variations in residential land use.

This cooperative practical learning laboratory is already proving to be of substantial value to the local communities of Orange County as well as providing students with a unique and lasting educational experience. The impact that UCI will have on the future development of Orange County will be enormous. UCI is quickly becoming one of Orange County's most important resources.

The day the university was dedicated is still vivid in my memory. The excitement of a Presidential visit, the thousands of gaily expectant people who had come to hear their President and see the new campus. Some, I imagine were disappointed when they arrived at the university site only to find gently rolling hills overlooking the headwaters of Newport Bay. Construction on the first buildings had just begun, and except for a few hastily constructed temporary facilities, the reality of a great center of learning-to-be was hardly evident.

I remember looking out over the heads of the crowds to the empty acres where cattle were still allowed to graze trying to visualize the changes that 20 years would make. A great library of more than 500,000 volumes. Creative architecture housing classrooms and laboratories, academic facilities homogeneously clustered, housing enough to accommodate 50 percent of the student population; an exciting town center with bookstores and small shops; developing industry and residential housing; and a stimulating, intellectually paced populace pursuing knowledge and progress.

One year after the dedication Irvine was accommodating its first students, its first lectures and experiments. Last Saturday Irvine held its first commencement exercises. In all there were 13 graduates, 10 bachelors, and 3 masters. A humble beginning perhaps, but no less humble than the University of California's first graduating class of three. Ninety-six years after the university's first commencement exercises, UCI, the seventh campus in the system, awarded degrees to 13 students.

Look magazine recently described the silent revolution taking place in California. The magazine described California as a "turned on" people whose new rules were challenging the frontiers of the intellect much in the same manner that our forefathers challenged America's western frontier. The University of California is the great pioneer on this "new frontier" of the intellect.

Perhaps one of the best explanations of the university's role in meeting the challenge of the intellectual frontier was included in the statement on behalf of the faculty of UCI:

We view the activities within the university as a continuum and the educational experiences as a seamless encounter with knowledge, human vitality, and vision. We care desperately about the individual student who cares desperately about making sense out of his life. We want to communicate the sense that one is constantly becoming, that no one arrives, and that the university experience is being and becoming, not watching and waiting.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANNA. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to compliment my colleague on the very fine statement he has made. I certainly want to associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join my colleagues today in commenting upon one of the great institutions of learning of all time, the University of California.

As you know, during the past few months I have been particularly aware—and on occasion painfully so—of the vast diversity that exists within the university. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that while some have looked askance on recent events in Berkeley it is this excitement and stimulation that makes for greatness in a university. I am proud not only to include the oldest of the nine campuses of the University of California in my district, but also proud to be one of its graduates and a member of its community. To those who exhibit concern over the future of the university let me say that I think it will be bright indeed.

Much has been written during the past 2 years about the Berkeley campus of the university. Unfortunately the vast bulk of this material has been directed in such a way as to emphasize only the conflict and confrontation, the beat and the bizarre, the violent and the vulgar. Today I should like to add to the effort of setting that record straight.

Before turning to the accomplishments of the university I should like to say a few words about one of the real educational statesmen of this generation. Many of my following remarks will, in fact, reflect the leadership that Clark Kerr has exhibited first as chancellor of the Berkeley campus, and since 1958, as president of the University of California. In the face of vast criticism from both the left and the right, Clark Kerr has directed the university to unparalleled heights during a period of incredible growth and expansion. With vision and determination he has moved to accommodate the demands of size without sacrificing the achievement of academic excellence. Those of us who have been privileged to work with him during this period were justly proud when, in a recent report, the American Council of Education noted that Berkeley today has "the best balanced, distinguished graduate school in the country."

Joining President Kerr is the new chancellor at Berkeley, Dr. Roger Heyns, who in a relatively short period of time has exhibited a deep sense of commitment to the academic community and to the maintenance of Berkeley's outstanding position in American higher education.

There is a tendency to oversimplify and make a caricature of Berkeley. Of almost comic proportions, for example, is the recent issue of Look magazine which cited as a "classic Berkeley coed" a Chicago-born, beauty contest winner who smokes cigars and marches in VDC parades. This was an extraordinarily charming girl but, I hasten to add, hardly typical.

The vast bulk of Berkeley undergraduates are Californians. Although beautiful, the majority of our coeds have not won a beauty contest, possibly because there are not enough contests. There were only a relatively small number of student marchers. Finally, while I do not think a survey has been taken, my impression is that most of the women at Berkeley do not smoke cigars.

Far more balanced and perceptive, Mr. Speaker, is the penetrating study made by A. H. Raskin, of the New York Times, that appeared in the Time magazine for January 30, 1966. I should like to insert this article by Mr. Raskin, entitled "I'm Just Here To Study," at this point in the RECORD:

"I'M JUST HERE TO STUDY"

(By A. H. Raskin)

The voice was earnest; it was also loud as it trumpeted through the loudspeakers. "There is a vacuum on this campus that must be filled," a stocky youth shouted into the microphone. But the vacuum was mostly of audience. Hundreds of students walked unconcernedly past, seemingly oblivious to the hortatory cascade. The only listeners were three other young men awaiting their turns at the microphone.

That was Berkeley's much-converted open forum one sun-splashed noon hour recently in the plaza outside Sproul Hall, the administration building, which student rebels at the University of California had converted into a cradle of liberty in a tumultuous sit-in a year ago. The evangels of unrestricted free speech had won agreement from the administration to allow any campus organization to invite speakers and broadcast its messages, no matter how anti-Establishment, over the amplifying system so long as advance arrangements were made.

A year-long parade of remake-the-world types, from every shade of the political spectrum, has left ears so bent that the orators now drown in their own unheard exhortations. The day after the un-rally, the microphone stood in the only island of silence on the buzzing, swinging plaza. No group had even bothered to apply for its use.

A visitor returning to Berkeley 12 months after "the seizure of the Winter Palace"—the faintly mocking descriptive that faculty sophisticates have borrowed from the uprising against Russia's Czar in 1917—finds a degree of serenity that puzzles the students themselves. So captive have they become to their own public image—battlers against a computerized educational system in a Jello society dominated by the military-industrial complex—that the almost invariable initial response to my questions about how they thought things stood on the campus now was: "You don't want to talk to me; I'm just here to study."

It took a while to persuade them that, old-fashioned as the idea might seem, there were still people who thought that studying was what universities were for and that their thoughts might be no less newsworthy than those of students who blared theirs through the campus sound system. A highly unscientific sampling indicated that the "I'm just here to study" crowd outnumbered the activists by 32 to 3.

There is little direct carry-over of the old Free Speech Movement, the vanguard force that kept the campus on a sputtering fuse for three months last winter through adroit management of the student anger aroused by a series of administration blunders. (The first and worst of these was the shutting off of the Bancroft Strip, which had served as the sole on-campus escape valve for releasing political energies through recruitment for civil-rights picket lines or off-campus partisan rallies. Canceled almost at once, this order left a residue of disciplinary issues that provided the ammunition for most of the subsequent upheavals. The climax came with the Sproul Hall sit-in and the carting off to jail of 800 demonstrators, among them scores of the university's brightest students. The F.S.M. strategy through the whole improbable chain of events was built on the application to alma mater of the principles of civil disobedience the student rebels had learned in battling for Negro rights in Mississippi and Alabama.)

Mario Savio, the charismatic sophomore who became the best-known of all the F.S.M.'s crusaders against "the knowledge factory," has gone off to Oxford with the wife he learned to love on the student picket line. His friends say he wanted a quieter environment in which to rethink some of his ideas on life and politics; the quiet may be interrupted by the fact that a son arrived a few days before the Dec. 2 anniversary of the Berkeley sit-in. A more serious interruption may come when the appeals courts in California hand down a final ruling on the prison sentences both Savios were given for their part in the demonstration—120 days for him and 45 for her. In the meantime, he is majoring in physics and Mrs. Savio hopes to complete a doctoral dissertation in philosophy.

Many of their old associates in the F.S.M. steering committee have also left Berkeley or have gone back to study as a relatively full-time campus endeavor. A few have switched to positions of leadership in the Vietnam Day Committee—an amorphous group dedicated to getting the United States out of Vietnam—but others are on the sidelines even when the V.D.C. stages its mass demonstrations. One who upped anchor is Albert Litewka, holder of a master's degree in English, whose last major task on campus was to raise \$400,000 in bail for the Sproul Hall defendants. He left in October to take a job with a New York book publisher, rather than embark on a life career as a "rebel youth." His departure implied no belief, however, that the F.S.M. had failed to achieve beneficial results in shaking frozen thought patterns on the campus, in the Bay area and in the nation at large. "Our aim was to promote debate, not to preach certainties; and we believe we did succeed at all levels in making people aware of trends that bothered us in our society," Litewka says.

My wanderings around Berkeley indicated that, whatever the impact on thought processes in the outside world, the jolt supplied by the F.S.M. had given a large part of the student body a more sophisticated concern with politics. There has been a considerable revulsion against the hyperbolic involvement of a year ago, and particularly against such juvenile forms of protest as the Filthy Speech Movement that erupted last spring. That aberrational exercise involved the pa-

rating of four-letter words as evidence of liberation from the constraints of bourgeois morality. Today many students appear to have tuned up, not out, in the quality of their political interest. This is no dull, dead campus in which devotion to studies implies total detachment from temporal affairs.

Listen to Barry Kingman, an economics senior and president of the Inter-Fraternity Council, whose blond hair, pink cheeks and regular features make him a prototype of the all-American young man; Kingman is the antithesis of everything the F.S.M. ever believed in, yet it is plain that he has not been untouched by its efforts to break the "idiot pattern" of traditional multiversity thought: "The heart and guts of this university have been strengthened by the turmoil of the last year. The outside press and the politicians have contorted it into something dirty, but the historic function of a minority group in any democracy is to make the majority analyze and defend its views. When you have a society that allows dissident groups like the F.S.M. free expression, you know you're not in a closed society; the only limit there is on improving that society is how imaginative you are in making proposals for change. One thing you can't say about this university is that it is stagnant. Ideas run free because people aren't afraid of ideas."

As one device in their war of ideas with the Vietnam Day Committee, Kingman and the Greek-letter societies sponsored a Thanksgiving blood drive for the American troops in Vietnam to coincide with a "bring-the-boys-home" march put on by the committee. The yield was 835 pints of blood. Last month the fraternities and sororities invited 200 fliers and sailors from the carrier Midway to dinner and a basketball game. Now Kingman is trying to persuade people ranging from Vice President HUMPHREY to Ronald Reagan to speak at Spring Week ceremonies on the campus in March.

But his operation is puny by contrast with the professionalism I found a few blocks off campus in the dingy frame house where the V.D.C. has its headquarters. Not long ago the committee distributed leaflets to members of the armed forces urging them to do as little fighting as they had to do in Vietnam and preferably to do none at all, even if it meant court martial. This counsel, coupled with the staging of widely publicized protest marches against U.S. involvement in Vietnam, brought from wounded troops in the combat zone denunciations so bitter that they made Berkeley sound like a suburb of Hanoi or Peking.

Mike O'Hanlon, who was bounced out of the Cardinal Hayes High School in New York eight years ago and has been kicking around the country ever since, introduced himself as the V.D.C. editor. He filed my arms with leaflets, including the one that has been causing all the clamor about telling G.I.'s not to fight. He also cheerfully displayed a basketful of condemnatory mail. "Burn, you dirty animalistic Commies, burn," one letter said. Another enclosed a razor blade with a suggestion that the beatniks on the committee use it to save or to "slash the wrists if life gets to be too much for you."

The committee has a dozen full-time workers, each of whom gets \$100 a month and none of whom is currently a student. A blond 2-year-old wanders around the headquarters and there are bottomless bags of cookies for staff and volunteers, but no inefficiency goes with the informality. It is a very purposeful place. The day I stopped in, the committee's co-chairman had gone to jail for a demonstration denouncing Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor as a "war criminal"; three other V.D.C. leaders were scheduled to follow him behind bars. Everybody seemed to be taking it philosophically. "You can't

work up much feeling about going to jail around here; it's sort of commonplace," said a girl the police had decided not to book.

One of the paid workers is Robert Hurwitt of Scarsdale, who was graduated Phi Beta Kappa from the New York University in 1964 and got his master's degree in English at Berkeley last June. He decided to interrupt his doctoral studies in September so he could speak out more vigorously for peace talks with the Vietcong.

Another paid worker, Anita Frankel of Teaneck, N.J., went to Antioch for a year and then spent three semesters at Berkeley before deciding that it was absurd to keep studying 12th-century Chinese history when there was "such a psychotic attitude in this country toward China."

She thinks the United States should just get out of Vietnam. "What right do we have to demand negotiations when we are in there illegally?" she asks. A disciple of Sartre and Camus, she speaks in great emotional throbs. The "very beautiful and rewarding three months" she has spent with the V.D.C. have persuaded her that she ought to go back to school next month and concentrate on communication and political argumentation.

Hurwitt and others will probably resume their studies, too, and the committee contemplates "a major reorganization." Some suspect it may be reorganized out of existence, but that is denied.

Back on campus I find myself in conversation with a student who has remained serenely disengaged from all the turmoil over F.S.M. and V.D.C. He is Neil Keane, a thin, languid senior, who came from Dublin four years ago to study physics at Berkeley. "Political activity bores me," he says, his back turned to the row of little tables on the plaza at which student proselytizers seek to enlist converts for causes ranging from legalizing abortions to recognizing Red China. "It is all an abstraction. People interest me, not mob behavior. From an academic standpoint this is a brilliant institution, but in terms of the human condition it is far from brilliant. The pointlessness of it all; it is much too big."

This echo of the old rebel charge that the "multiversity" degrades its undergraduates to the insignificance of I.B.M. numbers gets no support from Sandy Reidenbach, a sophomore, who has lived in Berkeley all her life, but who spent her freshman year at Cal's Santa Barbara campus. Sandy finds Berkeley a "much more stimulating" institution in every respect, even though its 27,000 students make it three times as big as Santa Barbara. Her enthusiasm is undisturbed by the criticisms of her father, who got his own medical degree at Berkeley and is now back for graduate courses in public health. He shares the F.S.M. view of the university as a factory and a breeder of alienation.

Mitsuru Ikuta, a freshman from San José, is as out of sympathy as Sandy with such complaints. "You are lost only if you allow yourself to become lost," he says. "If you have your own interests, there is plenty to keep you alive here and you never have to worry about being able to listen to another point of view on practically anything." What with his studies in the biological sciences and daily practice for the wrestling team (he is in the 115-pound class), Ikuta finds it "really a hassle—but tremendously exciting."

From the president of the official student government—Jerry Goldstein of Los Angeles, a senior in food chemistry—comes the flat statement that Berkeley is a vastly better place to go to school now than it was before all the shooting began. His opinion is of some importance because he successfully challenged SLATE, the left-oriented political party that has long dominated Berkeley student elections, to win the presidency by a 2-to-1 margin last June. He campaigned

on the platform that changes were needed at Berkeley, but that they need not be brought about through direct conflict.

Goldstein's optimism that Berkeley will become a nationwide model in educational reform and constructive intrauniversity relations has not been shaken by the fact that inheritors of the F.S.M.'s militant tradition scored a sweeping comeback in November elections for a constitutional convention to get rid of "Mickey Mouse undergraduate government" and give students a more assertive voice in campus affairs.

Nor does he find anything either strange or upsetting in the fact that the highest vote in an undergraduate election to choose for student members of an advisory committee on revising campus political rules went to 21-year-old Bettina Aptheker, a junior who not only admits but boasts that she is a Communist. Her designation has been denounced by conservative legislators of both parties as evidence of galloping subversion on the Cal campus. "Maybe a course in democracy for all university students is in order," intoned State Treasurer Bert A. Betts, a Democrat. And he added a warning that the state's credit rating would suffer—the last of all arguments to impress a Berkeley student of any political persuasion.

Goldstein, as the voice of middle-roadism, believes that part of the explanation for the Aptheker victory lies in the students' weariness of repeated votes on virtually everything. In the complicated November balloting, only a little over one-quarter of the 16,600 undergraduates bothered to go to the polls. In two more recent elections, the ratio has been smaller still. But more important than apathy in giving the daughter of Herbert Aptheker, the chief theoretician of American Communism, her big vote was that in the tangled ultraleftism of Berkeley's avant garde an orthodox Communist is a relative conservative. In the F.S.M. the political in-fighting got so tough last year that even pro-Peking activists found themselves stigmatized as "marshmallow Maoists."

Miss Aptheker has been at pains to earn recognition in the protest movement as a moderate, rather than an extremist. "She is one of our most responsible radicals," says Goldstein. "A lot of our students feel she need not necessarily be a subversive to be a Communist. They think of her as a 'good Joe' who has tried to discourage far-out activities."

Her anxiety to keep from being branded as a blind follower of the Moscow party line found expression just before the Christmas holiday in a letter she wrote to *The Daily Californian*, the student newspaper. It was an indirect answer to a communication from a graduate student chiding her father for falling back on charges of "Fascism" and "cold-war propaganda" when challenged to rebuke the Soviet Union for jailing such literary critics as Andrei Sinyavsky. Miss Aptheker wrote that she found "inexcusable" the official Soviet silence on the charges against Sinyavsky and that she opposed unequivocally "the arrest of an author for what he writes." Commented one faculty observer: "Bettina makes sure that her liberal flank is never turned."

With so safe-and-sane a leftist—especially one who had ostentatiously announced just before the balloting that she had been a Communist so long that she was liable to \$12-million in fines and 5,000 years in prison for failing to register with the Government—what better way for an emancipated student body to demonstrate its rejection of the "hypocritical" standards of the adult community than by putting her on the committee to help write new regulations governing campus politics?

Hypocrisy is the big focus of the students' grievance against society these days. The

most popular placards at the V.D.C. are those labeling President Johnson a "hypocrite" on the Vietnamese war, and few speeches are made outside Sproul Hall in which the word does not turn up at least a dozen times in condemnation of some phase of American life. "The vital center of student politics is the gap between what society say its values are and how it acts," is the way Chancellor Roger W. Heyns sees it as he rounds out his first semester.

Heyns, a post-revolution import from the University of Michigan, has put together an administrative staff that seeks to combat this cynical undergraduate estimate of contemporary morality through what amounts to a three-way stretch. His aim is to protect the right to dissent, the intellectual quality of the university and the public order of the Berkeley community.

By way of demonstrating that he is no Iron Chancellor in the Bismarck mold, Heyns maintains liaison with student organizations through John Searle, a philosophy professor, who was one of the F.S.M.'s most ardent faculty boosters in the days of the great rebellion. His switch to quarterback on the administration team has caused little perceptible change in Searle's appearance or viewpoint.

A short, intense man, little older than the students he confers with, Searle paces up and down in his tiny office with the energy of a caged tiger. His tie is askew, and a black pullover sweater takes the place of a jacket. "We had a revolution on this campus," he says, "and our task this year is to consolidate the various fruits of that revolution. There are two big obstacles. One is the outside pressure from forces in the Legislature or politicians generally; the other is the danger of more infantile extremism on campus such as the obscenity issue we had last spring."

Searle believes that "the whole place woke up last year." All his colleagues on the Chancellor's staff agree, but most seem happy that a lot of the ebullience has finally drained out of the awakening. The current task as Heyns sees it, is to analyze the extent to which some students may become educational casualties as a result of over-involvement in politics. He has been able to raise such ticklish questions without stirring new fears that the university is trying to clamp down or to appease its external critics. But there is still enough disquiet to cause Heyns to call himself "the commander of an outpost where most of the shooting is between our sentries and our own patrols; we can't seem to hold our fire until we really locate the enemy, or find out if there is one."

Where political activities have transgressed the minimal rules that now apply, the rules have been enforced—decisively but without a riot call. Thus, when the V.D.C. put a huge easel in the middle of the plaza in defiance of a regulation limiting displays to poster size, the administration did not retreat from a challenge to "take it down if you think you can." There was no dramatic confrontation, just a call from the Chancellor's office to campus janitors to haul away the sign. They did.

The really basic changes, however, are not in such tests of will but in attempts at educational innovation. Berkeley is trying to use its bigness as an asset in enriching the learning process for freshmen and sophomores, the great unwashed in the F.S.M. uprising. In many ways, the rebellion's central point was to force a reassessment of the faculty conceit that students are an irrelevant obstruction in a great research institution concerned with pushing out the boundaries of knowledge.

One approach to reform is being made through a special school for 150 freshmen in an old Tudor fraternity house on the edge

of the campus. In an atmosphere reminiscent of the Experimental College run at Wisconsin in the thirties by Alexander Meiklejohn, the students spent last semester learning about the Age of Pericles. This semester they turn to Cromwell's England in a routineless system of learning that abandons the whole concept of the course or even of formal instruction.

Joseph Tussman, a professor of philosophy, has recruited a mathematician, a poet, a lawyer and a political scientist to serve on the faculty with him, and things couldn't be more different from the old F.S.M. nightmare of a "computerized conveyor belt." A half-dozen boys and girls discuss the Peloponnesian War before a big fireplace. They sit on two battered lounges salvaged from the Law School; one boy is stretched out on the floor. Samuel Schaaf, a professor of aerodynamics and also chairman of Berkeley's public-school board, argues amiably with two students in an alcove. "So you don't think much of my interpretation," he says. When they confirm their dissent, he doesn't stomp into the office and demand that they be booted out for insubordination. "I'm having a ball," he tells me later. "I'm reading this stuff for the first time, just as they are. It's amazing, the depths of their perception."

The students take no examinations and get no punitive grades; the decision on whether they pass or fail is based on periodic papers they turn in on themes that interest them. Tussman insists that they are getting more individual attention than any other freshmen at Berkeley. "One of the things our students feel most at final exam time is guilt about enjoying themselves so much when their friends are working so hard and feeling so miserable," he declares. Some professors outside the program view it with less enthusiasm. They feel Tussman's students will be lost when they complete their two experimental years and move back into the regular curriculum to qualify for their degrees. Tussman himself acknowledges that he may find it hard to get five more professors to teach in a second round of the experiment.

A much larger attempt to reorganize teaching methods is being made by a select committee of the Academic Senate headed by Charles Muscatine, a professor of English. "We hope to come up in February with answers to what we believe is a worldwide crisis in education and in the relations between education and society," he says. A lot of the focus will be on trying to apply to the multiversity techniques that have long been used in small liberal-arts colleges like Sarah Lawrence.

Muscatine describes the lengths to which the faculty committee has gone to solicit student ideas—paid ads in *The Daily Cal*, questionnaires to 2,000 undergraduates, 10 open meetings and the enrollment of 15 students as members of its staff. As he talks, a graduate student in the Bob Dylan mold strays in—blue denims, high brown boots, curly hair and a giant Coke bottle in his hand. He volunteers an idea or two, then disappears as casually as he arrived.

The real resistance to the prospective reforms is likely to come from the faculty. "No one can be more conservative than a professor when it comes to educational reform," says Muscatine. The indications of faculty holdbacks are already so widespread that the next battle of Berkeley may present the ironic spectacle of an undergraduate push to preserve the report of an Academic Senate committee against repudiation by the Senate itself.

The basic problem is still the old one of "publish or perish," with its heavy primacy for research over teaching. Listen in on this colloquy between two economics professors and the head of the union that represents 362 graduate students who serve as

teaching assistants at Berkeley. Sidney Ingerman, the union head, who used to be an auto worker in Buffalo and is now studying for a Ph. D., says that the F.S.M. revolt has caused teaching to come up at least a little in the faculty's eyes. "Professors used to consider it beneath contempt to have to do any teaching," he declares. "Now it has elevated itself as a yardstick for promotion."

Lloyd Ulman, director of the Institute of Industrial Relations, and Walter Galenson, author of a dozen studies on international labor, dissent. "Teaching is a nebulous criterion to use in evaluating faculty members," Ulman says. "It is too hard to pin down quality." Galenson, recalling his five years as a professor at Harvard, says he is convinced that teaching is valued more highly at Berkeley, then adds: "We emphasize teaching, but we promote on the basis of research."

Ingerman hammers away at the need for student pressure to keep the professors from downgrading teaching. Galenson ends it: "The way to ruin this university is to increase the teaching load. You'd have faculty desertions *en masse* unless all universities did the same."

Feuds born of the F.S.M. battle still keep some professors from talking to one another, even in line of duty. A few faculty members have moved to other institutions, and a few more are likely to say good-bye in June. Says one of the prospective D.P.'s: "The faculty has been driven into the worst kind of fellow-travelerism. They fear to say anything critical of student pressure groups lest they find themselves blacklisted. The students go around boasting that they're the boss."

But such sentiments seem narrowly confined. Most who hold them are of Social Democratic background, and their political antennae vibrate at every rumbling from the New Left. Among conservatives on the faculty, apprehension about a student *putsch* has abated sharply. One oddly helpful factor in rebuilding faculty unity has been the sheepishness engendered among many professors by a sense that they demonstrated little courage or leadership at some crucial stages of the earlier conflict. This year's meetings of the Academic Senate have been quieter and much smaller, but the spirit of constructive accomplishment has been stronger.

How does it all look to the man who is Big Daddy to all 79,000 students on the University of California's nine campuses—its president, Clark Kerr, around whom much of the fighting swirled a year ago? The one thing he is sure of is that a university is "a surprisingly resilient institution." But his ideas don't stop there. As head of an educational Moloch whose total outlays this year will come to nearly \$700-million, he recognizes—and this is no new discovery for him—that the undergraduate in the giant universities has far too long been neglected.

"Academic reform on his behalf was desirable; it is now also imperative," he says in his measured way. He sees the "politicalization" of the university accelerating and the students moving to new types of political Bohemianism. How they can get much more Bohemian than some of Berkeley's farthest-outers, he does not reveal. As for the faculty, it gets progressively more cosmopolitan, with more and more off-campus ties to industry, government and foundations.

The changes in university rules to keep abreast of this transition have not come fast enough, nor gone far enough, as Berkeley discovered via the explosion route. Kerr, the administrator-philosopher, wonders now whether a new sense of responsibility will match the new freedom. It is one thing to give free rein to lawful political activities, but what happens when the campus is used as a staging ground for activities that cease

being legal after they leave the campus or when outsiders exploit campus freedoms for their own purposes?

These worries beset Kerr as he sits in his lovely glass-walled home on a terraced slope high above San Francisco Bay. But there is no defeatism in his total estimate. He recognizes that Cal's very nature makes it at once a casualty of social stress and a healer of it. In the next academic year 7,100 more students will be on the university's rolls, and the upward movement is so rapid that the long-range projections made in 1960 already have been thrown away as ludicrously inadequate. By the year 2000 the student roster will be at least 273,000.

In this period when technical knowledge is outrunning social intelligence, Berkeley is a precious national asset. The reforms and reappraisals spurred by the student rebellion are making it a better institution of learning. They are also making it a more creative force in a democracy seeking to keep the individual from suffocating in an environment of bigness. Torn a year ago with conflict so determinedly destructive that it often degenerated into nihilism, this campus throbs these days with a search for helpful new answers to the problems of identity and individual purpose.

Yet, paradoxically, these indications of expanded vitality are accompanied by a disturbing sense that Berkeley may be in greater peril of academic decline and political assault than at the seething height of the revolt. For millions in California and the nation, its name has become a synonym for student anarchy; and, even though that image never had much validity and is now principally a product of cultural lag, Berkeley could pay a high price in legislative harassment and in reluctance of outstanding professors from other institutions to join its faculty.

"The essence of a great university," says Cal's credo, "is an atmosphere of freedom. Originality and creativity cannot long breathe any other air." If the infantile extremists on its own campus and the off-campus forces of repression do not combine to obliterate that atmosphere of freedom, Berkeley will remain the great source of new ideas and new skills to serve all men that it has been for nearly a century. It may even become a greater one.

The tendency to focus exclusively on the immediate movements and problems at Berkeley has too often obscured the real Berkeley story—a story of intellectual excellence combined with a commitment to the advancement of knowledge that can benefit all mankind.

Buried, for example, in the tumult and the shouting is the unmatched Berkeley record of service in the Peace Corps. In the 5 years of the Peace Corps' existence, the Berkeley campus has provided almost twice as many applicants as any other college or university in the country. It alone accounts for roughly 10 percent of the acceptances for Peace Corps service. Berkeley students are serving in 37 countries around the world. This year Berkeley became the first university to sign up more than 1,000 students in a single year for the Peace Corps entrance examination.

Here at home where the problems are closer and perhaps even more complex, these students have been equally willing to help. Well over a thousand of them are involved in projects around the bay aimed mainly at raising the education level of minority and underprivileged groups. These include more than 300 students who have worked without pay

each week in the Berkeley schools as tutors, teacher aids and playground directors.

Other students teach high school in San Quentin Prison, teach classes for illiterate, non-English-speaking families in southern Alameda County, counsel potential juvenile delinquents in the big cities, and serve as guides and big brothers for programs which seek to raise the horizons of young people. The many hours spent each week in person to person relationships create a more vivid and realistic understanding of the problems of human despair, ignorance and poverty than can ever be learned or appreciated in the classroom.

Let me emphasize that the sit-in and the picket are simple assignments by comparison with the hour after hour, week after week jobs being done by these hundreds of students.

Training these intellectually exciting students is one of the most distinguished faculties to be found in the world; a faculty which includes nine winners of the world's most coveted award, the Nobel Prize. One cannot, as a matter of fact, think of any area of inquiry—whether in science, social science or the humanities—in which Berkeley scholars are not in the vanguard of probing at the very frontiers of knowledge.

Since the pioneering days of Ernest Lawrence, Emilio Serge, Glenn Seaborg, and others, Berkeley has been the world's center of high energy physics. Today, the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory is pressing forward on a dozen fronts to expand our knowledge on the basic substance of matter.

Scientists in the Hormone Research Laboratory discovered the complete chemical structure of the human growth hormone—a rare and exceedingly important substance they first isolated 10 years ago. From this work there is now a strong hope that human growth hormone can be synthesized and even tailor-made in new forms to treat problems of human dwarfism and other diseases.

Cell physiologists made significant new steps in understanding the process of photosynthesis—which is the basis of all life on earth. Radio astronomers detected a strange new energy phenomenon they call "mysterium" in far reaches of the galaxy. Virologists isolated for the first time the infectious genetic substance from influenza virus particles. Nutritionists conducted fascinating and vital experiments to develop the foods that our astronauts will eat on long-term space voyages. Engineers completed massive tests in a giant fog chamber to aid the development of safer runways and landing techniques for commercial airlines.

Berkeley's pioneering work in understanding the chemistry of human intelligence became the most talked-about topic at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science—an event that drew more than 7,000 scientists to the campus and made Berkeley the world's scientific capital for a week in December of last year.

But Berkeley's excellence has not been limited to the physical sciences. The publication this last year of the sweeping and incisive study of the root causes and forms of anti-Semitism in American Society is only an example of the contributions that have been made here.

In the arts and humanities, in law and social welfare, in economics, political science, and many other schools, colleges, and departments, this great and diverse university has been a leader in teaching and research. Its record stands for itself as a proud monument to what has been achieved and a beacon for the constant search into new paths of learning.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would like to include an article which appeared in the New York Times on June 21 of this year, entitled "The Students' Protest." It is a pointed warning that a Communist does not lurk under every bush of student discontent and that dissent is both the voice of an awakened generation and a path to even higher achievement in higher education:

THE STUDENTS' PROTEST

In characterizing the student protest movement as the creature of the Communist party, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee has impugned the idealism and seriousness of purpose of many young Americans.

Inevitably, Communists and their fellow-travelers have tried to exploit undergraduate dissatisfaction, just as they have attempted to make capital out of legitimate efforts to do battle against social or economic injustices in the past. But the fact is that, after years of apathy, many of the brightest and best young men and women on college campuses have begun to show deep concern over questions of war and peace, civil rights and the quality of the education they seek.

In calling the students' campus grievances "either fraudulent, created, stimulated or exaggerated as a catalytic means of setting off mob explosions," the committee overlooked the fact that conservative and highly respected educators had previously warned that undergraduates on many campuses were becoming the forgotten men. The distinguished American Council on Education last year devoted its annual meeting to what it considered the just grievances of the nation's undergraduates. Moreover, even the violent explosion at Berkeley brought in its wake important educational reforms which promise to improve higher education on campuses across the country.

If objections to present draft procedures may have put student rebels in the same corner with some Communists, they are also in the company of Defense Secretary McNamara and a number of Senators. This fact should remind the committee once again of the dangers of guilt by association—a lesson it never seems to learn.

Mr. HANNA. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL].

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank Congressman HANNA for his dedication to this cause, and for his kindness in providing me this opportunity to speak on this matter.

Mr. Speaker, today the role of our Nation's universities is more vital than ever, and their place in American society more firmly established.

For education is not, and cannot be, for the intellectual improvement of the individual alone.

Education must now more than ever be oriented toward the solution of community, State, and National problems.

A university that imparts a high quality of education for individual improvement and satisfaction, and at the same time instills in its students a sense of mission in the practical and complex affairs of man, and orients them toward fulfilling that mission—such a university is one to be encouraged and praised.

The University of California admirably fulfills the two interrelated goals of improving the individual intellectually and preparing him to utilize his fullest potential for a better world. All campuses in the university system share these goals.

Those of us from the Los Angeles area have special regard and respect for the Los Angeles campus of the University of California.

As the fastest-growing major university in the country, it reflects the vitality that characterizes the southern California environment.

Sharing the entire University of California mantle of academic excellence and sense of purpose, UCLA has, in an incredibly short period of time, developed into a first-rate distinguished university in its own right.

UCLA began in 1919, as a 2-year teachers' college.

In less than half a century, attendance has grown from 250 students to more than 26,000.

The campus has expanded from 25 to 411 acres.

A handful of old buildings has been replaced by 63 modern, well-equipped classroom and laboratory structures.

And the faculty has increased from 30 to 2,200.

The growth has been in quality as well as in quantity, for on the faculty are two Nobel Prize laureates, more than 20 members of the National Academy of Sciences, and scores of Guggenheim, Fulbright, and Bancroft Award winners.

This high academic quality reflects the total commitment to public education that has characterized California since statehood.

The people and the officials of the State have consistently supported this commitment.

They have supported the essential role of education as a cornerstone for a Democratic society.

Today, we take great pride in the fact that from kindergarten through advanced post-doctoral training, the State of California offers tuition-free education for those who can profit from it.

At UCLA, this commitment has been translated into a totally integrated major university composed of 14 schools and colleges, 75 departments, and 30 special research institutes and centers.

The new Health Sciences Center has already become world-famous in the field of medical education and research.

In the arts, the campus has become a major cultural center for the entire Los Angeles metropolitan area.

Its Department of Theater Arts, among the most outstanding in the Nation, has won innumerable awards.

The recent addition of the world-famous Wellcome collection of primitive art to the already extensive UCLA collection has created one of the great national resources that assist us in understanding cultures other than our own.

In the final analysis, however, laboratories, classrooms, and art collections cannot make a school great.

There must be leadership.

An institution must thoroughly understand its mission and be thoroughly committed to its goals and to its purpose in society.

Chancellor Franklin Murphy has given UCLA this kind of leadership, and has repeatedly shown his awareness of the essential purpose of a university.

His recent remarks to the departing graduates at the June 9 commencement summarize his own beliefs and establish this dual course for the university.

I should like to end my own remarks with several statements from Chancellor Murphy's speech. These statements emphasize his feeling of commitment to community and national responsibility:

Over the past century, while our universities were directly applying their talent to society's problems, there has been an enormous quantitative, as well as qualitative, development of scholarship in its purest, non-applied form in these same institutions.

The genius of the American university is that it has shown beyond doubt that it can, at the same time, house and support theory as well as practice, without violence to either, often for the mutual enrichment of both and always to the advantage of the whole society.

We must be in the library, but we must be in Watts.

We must be in the laboratory, but we must also be on the moon.

We will be in the lecture rooms, but we will also be in the operating rooms.

Without apology, indeed with undisturbed and I hope growing commitment, we will serve the world of pure scholarship and the world of man and his problems, and both with distinction.

We can have every confidence that the university will increasingly become the vigorous beating heart of the society and will never be in danger of becoming its irrelevant and vestigial appendix.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. TUNNEY].

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues from California in honoring a great educational system, the University of California.

There is a campus of the University of California in my district. The UCR campus was established in Riverside in 1907 as an experiment station in citrus agriculture. The station moved to the present site in 1917. In 1954 the college of letters and science opened with 127 students; and the graduate division and

college of agriculture were instituted in 1960 and 1961 respectively, following the designation of UCR as a general campus of the university in 1959.

Today more than 3,100 students attend UCR majoring in a variety of academic fields complete through the Ph. D. degree. UCR expects an enrollment of at least 10,000 by 1970. The citrus research center and agricultural experiment station in its more than 50 years of operation has become a world center for research in its special fields.

UCR now includes the college of letters and science, college of agriculture, graduate division, citrus research center, and agricultural experiment station of southern California regional headquarters of the agricultural extension service, university extension regional office, air pollution research center, Phillip L. Boyd Desert Research Center, and Dry Lands Research Institute.

Research carried on here is proving invaluable to the solution of various problems affecting the local community, the State, and the Nation.

The University of California is one of the finest educational systems in the world and continues to be responsible for great strides in educational progress.

The chancellor of the University of California, Riverside, Mr. Ivan Hinderaker, has demonstrated in the past 2 years that he is capable of meeting the challenges of university education for the future.

There are now at the University of California, Riverside, 834 graduate students in 16 Ph. D. and 23 M.A. programs.

It is really quite an outstanding example of what can be done.

I submit for the RECORD a statement and various articles concerning the University of California, Riverside:

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, RIVERSIDE

Among the general campuses of the University of California, Riverside, along with Davis and Santa Barbara, might be called second generation.

Berkeley and Los Angeles, then, are first generation, with both at or near an enrollment of 27,500 students, and with both already highly developed in graduate and professional schools and a broad range of research institutes as well as in undergraduate instruction.

The third generation would include the Irvine and Santa Cruz campuses which opened in 1965, and San Diego, which began operation as a general campus the same year.

University of California, Riverside, admitted its first students in 1954. In that year there were 130 undergraduates; in the fall of 1965, there were 2,700.

Graduate Division offerings date from 1960, with 20 graduate students that year. In 1965, there were 834 graduate students in 16 Ph. D. and 23 M.A. programs.

The College of Agriculture began functioning in 1961, developing out of the Agricultural Experiment Station which was established in Riverside in 1907 and which has been located on the site of the UCR campus since 1917.

Professional schools will include a School of Engineering, and a Graduate School of Administration, both to begin operation in 1967.

Principal research institutes relate to the study of land, air, and water resources and their inter-relationships in the environment. UCR is the headquarters for the university-

wide and interdisciplinary Dry Lands Research Institute and the Air Pollution Research Center.

Out of its agriculture component, UCR has gained worldwide recognition for its comprehensive research on all aspects of the production of citrus and avocados.

UCR's second mark of distinction is a level of quality in undergraduate instruction which has earned for this campus a ranking with the best of undergraduate educational opportunities in the country.

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

Throughout the planning for the College of Letters and Science at Riverside and during the first years of operation, the concept of the instructional program was exclusively undergraduate liberal arts. In addition to the undergraduate liberal arts focus, the plan called also for a relatively small number of students—a "Swarthmore-type" of institution within the University of California. Members of the faculty were recruited not just as faculty members, but because each had a deep sense of commitment to the undergraduate student, to creating an environment where faculty and students might work closely together, to academic excellence, and to remaining a small liberal arts college.

In 1959, The Regents designated UCR a general campus of the University. Although the original limited-purpose campus plan has been changed, faculty concern about the undergraduate mission and academic excellence has continued as one of the most important characteristics of UCR. These faculty attitudes, in turn, have produced a similar kind of commitment to academic excellence in the general student body. And out of the interaction between this kind of faculty and this kind of undergraduate students has come such comparative evidences of outstanding results as the following:

Some 55 percent of UCR graduates go on to graduate or professional schools.

In a recent report of the American Council on Education ranking colleges and universities in the percentage of national graduate fellowship winners among those who earned bachelors' degrees in the years 1960 through 1963, UCR was in 12th position along with Pomona and Wesleyan. Among public institutions, UCR was second after Queens College; among institutions classified as "major recipients of federal science research funds," it was third after Caltech and M.I.T. On the Pacific Coast, UCR and Pomona were ranked together after Caltech and Reed College.

In another study, covering the past 20 years, the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation ranks UCR fifth among California institutions in the total number of Woodrow Wilson Fellowships won (after University of California, Berkeley, Stanford, UCLA and Pomona). Although the implications are broader than undergraduate education, it is in point to cite here also the 1966 Guggenheim Foundation announcement of faculty fellowships. The Foundation lists the institutions in the order of number of fellowships awarded on each campus. UCR had six, ranking 12th nationally after Berkeley with 27; Columbia, 15; Pennsylvania, 13; UCLA and Yale, 11 each; Harvard, 10; Princeton, 9; Cornell and Chicago, 8 each; and Illinois and Minnesota, 7 each.

Such data as these represent only crude indices of something as difficult to measure as quality of undergraduate education. The data, however, do reinforce conclusions reached some time ago by UCR undergraduate students and faculty. Both groups, in fact, tend to take a "marine corps" type of pride in what they, together, have had a part in creating on the Riverside campus.

As UCR's enrollment increases and as general campus functions continue to broaden,

much is being done to insure a continuing high quality of undergraduate instruction. With the aid of a grant from The Regents, an Educational Evaluation Committee of the faculty has recently completed an 18 months study which suggests future academic directions for the campus. Its twenty-five major recommendations are now being considered for action by the faculty and administration.

The recommendations are too detailed and too wide-ranging in subject matter to be summarized meaningfully here. But several of the proposals in one area, Experimental Undergraduate Programs, might be cited as illustrative of the approach of the Committee.

1. Undergraduate Houses—These Houses would provide a physical center where relatively small numbers of students could study and live together, creating an atmosphere in which learning becomes an integral part of a total way of life shared by all. Several Houses would offer quite diverse curricula and different styles of instruction, but all would be administrative sub-units of the College of Letters and Science.

2. Freshman Tutorials—The tutorial technique can be profitably adapted for use at the entering freshman level, particularly in the student's intended major or field of general interest. The Report suggests: "During his first, critical quarter each freshman . . . would have a responsible member of the faculty, whom he really knew, naturally and conveniently available to him in case of need. The tutor meanwhile could watch the progress of his group through the quarter and be in a position to help its members cope with their problems before they reached a magnitude to be overwhelming. This argument for the freshman tutorial will, we believe, become increasingly cogent as the campus increases in size."

3. Intensive Single Area Course (ISAC)—The ISAC program would create groups of entering freshmen, from 100 to 150 students each, with each group dedicating its attention to one single academic area for one quarter. The group would then reorganize for the study of another single area (usually interdisciplinary) for the next quarter. There might be four ISAC quarters—two in the humanities and one each in the social and natural sciences. The Report comments: "After the same group of people have met together repeatedly they know something of each other's ideas, capabilities, and interests; hence they can carry on discussion at a higher and more productive level than if they were new to each other."

4. The Structured Minor—This would be an alternative to general College of Letters and Science breadth requirements. The student could pursue intensive work in an area well removed from his major. A carefully selected number and pattern of courses, cutting across department and divisional lines, would constitute the minor. "The Committee recommends this as an alternative in the belief that the liberally educated man need not be simply the one who, in addition to a preparation for professional training, has had an introduction to Letters, Arts, and Sciences, but may also be the one who demonstrates a genuine depth of understanding of a subject of his interest outside his professional balliwick."

Several experimental adaptations of these and other Educational Evaluation Committee recommendations for undergraduate education are underway. All of them aim toward the introduction of greater flexibility in the undergraduate program—flexibility to better enable each individual student to develop as closely as possible up to his own level of potential.

Undergraduate instruction in the College of Letters and Science is organized in the several departments of the humanities and

fine arts, social sciences, life sciences, physical sciences. There are undergraduate majors in 29 fields, all leading to the A.B. degree. Course work is provided for elementary and secondary teaching credentials, although there is no major in education or physical education. Pre-professional work in the College of Letters and Science is available for most professional fields.

Undergraduate instruction in the College of Agriculture began in 1961 with a curriculum representing a wide departure from traditional patterns of agricultural education in the United States. At Riverside, the emphasis is placed on providing a broad general undergraduate education, with good breadth in the humanities and social sciences, as well as solid training in the basic biological and physical sciences. Under the single agricultural science curriculum, students may elect fields of interest from agronomy, biochemistry, entomology (including biological control), horticultural science, nematology, plant pathology, soils and plant nutrition, and vegetable crops. The breadth of the program provides for students going on to graduate school a flexibility in selecting their fields of study at the graduate level to a degree generally not possible for those from highly specialized undergraduate programs.

Other features of student life at UCR include opportunities for original undergraduate research in such laboratory sciences as biology and chemistry or, more generally, in departments which offer the senior thesis. The opportunities also include programs offered by undergraduate language houses for French, German, and Spanish. These houses provide a rich variety of academically oriented extracurricular activities in addition to promoting oral facility in the languages.

GRADUATE EDUCATION

Limited graduate study opportunities in agriculture were available on the Riverside campus for many years before 1960 through off-campus degree programs under which graduate students who had completed all formal course work and preliminary degree requirements on another University of California campus were permitted to pursue research problems at Riverside. In such cases, however, the degrees were awarded, upon completion of requirements, by the campus of origin.

Following the designation of the Riverside campus as a general campus of the University, plans were formulated to undertake graduate instruction as an integral part of the total campus curriculum. By the fall semester of 1960, a program leading to M.A. and Ph. D degrees in chemistry was initiated, with 17 students enrolled. In the spring of 1961, additional programs leading to the M.A. degree in physics and the general elementary and general secondary teaching credentials were undertaken, with an additional 19 students. In the fall of 1961, M.S. and Ph. D work was available in entomology, plant biochemistry, plant pathology and soil science. Since then, growth has been rapid.

In 1965, there were 834 graduate students of whom 648 were enrolled in departments in the College of Letters and Science and 186 in the College of Agriculture. There were Ph. D. programs in anthropology, biochemistry, biology, chemistry, comparative literature, economics, English, entomology, French, geological sciences, history, mathematics, physics, plant pathology, plant science, political science, psychology, soil science, and Spanish. M.A. or M.S. programs could be selected in these Ph. D. fields and, in addition, in geography, German, music, philosophy, and sociology.

Programs beyond the baccalaureate degree leading to teaching credentials with specialization in elementary, secondary, and junior college teaching and for the teaching of exceptional children are also administered through the Graduate Division.

UCR's first Ph.D. was granted in January 1963. In the spring of 1966, 40 Ph.D. degrees were conferred: 14 in agriculture fields, 11 in physics, 8 in chemistry, 4 in mathematics, 2 in zoology, and 1 in history. M.A. and M.S. degrees totaled 88.

CONTINUING EDUCATION

University of California Extension, Riverside, has responsibility for continuing education programs in Riverside and San Bernardino Counties. Over 12,000 students enroll annually in approximately 450 courses in 25 communities. Special programs are scheduled in the population centers of Riverside, San Bernardino and Ontario, and in more distant and somewhat isolated communities as Barstow, Needles and Blythe. Increase in enrollment is 20 percent annually.

About 60 percent of Extension students hold undergraduate degrees, and an additional 20 percent hold such advanced degrees as LL.B., M.A., Ed.D., and M.D. Except for 3 percent, the remainder have done some work in a college or university.

Teachers comprise the largest portion of Extension student population, some 50 percent. Students electing work in business, engineering, and technical subjects make up about 25 percent. Government employees studying social welfare, probation, environmental problems, and resource utilization account for another 10 percent of the enrollment. The balance are interested citizens (physicians, attorneys, community leaders, housewives) who register in a variety of courses, lecture series, one-day conferences, and discussion groups. These programs consider community, state, national, and international issues, cultural and social problems, and other subjects which the participants see as contributing to their intellectual and personal development.

Interdisciplinary lecture series presented in recent years include: Politics of Urban Upheaval, The Urban Environment, The Renaissance and Twentieth Century Man, California Water Resources, Recent Developments in the Social Sciences, The Development of Creative Abilities, Education of Gifted Children, Controversial Issues in the Classroom, Communism in Theory and Practice, and The Negro in American Society.

One-fourth of the programs of University Extension are specially designed to refresh and extend the professional and civil knowledge of adults by presenting the most recent results of research and other scholarship. The programs utilize community leaders and specialists as well as academic staff as teachers. Various formats including courses, conferences, lecture series are used in presenting these programs.

AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION

The Agricultural Experiment Station conducts research on a broad spectrum of subjects ranging from fundamental problems of cellular and molecular biology, plant and invertebrate animal ecology, basic aspects of breeding and culture and protection of plants to the application of such information to the applied problems of agriculture. The work is being done on 550 acres of campus land in Riverside, on an 840 acre tract in nearby Moreno Valley, and at field stations in Tulare, Orange, Imperial, Los Angeles, and Ventura counties; and with cooperating growers throughout the central and southern portions of California.

At the 50th anniversary of the Agricultural Experiment Station in 1957, a citrus industry leader said that accomplishments by scientists at the Station "have frequently been the difference between the life and death of certain of our agricultural industries." What have the Riverside scientists accomplished in more than half a century?

When the Experiment Station was established in 1907, there was little scientific knowledge about citrus growing. Today

there is no other fruit—except possibly the apple—about which more is known. This is true because of projects such as the rootstock studies started in 1913. Horticulturists found that the vigor of the scion, or top, could make up for a less vigorous rootstock. One of the most valuable rootstocks the citrus industry now possesses is the Troyer citrange. Resistant to tristeza, hardier in cold weather, fast-growing in old citrus soil, Troyer rootstocks are used on about two-thirds of the two million citrus trees propagated yearly in California.

The discovery and control of brown rot gummosis laid the foundation for research by others that developed virus-free and virus-resistant citrus strains. University of California scientists found that tristeza—a worldwide "killer" disease of citrus—is caused by a virus.

One of the most far-reaching contributions to scientific knowledge was the work on black alkali soils in the 1920's. This provided the first complete explanation of the origin and nature of black alkali soils, which led to the reclamation of many thousands of acres throughout the world.

An early and serious affliction of the citrus industry was mottle leaf which causes leaves to lose chlorophyll, leaving only ribs and veins of green, and decreasing the size of fruit, its quality and yield. Studies pinpointed the cause of mottle leaf as a zinc deficiency which could be overcome by zinc sprays.

Another Experiment Station accomplishment enabled growers to make a profitable shift in marketing navel oranges and to increase the size of the fruit. Horticulturists discovered that spraying navel orange trees with 2,4-D held the fruit on the trees. This achievement gave new life also to the state's grapefruit industry by making it possible to keep fruit on trees until it could reach maximum quality and be sold at the best price.

The first commercially successful synthetic organic acaricide—a dinitrophenol compound—was developed in the late 1930's. For many years this was the walnut and citrus growers' chief weapon against red spider mites.

One Experiment Station project alone eliminated a large economic loss to California citrus growers. The citrophilus mealybug, which appeared in 1913, spread rapidly, and by the mid-1920's was affecting more than 100,000 acres of citrus. In 1927 an entomologist went to Australia to seek a natural enemy of the mealybug. Two of the parasites he found thrived when released in California. Within a year the mealybug ceased to be an economic threat.

Members of the citrus industry generally consider the Experiment Station's work with parathion, malathion and other new pesticides to be among its foremost contributions. Shortly after the organochlorine and organic phosphorus compounds appeared during World War II, Station entomologists found DDT and parathion to be highly effective in controlling citrus pests. Within a few years these and other new compounds replaced cyanide fumigation and partially replaced oil sprays.

Riverside entomologists not only pioneered in developing new insecticides, but also played a leading role in determining how insects are able to resist once-lethal chemicals after a few years of exposure to them. These scientists were instrumental, too, in devising ever more sensitive methods of detecting the residues of chemicals applied for insect control. From this research came a complete methodology for finding and measuring residues.

"Plants that bite back" is a phrase frequently used to describe crops treated with systemic insecticides. Fed to the plant by spraying on leaves, through irrigation water or by direct injection, these compounds enter

the sap system, and insects feeding on the plant are killed. Riverside entomologists devised a way of applying a systemic to cotton plants. Whole infestations of mites and aphids could then be wiped out.

Teamwork has characterized University investigations of agricultural problems, and nowhere is this better illustrated than in control of the spotted alfalfa aphid. Alfalfa growers lost several million dollars each year from 1954 to 1957 in extra control costs and unmarketable alfalfa because of the aphid. By 1958 a University-wide team reduced the aphid to the status of a minor pest by developing better chemical controls, by spreading beneficial insects imported from the Middle East and by introducing aphid-resistant types of alfalfa.

Riverside biological control experts have fought successful campaigns against three other pests: the walnut aphid, the pea aphid, and the green peach aphid. Imported wasps colonized and distributed in infested fields brought these pests under control.

In 1953 the khapra beetle became a serious pest of stored grain in California, Arizona, and New Mexico. By using University tested chemicals, state and federal officials initiated a program which achieved complete eradication of the insect.

Nematologists found a way to fumigate nematode-infested soil so that new trees could safely be planted. Safe methods were found for treating soil around growing trees in mature orchards. In general, these treatments have increased yields by from one to three boxes of fruit per tree a year. Similar increases have been obtained by treating land planted to vegetables.

Weed control by chemicals is an important phase of Riverside's work. Plant Physiologists have established safe and effective methods of using new chemicals that often have cut weed control costs in half.

DRY LANDS RESEARCH INSTITUTE

The Dry Lands Research Institute was created by The Regents in November 1963. In announcing its establishment, President Kerr noted the importance of dry land regions of the earth to the existing population, the vital need to learn how to use them for the benefit of the vastly increased numbers of people foreseen in the future, and the opportunity which exists to aid in this through significant, long-range research programs and related training activities in agricultural, biological, physical, and social sciences.

The objectives of the Institute are: to create a major center for interdisciplinary research on significant problems relating to man's use of the dry regions of the earth; to institute training programs to develop experts who can manage such dry land areas; and to serve as a vehicle for the extension of university research and instruction into important dry land areas abroad. Headquartered at Riverside, the Institute is a University-wide organization. Principal support for the Institute has come from the Rockefeller Foundation.

AIR POLLUTION RESEARCH CENTER

The Air Pollution Research Center was established on the Riverside campus in 1961 as an organized research unit to further University-wide faculty research and teaching in the various phases of air pollution. The objectives of the Center include: identification of pollutants and a study of their effects upon man, and biological and physical systems; studies of the fundamental chemical and physical reactions of pollutants in the atmosphere and their impact upon air quality; evaluation of community, industrial, and agricultural sources of pollution, and meteorological factors involved in the pollution of man's air environment; assessment of the effects of air pollution and control measures on the economic, social, and political life of the state; and development of the concept of

air resource use and management for man's domestic, industrial, and recreational needs.

The Center serves as a central agency to stimulate, solicit, and support statewide faculty participation in research areas requiring investigation, bolster research in critical areas, encourage and arrange for postdoctoral visitor participation in the statewide program, and sponsor graduate student participation in departmental activities organized under the aegis of the Center. In addition to facilitating cooperation among the all-campus faculty participants, the Center collects and distributes timely information among scientific workers and conducts intracampus seminars and conferences in all fields relating to air pollution.

[From the UCR Highlander, Nov. 17, 1965]

CHANCELLOR'S COLUMN—EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY SCHOLARSHIPS SUPPORTED

(By Ivan Hinderaker)

This column is in support of ASUCR's Fall Drive for the Educational Opportunity Scholarship Program.

Five students this year hold such scholarships. All were scouted for UCR, and sold on UCR, by Life Science Professor Eugene H. Cota-Robles through his work in the Mexican-American Movement.

This organization has worked in area high schools, attempting to counsel Mexican-American students. It has provided stimulus to students for continuing their education, and has sought scholarship funds for individuals of high promise.

The five Educational Opportunity Scholars have that kind of promise. The story of each is different, but all share in the desire to make a special contribution to the advancement of the Mexican-American community within the setting of our U.S. society.

Two want to become secondary school teachers; two seek careers in medicine; one, in journalism or law.

Next year it is our hope to double the program and to include students from other groups. From what has been a one-to-one matching arrangement, the Regents recently agreed to match five-to-one funds raised by students, faculty, and staff, and by others locally.

The returns to UCR in general, and to students in particular for our individual efforts in this drive will be great. I invite your generous contributions.

There is news elsewhere in this issue about the Cal-Club coordinated bake sale, International Club Dinner auctions on Sunday, movie concessions on Friday and Saturday and opportunities to contribute at the Political Union debate on Viet Nam on Friday and the UCR-Cal Lutheran football game on Saturday.

To this should be added the chance to send checks made out to The Regents (for UCR Educational Opportunity Scholarships) to Ralph Allison, Chairman of the Fall Drive Committee, ASUCR. If you should forget Mr. Allison's name or address, the Chancellor's Office will be happy to receive and transmit your contribution.

Although we can't always live up to the ideal, one of the great things about American society is the opportunity for anyone to advance, provided he has the ability and is willing to put out the effort. Often it is education which opens the door. Increasingly is education a necessity.

All men are not born equal. That is something which cannot be.

Something which can be, however, is an environment in which, for all men, there is an equal opportunity—never perfect, perhaps, but nonetheless an equal opportunity.

That is what the Educational Opportunity Scholarship Program is all about. That is what leads me to hope that soon we can go far beyond scholarships, working with other

public and private segments of education in the Inland Empire toward a massive attack on the problem of development of human potential.

[From the Regents' meeting, May 22, 1964]
THE CITRUS RESEARCH CENTER AND AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION

The year 1907 was full of exciting new developments. Marconi began operating his transatlantic wireless telegraph. The U.S. Army called for the first bids on a practical airplane, and Army engineers took over work on the Panama Canal. It was a year when you could buy a Cadillac for \$800 or a Success Automobile for \$250, with rubber tires optional. William Jennings Bryan was nominated for the Presidency—San Francisco was already rebuilding on its ruins—and the University of California founded the Citrus Experiment Station at Riverside.

It was a good year for citrus crops and yields worth \$5,000 an acre were by no means exceptional—yet Southern California growers had called for scientific help.

Competitors were springing up in Florida, northern California, Puerto Rico and South Africa. Since 1873, when the first navel orange trees arrived in Riverside, local growers had fought to establish their industry against obstacles consisting of plant disease, irrigation problems, nutritional deficiencies, occasional frosts and inevitable insect pests. These were the problems citrus men wanted the Station to solve.

Yet the first head of the Citrus Experiment Station, Professor Ralph E. Smith, prophetically told growers at a citrus institute held in Riverside in 1907: "This . . . is not necessarily an exclusively citrus experiment station. . . . While its greatest efforts must naturally be in this direction . . . there are problems relating to other fruits and products. . . . Such matters will receive the proper consideration."

At its founding, the Citrus Experiment Station consisted of two small cottages and a stable on the eastern slope of Mt. Rubidoux, about four miles west of the present Riverside campus. Its two-man staff conducted fertilizer experiments but performed little other research.

EARLY DEVELOPMENT

Professor Smith was succeeded by Professor J. Elliot Coit, who served as Superintendent of the Station from 1911 to 1912. He was followed in 1913 by Professor Herbert John Webber, the first man to hold the title of Director of the Citrus Experiment Station.

In 1914, CES had a total staff of 18 and an annual budget of \$60,000. Its 11 research men were busy turning out information on fertilizers, rootstocks, new varieties of citrus, orchard heating, citrus diseases, packing-house problems, and nematodes—the insidious soil worms that had just been found in almost every section of California.

In 1917 Professor Webber and his staff moved into a newly constructed building three miles east of downtown Riverside. The three-story Spanish-type building, with a south wing, sat in isolation on the lower slopes of the Box Springs Mountains. Photographs taken by Professor Webber show a treeless sweep of rock-strewn hills, with a smogless view extending to the mountains north of San Bernardino. In 1931 a second wing was added to the main CES building and grass, hedges, flowers and trees lent beauty to the masonry.

Following Professor Webber as Director was the late Professor Leon D. Batchelor who, like his predecessor, was a former Cornell University staff member. He became Director in 1929 and served 22 years in that capacity. The Station continued to expand in staff, reflecting the rapid growth of California agriculture. During his 38 years on the CES staff (1915-53), Professor Batchelor saw

the Station's land area grow from 30 to almost 1,000 acres, and in staff from 265 members.

One of the first agriculturists to realize the value of statistics and experimental plot design, Professor Batchelor initiated many of the long-term fertilizer experiments at Riverside. He helped the walnut industry solve problems involving diseases, processing and shipping. For the citrus industry he initiated the development of better rootstocks and varieties needed to combat disease and improve fruit quality. As administrator, he continued and strengthened Professor Webber's policy of hiring capable people and letting them work, free and uninterrupted.

The Station continued to expand in physical facilities, personnel and research activities under Dr. Alfred M. Boyce, who became its Director in 1952. CES scientists occupied most of a large new building, Webber Hall, in 1954. A cluster of structures appeared around the main entomology building between 1958 and 1961, the last being the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Boyden Entomological Laboratory. Greenhouses and other smaller structures stretched out like rows of dominoes. Agricultural land was increased to 1,100 acres as scientists' needs increased.

A vegetable crops group from Davis was added in 1955 and agronomists from Davis began operations at UCR in 1961. In the near future, it is expected that agricultural engineers from Davis and Los Angeles, ornamental and subtropical fruit horticulturists from Los Angeles, and perhaps agricultural economists from Berkeley will be transferred to Riverside.

CES: A MISNOMER

As the Station broadened its studies, the name Citrus Experiment Station became more and more of a misnomer. In 1961, therefore, the Regents renamed it the Citrus Research Center and Agricultural Experiment Station. This action recognized the changes wrought in 56 years; the Station had reached into areas far removed from citrus, yet it also remained the "world headquarters" for citrus research.

Since agricultural research requires large acreages, the campus in 1962 acquired 840 acres in nearby Moreno Valley, principally for field and vegetable crop studies. Riverside scientists and Extension specialists also use land at University field stations in Imperial, Orange, Los Angeles, Fresno and Tulare counties. Equally important to their work are the hundreds of acres lent to them by cooperating growers for use as test plots.

Currently CRC's staff consists of 350 academic and non-academic personnel. Its researchers have established international reputations in irrigation, soils and plant nutrition, insect control through chemical and biological methods, plant breeding, plant diseases, nematology, horticulture, vegetable crops and the biochemistry of citrus and avocado fruits. For studies of air pollution as it affects agriculture, Riverside is indisputably the nation's research headquarters. UCR became the University's focal point for smog investigations when the Air Pollution Research Center was established in 1961.

COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE FORMED

Following closely upon their awarding of general campus status to UCR, The Regents in 1960 authorized formation of a College of Agriculture, with Dr. Boyce as its Dean. In developing the curriculum, faculty members of the new college decided to throw out old approaches that no longer seemed appropriate. Courses were designed to supply modern agriculture's need for more broadly educated men and women with a firm foundation in the fundamental sciences and the liberal arts. The aim was—and is—to give students a broad knowledge of the natural science; an acquaintance with the whole

science of agriculture; a good knowledge of the humanities and social sciences; and a limited amount of specialization.

The College of Agriculture, although drawing upon the time and resources of research people, does not divert them from turning out information needed by agriculture's advancing technology. Moreover, graduate students conduct fundamental research on many problems of concern to the over-all agricultural research program.

The reputation of the Experiment Station in studies of problems in arid and subtropical agriculture has attracted graduate students from all parts of California, many other states and more than a dozen foreign countries. About 20 percent of UCR's total enrollment in the Graduate Division—more than 500 in the fall of 1963—consists of candidates for higher degrees in the agricultural sciences.

AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SOUTHERN HEAD-QUARTERS

To aid in the extension of research information to farmers, UCR in 1954 was made headquarters for the southern region of the U.S. Agricultural Extension Service, with Assistant Director Harold W. Schwalm supervising the work of 20 Extension specialists and 75 farm and home advisers. Extension people work with the Citrus Research Center and Agricultural Experiment Station in bringing research findings to growers in San Diego, Imperial, Riverside, San Bernardino, Los Angeles, Ventura, Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo, Kern, Fresno, Tulare, Madera, Inyo and Mono counties.

Farmers in this area produce fruits, nuts, livestock, field and vegetable crops with an annual market value of about \$1.7 billion, or half of California's total farm production.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF UCR SCIENTISTS

What have the Riverside scientists accomplished in more than half a century of work with soil auger, sweep net, test tube and microscope?

The late Professor Howard Fawcett is credited with one of the greatest contributions to world citrus production: the finding that brown rot gummosis, which decays lemons and infects the bark of lemon, orange, and grapefruit trees, can be controlled by copper sprays. Professor Fawcett also showed that infected bark could be removed to save the tree from dying. The control of many other fungus diseases followed from his research. He and Professor Leo J. Klotz were the first to identify psoriasis, the earliest virus disease known in citrus. This discovery laid the foundation for research by others that developed virus-free and virus-resistant citrus strains. Professor Fawcett and Plant Pathologist J. M. Wallace showed that tristeza—a worldwide "killer" disease of citrus—is caused by a virus. Today tristeza can be overcome through the use of resistant rootstocks.

As has been noted, walnut growers were among the first beneficiaries of research by the Citrus Experiment Station. (Until the mid-1930's, the state's walnut industry was centered in Southern California.) Professor Batchelor, seeking a way to prevent losses that occurred when whole crops had moldy, discolored kernels, found a simple solution: irrigate late in the season. This promoted the cracking of husks, making nuts drop clean and speeding the harvest. He also promoted artificial dehydration to further hasten processing, which allowed early merchandising to take advantage of the Christmas season trade.

One of the most far-reaching contributions to scientific knowledge was Professor Emeritus W. P. Kelley's work on black alkali soils in the 1920's. He provided the first complete explanation of the origin and nature of black alkali soils, which led to the reclamation of many thousands of acres throughout the world.

An early and serious affliction of the citrus industry was mottle leaf which causes leaves to lose chlorophyll, leaving only ribs and veins of green, and decreasing the size of fruit, its quality and yield. Studies by Professor W. H. Chandler, D. R. Hoagland, Agriculturalist J. C. Johnston and Professor E. R. Parker of Riverside, plus work by Florida researchers, pinpointed the cause of mottle leaf as a zinc deficiency which could be overcome by zinc sprays.

When the Riverside Experiment Station was established in 1907, there was little scientific knowledge about citrus growing. Today there is no other fruit—except possibly the apple—about which more is known. This is true because of projects such as the rootstock studies started by Professor Webber soon after his arrival in 1913. In 1929 this work was intensified by Professor Batchelor. Horticulturists found that the vigor of the scion, or top, could make up for a less vigorous rootstock. One of the most valuable rootstocks the citrus industry now possesses is the Troyer citrange. Resistant to tristeza, hardier in cold weather, fast-growing in old citrus soil, Troyer rootstocks are used on about two-thirds of the two million California citrus trees propagated yearly.

Another CES accomplishment enabled growers to make a profitable shift in marketing navel oranges and to increase the size of the fruit. Horticulturist William Stewart discovered that spraying navel orange trees with 2,4-D held the fruit on the trees until the beginning of the main Valencia orange season (June-July). Before 2,4-D, the fruit had to be picked by March, which hindered the controlled marketing of the fruit. Mr. Stewart's work also gave new life to the state's grapefruit industry by making it possible to keep fruit on trees until it could reach maximum quality and be sold at the best price. All packinghouses now treat lemons with 2,4-D to prevent black bottom fungus. This work by Mr. Stewart, in collaboration with Plant Physiologist Louis Erickson, removed what had been a very serious processing problem for the lemon industry.

The first commercially successful synthetic organic acaricide—a dinitro-phenol compound—was developed largely by Dean Boyce in the late 1930's. For many years this was the walnut and citrus growers' chief weapon against red spider mites, important pests affecting these industries. Dean Boyce's experiments with antimony compounds led to the use of tarter emetic for control of citrus thrips. He was also involved in pioneering work with DDT and several other new compounds for controlling walnut and citrus pests.

One CRC project alone has eliminated a large economic loss to California citrus growers. The citrophilus mealybug, which appeared in 1913, spread rapidly and by the mid-1920's was affecting more than 100,000 acres of citrus. It not only reduced the size of the crop but forced growers to pick fruit before it could be marketed profitably—otherwise the fruit would drop to the ground. In 1927 Professor Harry Scott Smith, founder and head of the University's unique Department of Biological Control, sent Biological Control Specialist Harold Compere to Australia to seek a natural enemy of the mealybug. Two of the parasites Mr. Compere found thrived when released in California. Within a year the mealybug ceased to be of economic importance. By allowing proper marketing of lemons and oranges, this success has added substantially to the value of each box of citrus fruit the state sells (current production: 30 million boxes yearly).

Shortly after the organochlorine and organic phosphorus compounds appeared during World War II, Station entomologists found DDT and parathion to be highly effective in controlling citrus pests. Within

a few years these and other new compounds replaced cyanide fumigation and partially replaced oil sprays. Members of the citrus industry generally consider CRC's work with parathion, malathion and other new pesticides to be among its foremost contributions.

Riverside entomologists not only pioneered in developing new insecticides (especially the widely used carbamates), but also played a leading role in determining how insects are able to resist once-lethal chemicals after a few years of exposure to them. These scientists were instrumental, too, in devising ever more sensitive methods of detecting the residues of chemicals applied for insect control. From this research has come a complete methodology for finding and measuring residues. The techniques have been widely used in obtaining federal approval for the safe use of commercial insecticides.

"Plants that bite back" is a phrase frequently used to describe crops treated with systemic insecticides. Fed to the plant by spraying on leaves through irrigation water or by direct injection, these compounds enter the sap system, and insects feeding on the plant are killed. Riverside entomologists, headed by Professor Robert L. Metcalf, devised a way of applying a systemic to cotton plants. Whole infestations of mites and aphids could then be wiped out, eliminating troubles in picking, ginning and spinning that were caused by the sticky substance given off by the aphids.

Teamwork has always characterized University investigations of agricultural problems, and nowhere is this better illustrated than by U.C. response to the Sherman-like march of the spotted alfalfa aphid through California from 1954 to 1957. Alfalfa growers lost several million dollars each year in extra control costs and unmarketable alfalfa. By 1958 a University-wide team including biological control specialists, insect pathologists, entomologists and agronomists reduced the aphid to the status of a minor pest by developing better chemical controls, by spreading beneficial insects (imported from the Middle East) throughout the state and by introducing aphid-resistant types of alfalfa. Riverside entomologists played a major role in this victory over the spotted alfalfa aphid. Among these, the principal investigators were Associate Entomologist Robert van den Bosch, Associate Professors E. I. Schlinger and I. M. Hall, and Professor Robert Dickson.

Recently Riverside biological control experts have fought successful campaigns against three other pests: the walnut aphid, the pea aphid and the green peach aphid. Imported wasps colonized and distributed in infested fields by Mr. Schlinger and Mr. van den Bosch brought these pests under control. And there are strong indications that red scale—a pest that once cost citrus growers \$10 million a year—has greatly diminished under the combined attack of effective chemicals and University-imported wasps from Asia, the latter program being headed by Professor Paul De Bach.

In 1953 the khapra beetle became a serious pest of stored grain in limited areas of California, Arizona and New Mexico. Entomologist David L. Lindgren led a Riverside effort to find chemicals that would stamp it out. Methyl bromide and malathion turned out to be the answer, and by using these chemicals, state and federal officials initiated a program which achieved complete eradication of the insect in 1962.

About 95 percent of California's 230,000 acres of citrus land (and of all other farmland, for that matter) is infested with nematodes. These tiny subterranean worms attack plant roots, causing production losses of 10 to 30 per cent. Nematologist R. C. Baines, in cooperation with Fred Foote of the Limoneira Co., Santa Paula, found a way

to fumigate infested soil so that new trees could safely be planted. Recently Baines found safe methods of treating soil around growing trees in mature orchards. In general, these treatments have increased yields by from one to three boxes of fruit (lemons and oranges) per tree a year. Similar increases have been obtained by Nematologist I. J. Thomason by treating land planted to vegetables.

Weed control by chemicals is an important phase of Riverside's work. Plant Physiologist Boyse Day's weed control group has established safe and effective methods of using new chemicals such as simazine and monuron, working out accurate dosages for many crops growing in many kinds of soil. Often weed control costs have been cut in half through use of these chemicals.

BETTER IRRIGATION

The widespread adoption of tensiometers by growers of citrus, avocados and vegetables can be attributed to UCR studies by Professor Sterling Richards and his colleagues as well as to the "missionary" work of Agricultural Extension personnel in showing farmers how to use these soil moisture-measuring instruments. Better irrigation almost invariably results from their use, with consequent increases in yield and sometimes a saving of water.

Improvement of citrus varieties—a top-priority program in the California citrus industry—was made possible by the work of Howard Frost, Associate Plant Breeder, who in the 1920's investigated the invigorating qualities of nucellar seedlings. Since nucellars originate from seed, and virus diseases are not usually transmitted by seed, nucellars do not contain virus diseases; hence they produce better fruit. The use of nucellar seedlings thus provides the key to constant improvement of California citrus fruit quality.

MECHANIZED PICKING?

A Riverside horticultural project is speeding the mechanization of the citrus harvest. Early tests of a tree-working machine showed great promise and an improved version is under construction. Related to this project is industry's widespread adoption in the last three years of the "rapid pack" system of citrus packing, brainchild of the same UCR scientist, Professor Roy J. Smith. The system cuts packing costs by 25 per cent.

Improvement of quality also is being sought through the introduction of better varieties of citrus from foreign lands. Co-operating with the United States and California Departments of Agriculture, Riverside horticulturists and plant pathologists have planned and implemented a program of importing budwood, which is then carefully checked for five years for freedom from disease. As a result of this program, led by Professor Walter Reuther, Chairman of CRC's Department of Horticultural Science nurserymen and growers will eventually be able to obtain budding material from registered trees of known origin and varietal name, free of certain known virus diseases.

MIRACLE HORMONE

Lemon growers stand to benefit from a recent Riverside study involving the use of the so-called "miracle hormone," gibberellic acid. Horticultural Scientists Charles Coggins and Henry Field found that applications of the material retard fruit maturation and tree flowering. This permits a shift in harvest to a time when demand is highest, and increases the proportion of first-grade fruit produced.

How well-fed is a citrus tree? This is a question growers would like to answer with certitude, because the nutritional condition of the tree, just as its freedom from disease, determines the quality and quantity of its production. The work of Professors H. D.

Chapman and W. W. Jones, Horticultural Scientist T. W. Embleton and others at Riverside brought about diagnostic techniques for using visual symptoms, leaf analysis and soil analysis to determine the tree's state of nutrition. These methods are a tremendous advance over old rule-of-thumb ways of determining how much and what kind of fertilizers to use in an orchard.

CONTROL OF DECAY

Riverside Plant Pathologists Joseph Eckert and Martin Kolbezen have discovered and turned over to industry for development a compound they found highly effective in preventing post-harvest decay of citrus fruit. Such decay costs California and Arizona citrus fruit shippers at least \$2.5 million a year. The chemical prevents decay in a wide variety of perishables: oranges, lemons, apples, peaches, pears, bananas, cut flowers and bulbs.

Potatoes, California's most important vegetable crop, have doubled their yield in many fields where potassium fertilization was increased. This was a result of nutritional experiments by UCR's Department of Vegetable Crops under the direction of Professor Oscar Lorenz. The study revealed a definite need for phosphorus fertilization in most parts of Southern California, and it determined the best nitrogen application rates for high yield.

BATTLE AGAINST SMOG

The Air Pollution Research Center at Riverside is the outgrowth of Southern California's long post-World War II battle with smog. It was 19 years ago (1944) that a young Riverside plant pathologist, John T. Middleton, discovered the first evidences of air pollution injury to certain vegetable crops in Los Angeles county. Since then smog has spread to 28 California counties; our farmers lose \$8-11 million a year from injury to crops such as flowers and succulent vegetables. Growers of salad greens, spinach and lettuce, have been forced to move from populated southern areas either inland or north to Monterey, Santa Barbara and Ventura counties.

Smog damage to crops is not always spectacular. Often, only trained agriculturists can detect the various symptoms. But whether detectable or not, damage by air pollutants costs the farmer money. Because crops in polluted air take longer to mature, the farmer may have to use more water. His harvest yield is lower and its quality is poorer.

Riverside smog research has had three objectives: to learn what elements of smog are doing what kinds of damage; to seek methods of preventing crop injury; and to obtain basic information about smog that is needed in setting up countermeasures.

Professor Middleton and his colleagues, Plant Pathologists Ellis Darley and Robert Brewer and Horticultural Scientists O. Clifton Taylor found that vegetables, field crops, citrus, ornamentals and even pine trees on mountain slopes far from cities are damaged by pollutants in the air. Oxidants and ozone in smog cause brown blotches on leaves, reduce plant growth and usually cut crop yield.

Susceptibility to smog was found in citrus, grapes, cotton, alfalfa, oats, sudan grass, sugar beets, beans, beets, celery, endive, lettuce, onions, tomatoes, parsley, parsnips, spinach, Swiss chard, turnips, chrysanthemums, orchids, petunias, snapdragons, larkspur and rye grasses. Walnuts, prunes, peaches, apricots and plums are also victims of smog. In all, UCR surveys showed more than 300 plant species affected by air pollutants.

Prevention of injury by smog was shown by UCR researchers to be possible through use of chemicals such as zineb and vitamin C, but commercial application of these methods has not proved practical.

PAN ISOLATED

The first pure component of smog that causes both eye irritation and plant damage—PAN—was discovered and isolated in 1961 by Research Chemist Edgar R. Stephens at UCR. Subsequently he purified other compounds with the same characteristics: PPN and PBN.

Another study at Riverside seeks to learn whether brush burning and burning of farm wastes such as orchard prunings, barley, and rice straw contribute significantly to California's total air pollution.

Currently the Air Pollution Research Center is getting ready to consolidate its rather spread-out activities by moving into an Environmental Pollution Control building. Headed by Professor Middleton, the APRC will continue present projects and work in new areas involving more testing of the effects of smog on animals and people.

APRC research is substantially aided by grants from industry and governmental agencies (county, state and federal), totaling almost \$700,000 a year.

A decade of painstaking investigation has shown California what smog is doing to its food supply; has helped set state standards for air purity in connection with abatement programs; and has determined that the only effective way of protecting people, crops and animals from injury by smog is to get rid of the main source—the exhaust emissions of automobiles.

LIFE AND DEATH

The true significance of Riverside's total agricultural research program may have been stated best by Mr. T. Allen Lombard, a citrus industry leader. At the Experiment Station's 50th anniversary celebration in 1957 he praised it for its worldwide influence and for accomplishments which "have frequently been the difference between the life and death of certain of our agricultural industries. . . ."

At another point Mr. Lombard said: "As an industry we are indeed fortunate to have had the leadership and farsighted thinking, not only of the men who directly lead this institution but also of the Board of Regents which through the years has enabled us to obtain sufficient funds and the brainpower needed to build this world-renowned institution, the Riverside Citrus Experiment Station. I think that this is probably a misnomer . . . and feel from all the information I have that it should be called the World Citrus Experiment Station."

[From the UCR Highlander, Dec. 1, 1965]

CHANCELLOR'S COLUMN—LIBERAL ARTS EDUCATION NECESSARY IN FUTURE WORLD

(By Ivan Hinderaker)

Occasionally one reads something which, for him, has a special impact. The reaction is beyond just thinking the idea and style in which it is written are good. Rather, it is something like a loud "amen."

My latest experience of this came from reading an argument for liberal arts education by 38 year old Bell and Howell President Peter G. Peterson, writing in the Christian Science Monitor.

In two short decades, the world has been plunged into the atomic, computer, and space ages. The most descriptive word about what is going on around us is "change." Our problem, then, is how to help educate men so they are best equipped to cope with change.

After noting several kinds of managerial skills which undoubtedly will be necessary in any future, Mr. Peterson observes that information, however important, is not enough.

"It is far easier to get people to absorb new knowledge than it is to get them to alter their conclusions. Most of us have an incredible talent in processing new facts in

such a way that our prior conclusions remain intact.

"The new world demands, perhaps above all things, emotional flexibility and freedom. In this new world, rigidity may actually be a greater barrier to progress than ignorance.

"The late Paul Tillich said we must learn to be comfortable with ambiguity. Put another way, this world of ours is rapidly becoming a more unpredictable, ambiguous, and uncertain place, and we must come to terms with it.

"Can your educational environment, in fact, help provide the emotional security which enables you to recognize that life is indeed filled with risks and ambiguities, and that the great human achievement is to deal with them creatively and joyfully rather than be blind to change, or, even worse, fearful of change?"

Amen. For me, the impact came in three dimensions.

First, in politics, one of the greatest dangers flows from the far left and far right's crusade for the simple solution. In this complex world, any political problem worth calling a problem, however, isn't simple. More likely than not, neither is there an answer.

Second, in management, to anything not mentioned in the rule book or altering a little the comfortable routine of bureaucracy, without even an examination of the alternatives, too often the response is "no." That is not good. In large part, the quality of an institution is determined by what it is striving for, and by the vitality of the process of striving.

Third, in education, as important as what is taught is the manner in which it is taught. In liberal education there must be an open mind—questioning, weighing alternatives, making decisions, questioning. In addition to intellectual breadth, there must be emotional balance. This is no place for intellectual authoritarians.

It is my hope that students can gain from interaction with faculty the qualities of emotional flexibility and a passion for constructive change; that students can come to terms with ambiguity and unpredictability. It is my hope that we in the administration, older and perhaps more in need, can do no less.

[From the UCR Highlander, Apr. 13, 1966]

CHANCELLOR'S COLUMN—GUGGENHEIM AWARD WINNERS SHOW EXCELLENCE OF UCR

(By Ivan Hinderaker)

Last week the Guggenheim Foundation announced the winners of its 1966-67 faculty fellowships. Six were from UCR: professors George Buelow of music, Albert Page of soil science, Robert Peters of English, Evert Schlinger of entomology, Irwin Sherman of zoology, and Peter Tsao of plant pathology.

The first purpose of this column is to congratulate these individuals.

Only 11 universities won more Guggenheim fellowships than this campus. Those 11 were: Berkeley, Columbia, UCLA, Harvard, Yale, Pennsylvania, Princeton, Chicago, Cornell, Illinois, and Minnesota. In proportion to enrollment, UCR was exceeded only by Princeton and Brandeis.

My second purpose is to suggest that UCR's high ranking in total 1966-67 Guggenheim fellowship awards is just one of several indications that something very important is happening here.

Standing alone, these elections testify to the honor to which six members of the faculty are entitled. I think, though, that more may be read into these awards since they do not stand alone, but are part of increasing recognition for the entire campus, faculty and students alike.

I have frequently cited other kinds of recognition, and I will here point to some of

those items again because they take on an added importance in relation to the 1966-67 Guggenheim awards.

In a recent report of the American Council on Education ranking American colleges and universities in the percentage of national graduate fellowship winners among those who earned bachelors' degrees in the years 1960 through 1963, UCR was in 12th position along with Pomona and Wesleyan. Among institutions classified as "major recipients of Federal science research funds," UCR was third after Cal Tech and M.I.T. On the west coast, UCR and Pomona were third, after Caltech and Reed College.

In another study, covering the past 20 years, the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation ranks UCR fifth among California institutions in the number of Woodrow Wilson Fellowships won, even though UCR students have been eligible for only half the period. (The College of Letters and Science opened in the spring of 1954.) UCR was surpassed only by Berkeley, Stanford, UCLA, and Pomona.

Last spring, a Phi Beta Kappa chapter was installed at UCR—the third chapter in the University of California, after Berkeley and UCLA.

Three years ago, this was preceded by Sigma Xi, national honorary science society. Installation of chapters of Sigma Xi is based on the extent and excellence of scientific research carried on by the faculty.

The Guggenheim fellowships say something about UCR's faculty. The American Council for Education and the Woodrow Wilson data say something about UCR's students, faculty and facilities, as do also the Phi Beta Kappa and Sigma Xi chapters.

These data suggest that UCR, in one decade, has earned a ranking with the best of undergraduate educational opportunities in the country. The data suggest, also, in a period of six years, that UCR has made significant progress toward a comparable level of quality in several areas of graduate instruction.

UCR has always placed great emphasis on recruitment of faculty members of exceptional teaching capability and deep interest in original, creative research. It has placed the same kind of emphasis on academic excellence.

In some respects UCR has already earned the ranking of "great." It will, in other respects, in the future.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, the Santa Barbara campus is a branch of the University of California, one of the Nation's most distinguished universities. Situated by the shore of the Pacific Ocean, its location and expansive beach are particularly attractive to students.

The university is presently in the process of expanding and developing its intellectual resources, and its faculty, in order to provide for the educational needs of many qualified young people who plan to enter this college. While retaining its traditional interest in undergraduate teaching and the liberal arts, it is increasing its graduate studies and professional schools, thereby becoming a "general" university campus. The present 24 fields of the master of arts degree, the master of fine arts degree, and the master of science in electrical engineering degree are to be further expanded, as are many other fields.

The enrollment is rapidly growing with an expected 11,000 students for the fall of 1966. Twenty-seven permanent buildings with equipment have now been completed which are both attractive and

functional. These include a library of approximately 400,000 volumes and a student-oriented university center for extracurricular activities.

This growth in the physical attributes of the college is paralleled by a growth in its quality. The undergraduate students are better prepared before enrollment. The undergraduate courses are being extensively reorganized, while the graduate courses are improving due to the attraction of a great number of excellent students and scholars to the campus. The entire revision of the college's academic plan should be finished by this fall. Included are a School of Management, a School of Law, a School of Area Planning, and others for professional programs. An experimental College of Creative Studies is also being planned which will be small and shall investigate several new approaches to education.

Being situated near Santa Barbara, a city which has maintained a continual concern for culture, UCSB follows in this tradition. It provides the public with a wide variety of cultural activities including concerts, dramatical programs, and lectures by world-renowned scholars. Programs which are of interest to the entire university travel to different campuses through the Inter-campus Cultural Exchange Committee. In addition, the Santa Barbara campus has become the administrative center for the University of California's education abroad program. In 1966, 350 students from various UC campuses spent the year at study centers in Europe, Asia, and Latin America, including such countries as Japan, China, and Colombia.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join my colleagues today in remarks dealing with the University of California. In less than a century, the people of California through their elected representatives and under an outstanding series of educational statesmen, have demonstrated their total commitment to the most permanent foundation a democratic society can build—a superb system of public higher education combining the needs of quantity with the imperatives of quality. That structure with the University of California at its apex, stands today as the greatest educational system in the world. With nine major campuses stretching from Davis in the north to San Diego on the Mexican border, the University stands ready to offer all those who qualify, a post-high school education ranging from the bachelor's degree to the most advanced post-doctorate training. Whether we talk about the outer reaches of space, the new frontiers of the ocean depths, or the infinitesimal structure of sub-atomic matter, U of C scientists are pushing at the very boundaries of established knowledge in their never-ending search for new truths.

As an alumnus of UCLA, the Los Angeles branch of the university, I am justly proud of these accomplishments. The University of California, Los Angeles is only 46 years old. Despite high entrance requirements, enrollment has grown to over 26,000 full-time students plus 25,000 extension students. Chancellor Franklin D. Murphy heads a fac-

ulty of over 2,200 and directs 71 departments in 14 schools and colleges.

My colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL], has already talked about the general outlines of UCLA. I should like to devote my time to some of the recent special projects of the Los Angeles campus. I want to emphasize that these programs serve not only the traditional functions a university is expected to perform, but they also provide valuable new services in much broader areas as well.

For example, UCLA is one of the few universities providing a psychological clinic for outpatient service to the general public dealing with various adjustment problems. A \$4 million rehabilitation center was completed in 1965 to house teaching and research programs on means of returning the handicapped to a useful role in society. The Neuropsychiatric institute provides hospital and clinical facilities as well as research programs in the field of mental health. Presently under construction are new facilities for the school of dentistry as well as the Jules Stein Eye Institute to study diseases of the eye.

On an international scale there is Project Brazil. Launched in 1961 this project proposed the building of small manufacturing plants in Brazil to be financed and staffed by local citizens with technical help from UCLA and Brazilian students and professors. This project not only introduced grassroots capitalism in a region where the old choice was between feudalism and communism, but it also brought numerous academic benefits to UCLA as a teaching institution and to the individual students who participated.

Closer to home, the UCLA tutorial project is a student effort to help schoolchildren in economically depressed areas who are potential or actual school dropouts. It provides personal academic tutoring for those young people who could not otherwise afford it. The project began in 1963 with 80 tutors. This fall approximately 600 UCLA students will participate in the program.

Probably America's fastest growing university, UCLA is part of a university system of which, not only Californians, but all Americans should be proud. A living example of America's dedication to higher education, I am proud to join my colleagues in honoring the University of California.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, as a representative from the State of California. I have a special concern and pride for the University of California. The university has been the subject of a great deal of criticism and controversy during the past few years and this is a fine opportunity to consider the criticism and to deliberate upon what we regard as the role of a State university.

The University of California is a uniquely large and diverse public institution enrolling 75,000 students on nine campuses. They are in order of their founding since 1868: Berkeley, San Francisco, Davis, Riverside, San Diego, Los Angeles, Santa Barbara, Santa Cruz, and Irvine. Each campus cherishes its own

brand of academic specialization, public service, and collegiate atmosphere. By the year 2000, when the population of the State is expected to reach 45 million, the university will enroll as many as 330,000 students.

The university is big. It is at the same time one of the best. The distinguished British scientist and writer Lord Snow has said:

By all the criteria * * * the University of California is one of the greatest in the world. That is, its record of original research stands comparison with any university—and that may be an understatement. Its top rank of students equally stands comparison with any.

This opinion can be confirmed in any number of ways.

The university's Berkeley campus students lead those of all other colleges in volunteering for the Peace Corps. Their ratio of acceptance is 1 to every 2 who apply, compared with a national average of 1 to 3½. Since World War II, UC has provided more Foreign Service officers than any other school except Harvard and in the last 5 years, there have been 52 from California to Harvard's 49.

The Nation's top high school graduates—National Merit Scholarship winners—named California first choice among all State-supported institutions. Similarly, among State and land-grant institutions Cal is the first choice of outstanding college graduates who have won Woodrow Wilson fellowships.

Twelve Nobel Prize winners are university faculty members—more than at any other American university. Achievements by California researchers are among the most significant of our time; they include development of the cyclotron and the bevatron and discovery of carbon 14, antimatter, plutonium, and the chemistry of photosynthesis.

The university is first among American universities in faculty representation in the National Academy of Sciences; second only to Harvard in elections to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences; first by far in Guggenheim Awards for faculty study in sciences, arts, and social sciences; first in National Science Foundation grants for basic research; and in American Council of Learned Societies postdoctoral grants in humanities and social sciences.

California leads 82 public institutions in expenditures for all kinds of research, according to Industrial Research magazine. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and San Diego ranked among the 10 schools in the Nation receiving Federal grant aid. Last spring its international relations scholars received the largest Ford Foundation grant ever given to a State university. Financial support from the State of California, the Federal Government, and private foundations support Cal professors as they grapple with the toughest problems of our times—from smog to poverty and from NATO to Vietnam.

Only last month, the American Council on Education cited the graduate school at the University of California at Berkeley as the "best balanced distinguished university in the country." This conclusion is the result of the most exhaustive assessment yet made of quality in

individual disciplines of graduate education. The study, known as the Cartter report, was financed by the American Council on Education, the U.S. Office of Education, the National Science Foundation, and the National Institutes of Health. Ratings were made on the basis of more than 4,000 questionnaires to faculty members at 106 universities across the country. The report also ranked university programs by "effectiveness" and here again Berkeley comes out on top; 20 of its departments rate among the top 3 in the Nation. Harvard is a close second with 19 departments in these categories.

The quality of the university is unquestioned and I recite these honors only as a prelude to the discussion this afternoon. We might now turn to the question of "how" and "why."

Basic to the development of our system of higher education in California is the massive financial commitment on the part of the people of the State. As Governor Brown has said:

California long ago rejected the notions that only a select few should be eligible for post-secondary education and that the quality of our colleges and universities would be diluted when they became available to all.

Between the years 1959 and 1964 alone, the State of California has invested \$8.5 billion for educational purposes. Money alone can insure quantity of education, but not quality. To have and maintain excellence requires at least two related factors. First, independence and second, freedom to speak and write freely.

Independence is guaranteed by the State constitution of California which declares the university to be autonomous. The board of regents are solely responsible for the organization and the administration of the university and their appointment is nonpartisan for a term of 16 years.

The board and President Clark Kerr have felt deeply their responsibility toward protecting the liberty of the students and the faculty. They have felt just as deeply their responsibility to the State to prevent the exploitation of the university by any political group. This policy was enunciated by President Kerr at the Charter Day Exercises at Berkeley in March 1961.

As in all the affairs of men, freedom must be matched by responsibility if freedom is not to die. And the University has the responsibility to insure that the search for truth will never be subverted internally. For this precise reason, the University of California has refused to employ persons whose commitments or obligations to the Communist Party, or to any other organization, prejudice impartial scholarship and the free pursuit of truth. That has been the policy of the Regents and the Academic Senate for many years. That is our policy today. That will continue to be our policy.

What is there about freedom of expression that is so essential to the growth of a great university? Most importantly, the magnetic effect of attracting top people, both students and faculty, people who are above average in their thinking ability, their dedication to knowledge, and their sensitivity, whether in literature, chemistry or physics, anthropology, art, or the social sciences. Evidence the

new Santa Cruz campus—just begun this year, it is widely regarded as one of the most exciting developments in higher education. It has planned a cluster of 20 small liberal arts colleges and men from such schools as Harvard, Yale, and Princeton have come to staff this brand-new endeavor.

Assuming the kind of effort—bright students, a free-thinking faculty, a well-financed school headed by an independent board—there is bound to be criticism and controversy. The words of Robert Hutchins express this well:

The claim of academic freedom is based on the high and serious calling of the academic profession. That calling is to think. A university is a center of independent thought. Since it is a center of thought and of independent thought it is also a center of criticism. . . . A university that is not controversial is not a university. A civilization in which there is not a continuous controversy about important issues, speculative, and practical is on its way to totalitarianism, and death.

It is easy to affirm a policy of free expression in a society without uncertainty. Unfortunately we cannot look forward to such a situation. Today's world is one which is conducive to insecurity—the individual is a very small part of a highly mobile, urban, and organizational society. The frustrations of the cold war intensify already-existing fears and the sad consequence is too often an emotional, irrational reaction against any outspoken group or individual. The situation becomes still more critical when words are followed by action—a boycott of classes, the immobilization of a police car, a sit-in in an administration building, and all this on the campus of a State university.

As the free speech movement at Berkeley took hold and grew more explosive many persons were outraged and the charges and criticism ranged from objections to the often offensive statements or actions of the students to the belief that Communist elements were primarily responsible for the troubles at Berkeley.

The main document which declares communism to be the cause of student unrest is the 13th report of the Senate Factfinding Subcommittee on Un-American Activities to the 1965 California Legislature issued by the Subcommittee Chairman Senator Hugh M. Burns on June 13, 1965. This report was very critical of President Clark Kerr and his policies both before and during the free speech movement.

The report is a classic example of the techniques of innuendo, guilt by association, distortion, half truth, and telescoping of time to connect unrelated events. It was written without holding any public hearings and without any witnesses from the university. There was no contact whatsoever with President Kerr, the man the committee charged was responsible for "a tolerance of the radical student groups, the opening of the campus to Communist officials, the reluctance to curb the activities of the most brash and defiant student rebels, and the obvious distaste for adequate security precautions."

It is replete with inaccuracies—both about situations and about persons. Dr. Kerr issued, last October 5, a detailed answer to the charges in this report, showing where, over and over again, the errors lay and thereby making a sham of the charges. As our Governor, Pat Brown, said the next day, President Kerr has done "a masterful job of documenting the fact that the Burns report was not factual." State Senator Stephen P. Teale, Democrat, of West Point, refused to sign the report even though he was a member of the Subcommittee. Teale said:

Most anyone who reads the report could see why I didn't sign it. It took 200 pages to say what could have been said in six pages, so far as factual material was concerned. The balance is just drivel of old Communist stuff—quotes from old newspapers and from old reports of the same committee. The impression I got was that simply by association, interspersing paragraphs about recent troubles at the University with totally unrelated activities of the last 20 years, we are trying to imply that all recent campus action was a Communist plot. Had there been any concrete evidence of this I would have gone along with the report. But I didn't see any such evidence.

The free speech movement was not a result of Communist infiltration and administrative laxity toward security. Neither were the students involved Communist dupes. Rather than being unwitting pawns of a Communist operation, they were among the brightest and most alert members of the student body. This is well documented by a survey by Prof. Robert H. Somers of the department of sociology at Berkeley in November 1964. From a sample representing the entire student body, Somers found a strong correlation between academic achievement and support for the FSM. Of all those students with a B-plus average or better, 45 percent supported both the goals and the tactics of the FSM and 10 percent opposed it. In contrast, over one-third of those with a B-minus average or less opposed the FSM and 15 percent supported it. When only the 800 demonstrators who were arrested are studied, this correlation is even more striking.

Over one-half of these undergraduates have a B average or above. Of the graduate students arrested, the achievement level was even higher. Twenty students were members of Phi Beta Kappa; eight held Woodrow Wilson fellowships.

We cannot dismiss the just grievances and the deeply felt concern of many of today's students. This point was emphasized by the New York Times on June 21, 1966, in response to the recent Senate Internal Security Subcommittee report, and I would like to insert this editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

THE STUDENTS' PROTEST

In characterizing the student protest movement as the creature of the Communist party, the Senate Internal Security subcommittee has impugned the idealism and seriousness of purpose of many young Americans.

Inevitably, Communists and their fellow-travelers have tried to exploit undergraduate dissatisfaction, just as they have attempted to make capital out of legitimate efforts to do battle against social or economic injustices

in the past. But the fact is that, after years of apathy, many of the brightest and best young men and women on college campuses have begun to show deep concern over questions of war and peace, civil rights and the quality of the education they seek.

In calling the students' campus grievances "either fraudulent, created, stimulated or exaggerated as a catalytic means of setting off mob explosions," the committee overlooked the fact that conservative and highly respected educators had previously warned that undergraduates on many campuses were becoming the forgotten men. The distinguished American Council on Education last year devoted its annual meeting to what it considered the just grievances of the nation's undergraduates. Moreover, even the violent explosion at Berkeley brought in its wake important educational reforms which promise to improve higher education on campuses across the country.

If objections to present draft procedures may have put student rebels in the same corner with some Communists, they are also in the company of Defense Secretary McNamara and a number of Senators. This fact should remind the committee once again of the dangers of guilt by association—a lesson it never seems to learn.

Mr. Speaker, other universities have gone through similar periods of stress and criticism because of the political activities of students and faculty. In the early fifties, Senator McCarthy referred to Harvard College as a sanctuary for Communists and a "smelly mess" because it refused to dismiss a professor who had claimed the fifth amendment to the Constitution. The University of Wisconsin—long known for its tradition of political liberalism—has fervently maintained the guarantees of freedom on their campus. In the midst, even, of the McCarthy era, Wisconsin saw the appearances of men who had been publicly denounced by their own senior Senator. Both of these great American universities have survived vicious attacks and gone on to maintain the level of attainment for which they are noted. It is unfortunate that other schools without the tradition and support needed, have bowed to threats of investigation, and weakened the spirit of free and independent enquiry so vital to a great university.

The University of California has serious problems in administration, in achieving that precious balance between liberty and order, and in insuring quality along with quantity. These are the problems the regents must deal with and it is my belief that we must not be diverted from these very real issues by the outrageous charges or irrational responses exemplified by the Burns report. Nor should we countenance the suggestion that the university needs to be "investigated."

As Governor Brown has written:

Great schools have survived without large sums of money, and even without a high degree of public interest and enthusiasm. But they cannot survive dictation from outside their own ranks concerning what the teacher can teach and what he cannot. Nor what the student may hear and what he may not, or which fields of enquiry are open and which are closed. Education today is being challenged by those who would clamp the lid on intellectual enquiry, but we in California are determined to counter such efforts with all the force we can muster.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, if I may conclude, I wish to thank all of my colleagues who have joined me in this presentation.

What we have attempted to do this afternoon is to put into perspective two aspects of the University of California.

The first is its students; both those who are involved in some of these questionable activities, and those who are not. For those who are, we want it to be clear that in our judgment young people should be encouraged to get involved; they should be a part of controversy. It is the nature of youth to challenge, to question, to seek other answers, and to be different.

But when they do so they must also recognize the tolerance levels of the society of which they are a part and they must also stand ready to be questioned and to be graded on the basis of their conduct. To be a part of controversy just to be in conflict for the sake of conflict, to be different just to be different is hardly to be justified. To attack everything that comprises the established order on the basis of an abstract right may very well be sapping the substance of society without which it cannot survive. The young people that have not yet gotten to the point of realizing this are in trouble, and we must point that out to them. On the other hand, we cannot criticize a university that allows this kind of activity to be carried on within the environs of the university and attack it with sweeping generalizations which would destroy the whole because of a small part. This creates an injustice to that great institution which is itself a constructive servant of the people. So when we see this in its correct perspective and grade it on the basis of critical judgment, we will have done justice to what is going on and see more rightly where the interest of the people lies.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in saluting the University of California.

My district, the Fifth Congressional in San Francisco, is justifiably proud of its campus—the University of California's San Francisco Medical Center. Not only is it the second oldest campus of the University of California system and the only one devoted exclusively to the health sciences and their relationship to man and his environment, but it also has the distinction of being one of the world's distinguished medical centers of health education. It is one of the few health centers in the Nation incorporating schools of dentistry, medicine, nursing and pharmacy and in 1961 a separate division of graduate academic study was established.

The task of training our young men and women for careers in medicine and the other health sciences is now more complicated than at any other time in history. The explosion in knowledge has been especially heavy in the biological sciences; there is more that must be taught than ever before. Consequently, for medical students for example, the amount of ground that must be covered from anatomical microscopy to X-ray

cinéangiography, is greater than can probably be assimilated in 4 years, if indeed it can in a single lifetime.

Combining the much publicized population explosion with the simple fact that more people are demanding a better quality of care than was previously available to anyone, whatever his means, makes it imperative to raise the standards of education in medicine and the other health sciences while at the same time increasing the number of people trained.

Moreover, medical and health science education must contend with a changing sociological structure in which people will no longer accept being treated merely as a physical embodiment of symptoms. The challenge to the faculty and staff at San Francisco for the future is to train physicians and other health scientists capable of dealing with the patient as a complete human being in a total environment. This may well be the most difficult task facing all the fields of medical and health science education today and I am confident that my campus—the University of California Medical Center—will be among the leaders in finding a suitable solution.

A large number of exciting events occur at the medical center each day of the year and they add up to many advantages for all of us in California and the Nation. For example, the school of dentistry must teach new scientific knowledge and technical innovations, such as the use of very high speed drills and new restorative materials to its more than 358 undergraduate dental students. Dental students therefore, literally must master a new order of subtle skills. To administer the great number of drugs available, and to cope with the many new advances in dental therapy ranging from psychological aspects of treatment to improved techniques of orthodonture, requires a deeper understanding of pharmacy, pharmaceutical usage, psychology, and so forth.

The school of pharmacy is the second oldest school at the medical center. Scientific advances have affected pharmaceutical training as deeply as the other medical professions. Today's student of pharmacy must be thoroughly trained in the basic sciences such as biochemistry and microbiology as well as in traditional pharmaceutical techniques. The school also prepares students for careers in research and teaching, as well as for the necessary role of neighborhood pharmacist. Today's pharmacy student therefore may specialize in training for a number of important careers such as general pharmacy, pharmaceutical technology, hospital pharmacy or pharmaceutical chemistry. The school also conducts an active graduate program for students who wish to pursue careers in academic pharmacy.

The school of nursing with an enrollment of 347 undergraduate and graduate students is the newest of the professional schools. Today's registered nurse must be trained in new skills and techniques which range from administration to development of new ways to exercise greater judgment in dealing with psychological needs of patients. In addition to increased technical training, nurses must

also be conversant with other fields, such as economics, psychology, public health, sociology, and statistics. The university's school of nursing makes a significant contribution to nursing education for California and the Nation which is particularly important at a time when there is such an acute shortage of registered nurses in the Nation.

A major goal of the new graduate division, which was established in 1961, is to foster the increase of basic knowledge which is necessary to advance the clinical sciences and their associated technologies. The graduate division makes it possible to accomplish this goal through formal training and by research in the four major schools, clinical research in the hospitals, and in the major research institutes on the campus. This new division adds a new dimension to the teaching, research, and public service aspect of the university's San Francisco campus program.

The program is continuing education for medicine and the health sciences is an essential one today to insure that the physician and health scientist is provided with a disciplined system for keeping informed. The nature of the medical and health sciences is changing so rapidly today that it has been estimated, for example, that a medical school graduate of 1955 may have difficulty understanding journal articles even in his own field. It is, therefore, absolutely essential to the day-to-day care of patients that every effort be made to keep physicians and health scientists abreast of developing techniques and discoveries. This is a prime objective of the continuing education program for the medical and health sciences which the university now operates at its San Francisco Medical Center campus.

The University of California also operates five training programs for paramedical personnel in: exfoliative cytology—cellular study and analysis; medical illustration—for teaching and communication; medical technology—to perform hospital service tests; orthoptic technique—technicians for ophthalmologists; and physical therapy. These training programs are essential for assuring an adequate number of well-trained supporting technical staff needed to provide the best in health care.

The vast majority of our citizens are aware that research has played an important role in the many scientific advances and technological breakthroughs which have occurred at an unprecedented rate since the end of World War II. Many citizens are also aware that our universities have contributed enormously to these breakthroughs. We must all, therefore, continue to be concerned about the need for continuing and strengthening this effort.

In medicine and the health sciences it cannot be disputed that the primary and legitimate functions of a medical campus are teaching and research. Both activities are essential to the educational process and to the fulfillment of a moral obligation to provide the public with the best possible medical care. Far from being in conflict, teaching and research

are in fact complementary, because today's student must practice the medicine and health care of tomorrow and not of today.

All of the University of California Medical Center's research accomplishments cannot be discussed here today, because time would not permit it. However, a few unique and outstanding contributions should be mentioned. For example, work in nutrition at the medical center was of such importance that a faculty member, Dr. A. E. Taylor, was asked to join the Hoover Commission to direct the program to combat starvation after World War I. Some of the very first antihistamines were discovered and introduced by pharmacologists at University of California's Medical Center. New anesthetics were developed here and work on the mechanisms of pain and its control continues today.

In clinical medicine and surgery the contributions have been of the first importance. Dr. George Whipple, working at the medical center, shared with Minot and Murphy the Nobel Prize in 1934 for research on blood and the conquest of pernicious anemia. In orthopedic surgery, leg-lengthening and leg-shortening methods were developed at the medical center. Researchers in dentistry have uncovered the pathology and mechanisms causing dental caries. The recent isolation of the virus causing trachoma, the leading cause of blindness in the world, presents the possibility of its total eradication.

Investigations on botulism saved the canning industry in California. Great progress has been made in the study of bubonic plague, always a potential threat to the entire Western United States. The only plague laboratory in the country is at the medical center and has been called upon repeatedly by the Armed Forces for assistance and by almost all Americans for a supply of plague vaccines.

Work on psittacosis, a virus disease carried by birds, protected the State's turkey industry when its flocks were threatened by extermination. A recent breakthrough has been made in the parasitic disease, shistosomiasis, a terribly debilitating and often fatal disease affecting an estimated 200 million people in the world. If successful work continues, one of the last great parasitic diseases to defy man could be controlled. This would be an accomplishment to rank with the conquest of malaria.

Inasmuch as teaching and research are both necessary for better medicine and health care, a balanced commitment to each activity must be made. The university's commitment to research has grown with its accelerating importance to medicine and health care.

The expanding nature of medical science requires that research be conducted on an interdisciplinary basis. To accomplish this essential goal, various research institutes have been established on campus whose staffs are composed of specialists in all fields of medicine and the health sciences. These institutes include the biomechanics laboratory, cancer research institute, cardiovascular in-

stitute, Hooper Foundation, hormone research laboratory, metabolic research unit, and the Proctor Foundation.

I have attempted to give you some insight into the extent of the University of California's involvement in medicine and the health sciences at its San Francisco campus; the order of magnitude is beyond what most of us are able to comprehend. You may be sure, however, that the able and dedicated faculty, staff and students of the University of California Medical Center at San Francisco will continue through their efforts in teaching, research, patient care, and public service to have a profound and beneficial effect on the lives of Californians, indeed on all people throughout the world.

In paying honor to the University of California today, I would like to close my statement with these important words of its president, Clark Kerr:

Knowledge has certainly never before in history been so central to the conduct of an entire society. What the railroads did for the second half of the last century and the automobile for the first half of this century, may be done for the second half of this century by the knowledge industry; that is to serve as a focal point for national growth. The university is at the center of the knowledge process.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, the University of California's long and distinguished list of honors and major contributions on behalf of the people of California and the Nation in virtually every discipline and field of knowledge known to man is well known to scholars, leaders, and thinking people of our State and the Nation. In the recent past some incidents involving student activities at Berkeley have received national publicity on a scale greatly out of proportion to the hundreds and perhaps thousands of other significant University accomplishments which were occurring simultaneously. I am taking this opportunity therefore to say a few words today for inclusion in the RECORD about this great institution of the State of California and in particular about the University of California San Diego campus of which we in the 37th Congressional District of California are so justly proud.

In less than a century, the University of California has become one of the world's largest and most distinguished universities. When it was first established in 1868 as a land-grant institution, it consisted of 10 faculty, 38 students, and a temporary campus. Today, its nine campuses reach from Davis in the northern part of the State to San Diego in the south. There are more than 7,200 full-time teachers and 75,000 full-time students, of whom more than 51,000 are undergraduates and 24,000 graduate students. University planners are busy preparing for an anticipated increase in enrollment by 1980 to 179,725 full-time students.

Many citizens continue to think of the University of California as being limited to Berkeley alone because it was first located on only the one campus at Berkeley. Today there are eight additional University of California campuses

in operation—Davis, Irvine, Los Angeles, Riverside, San Diego, San Francisco, Santa Barbara, and Santa Cruz. These nine campuses are only part of a vast educational and research complex. The University also operates research stations, field stations, and extension centers in more than 80 locations throughout California.

Since its founding more than a quarter of a million degrees have been granted by the university. The University of California leads all institutions in the world in the number of Nobel laureates on its staff and also has on its staff more members of the National Academy of Sciences than any other university. I have enumerated only a few of the significant facts and distinguished honors which have been earned by our great University in California; many more have been achieved in teaching, research and various public services, and, I believe, along with the University's President Clark Kerr and the regents, that we have only begun to see and benefit from the outstanding work of the University's dedicated faculty, staff and students.

My district, the 37th Congressional District of California, is proud of its new University of California campus. It is situated near the northern limits of the city of San Diego, occupying more than 1,000 acres. The campus site spreads from the seafloor, where the Scripps Institute of Oceanography is located, across a large portion of the adjacent Torrey Pines Mesa high above the Pacific Ocean. Much of the land is wooded; to the east and north lie mountains, to the west, the sea.

San Diego is California's oldest and third largest city, with a metropolitan area population of slightly more than 1 million. The city's and surrounding area's attractions are many and varied for the students and faculty: theater, museums, art, music, sports—all are available in San Diego.

The University of California San Diego campus had its origin in the closing years of the 19th century. In 1912 the university established the Scripps Institution for Biological Research at La Jolla which was changed in 1925 to the now famous Scripps Institution of Oceanography. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, it is more than an interesting statistic to note that the Scripps Institution of Oceanography maintains and operates the 13th largest navy in the world. In 1959 the University of California at San Diego was established as a general campus. Today it has an enrollment of nearly 1,500 full-time students, including more than 550 graduate students and expects a full-time student enrollment of 27,500 students by 1995.

Outstanding scientific contributions have already been made by the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, which is recognized as one of the most important facilities in the world for marine science research, as well as two other renowned activities located on our campus—the Institute of Marine Resources and the Institute of Geographic and Planetary Physics.

I firmly believe that the future will bring a spate of new laurels to the university and its new San Diego campus in a variety of disciplines and fields—some of which perhaps may not yet even be within either man's present knowledge or capability. I am also convinced that these future achievements will be of enormous benefit to the people of California, the Nation, and hopefully to all of mankind.

I am especially grateful for, and proud of, the university's new school of medicine which plans to enroll its first class at the San Diego campus in September 1966. Present plans call for a progressive increase to an entering class size of 96 students so that within a relatively short span of time the University of California's San Diego campus will be graduating nearly 100 new physicians each year. This contribution to the critically short medical manpower pool of California and the Nation is all the more important today in the light of increased demands for physicians' services which have resulted from the many new and beneficial categorical medical service programs implemented during the past year.

The citizens of California and the Nation have benefited enormously as a result of the tireless efforts and outstanding achievements of the University of California, its faculty, staff, and students.

Mr. Speaker, the June issue of San Diego magazine carried an enlightening article on UCSD's development and community acceptance, written by editorial consultant Mary Harrington Hall. I include Mrs. Hall's article in the RECORD.

U.C.—IS IT RED CHINA OR GENERAL MOTORS?

(By Mary Harrington Hall)

The University of California is the star of a new film which has been widely and furtively shown for at least a month in San Diego and throughout the state. In the 27-minute production, actually a meld of stills, a portrait of Lenin flashes against a brilliant red background; later, a photograph of UC President Clark Kerr appears against the same red, while the sound track booms the same theme music. The film is based largely on the 1965 report of the State Senate Subcommittee on Un-American Activities, and it relates UC—mainly mighty Berkeley—to draftcard burnings in New York, peace marches in Washington, drugs on the campus, and sex, which apparently bothers the John Birch Society and some legislators an inordinate amount of the time. The film is distributed by a Whittier, California, citizens' group.

This sadly effective propaganda film undoubtedly will be updated to include lunacy and lasciviousness from the 153-page "supplemental" report released last month by State Senate President Pro Tem Hugh M. Burns (Democrat, Fresno). He is chairman of the subcommittee which might well change its name to read *Un-American and Un-Conventional*. The new report will make for a sexier film. It will also make political hay during an election year in a state where the extreme right wing is fighting for its life with every weapon, even with the good name of a great university. (In a spine-tingling coincidence, one of the Senators who signed the report is named McCarthy.)

The current film is carefully done so it never quite crosses the line of libel. For instance, Kerr is described as a man who did government work during World War II, and

then the viewer is told that "war agencies were infiltrated by Communists and Communist sympathizers." The Senate subcommittee report on which the film is based, as well as last month's scurrilous supplement, certainly are libelous. But the University and its president are helpless. All the charges are wrapped in the safe cloak of immunity.

In a way, Kerr asked for the new charges. Last year's report assaulted him, insisting he was soft on Communists at UC and had made Berkeley a haven for Reds. In his reply, Kerr demanded that the subcommittee waive its immunity from libel. (There are many who say Kerr should never have answered the asinine report in the first place; but then there are always those who believe that, if you keep very quiet and do not look at the face of evil, it will go away.)

Naturally, Burns now says the subcommittee can't possibly waive immunity, and much of the new attack is a rehash: "In the name of free speech, civil liberties and academic freedom, the campus at Berkeley has been harboring radicals . . . the abdication of responsibility for maintaining order and discipline at Berkeley appears to be the confession of a weak administration . . ." Demanding that three Cal professors be fired as Communists, the new report explains: "It is Kerr's continued insistence on 'proof of Communist membership' that reduces to empty words the substance of the policy (against the employment of Communists)." It is a pity that the professors cannot sue; their research projects undoubtedly would benefit from the tremendous sums any court would award them.

The lewd and lascivious portions of last month's report, however, are new and might even make for a successful stag movie. The subcommittee verbally ogled a dance sponsored at Cal on March 25 by the Viet Nam Day Committee: "The dance was billed as featuring 'hallucinogenic sounds, projections and lights.' The movies and lights provided the only illumination and the pictures were color sequences of liquids spreading across the screen with occasional views of nude torsos of men and women which were exhibited in a sensual and provocative manner . . . According to reports (italics ours), the sweet, acrid odor of marijuana pervaded the area, many of the dancers were obviously intoxicated, and there was evidence of nausea in the lavatories . . ."

The report was tricky in grabbing headlines about homosexuality, which everyone knows is un-American or at least front-page copy. The subcommittee quoted an article in the Berkeley student newspaper which quoted a man who quoted Kinsey statistics that ten per cent of any male population is homosexual and therefore there probably are 2700 homosexuals on the Berkeley campus (or might be if the entire student body was male). The subcommittee's alleged purpose in this lengthy section of its report: the student newspaper was wrong to print such an article, and any decent university administration would have disciplined the editors. Functioning also in the role of drama critic, the un-American activities subcommittee blasted the UC administration for permitting performances on campus by a San Francisco theatrical troupe whose show "should never have been allowed on campus and was in total bad taste." Berkeley Chancellor Roger Heyns commented that "no one from the subcommittee has ever spoken to me about these charges." He didn't sound as though he had missed an illuminating experience.

The subcommittee justified its sly report by explaining that "these deluges of filth" all happened at Cal after the Free Speech Movement of 1964; FSM leaders now have control of the Viet Nam Day Committee, the report explained, and anti-Viet Nam demonstrations in the San Francisco area are all Communist-controlled.

There is much righteous public indignation from the political right and considerable genuine confusion all around. Politicians who see the subcommittee report as a tool are demanding a full-dress public Regents' investigation. Actually, the University Board of Regents has been absolutely correct and is following normal procedure. Board Chairman Edward W. Carter has appointed a Regents' committee to study the subcommittee charges and report back; DeWitt Higgs, the San Diego attorney who has just been appointed a Regent, is on the committee. It will be interesting to see if they keep right on studying through the Primary Elections. Cal's officials are naive if they think they'll get strong, fighting support from either Regents or the Governor during an election year. Whatever the outcome, there has been damage: there is an educational bond issue on the ballot, and the voters have been misinformed; the Legislature still is considering the University budget, and the legislators have been misinformed. If there is any winner in such a sad situation, it is Clark Kerr, hardly the type one would cast as a hero nor one who, under normal circumstances, inspires intense admiration or much personal loyalty. Our estimate is that he now commands the real support of only 50 per cent of UC's Regents, with 25 per cent somewhat undecided and 25 per cent dead set against him. However, as that political scholar, the late James J. Walker, explained: "Politics makes strange bedfellows." Unless the Regents stick with Clark Kerr, they are damning the University of California, because the attacks on his administration are not personal; they would not be so dangerous if they were.

The Regents, legislators and electorate might learn far more from the newly-released two-year study of graduate education by the American Council on Education, the country's principal educational coordinating agency. This study shows that UC-Berkeley is "the best-balanced, most distinguished university in the country." More than 4,000 scholars working in 29 fields at 106 universities cooperated in this study by evaluating their own departments and stating where they would most like to take Ph.D. work if they had it to do again. Berkeley, followed closely by Harvard, led the list. The study showed that "good education is costly education . . . there is a close relationship between faculty salaries and quality of the graduate faculty."

Last month in Los Angeles, just after the un-American group's report was released, the presidents of 227 colleges and universities and an audience of some 1,000 distinguished educators and laymen applauded Clark Kerr almost to the point of a standing ovation. He knew that wasn't personal, either. Kerr is not considered a visionary educator, and he knows it.

The applause came during a fascinating three-day convocation on "The University in America," sponsored by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, that provocative Santa Barbara think-factory originally set up with Ford Foundation money and dedicated to the preservation of the dialogue on vital subjects affecting a free society.

The meeting was an attempt to sort out the problems of higher education, and almost every speaker ended up illustrating every problem—and every hope and fear—by using as an example The University of California. UC was the star and the target. The roster of speakers and panelists was impressive, composed of men like Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas; Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT; Center President Robert M. Hutchins; Walter Lippmann; Sir Eric Ashby, Master of Clare College, Cambridge University; and Jacques Barzun.

Kerr cut loose after one critic from the Santa Barbara Center termed UC "the educa-

tional General Motors . . . so big that the system must be broken up before it extracts a terrible human cost."

"It would be disaster to split up the University and compete in Sacramento for funds," Kerr said in an interview, which was an expansion of the one in our April issue. "Ideally, the University should be out of the political area, and that is apparently impossible just now. Think of the competition politically if the University were split. In addition, the only chance today for experiment and diversity in public institutions is within the large university. If we were small, we would only try that which we know has worked; we wouldn't dare anything new in education."

He was franker than usual about his own position: "I live in a very real world, in the arena where sometimes the gladiator is forced to drink the hemlock," he said. "I certainly don't live on Eucalyptus Hill (a reference to the Santa Barbara Center's cloistered position) but in a university trying to serve a large urban society and with the task of making life meaningful within this society." He defined his role as UC president. "In terms of function, the major job is just to hold the place together," he said, "not solely the faculty and students, but within the faculty to bring cohesion from all points of view. Second is the effort for progress. Universities tend to be internally pretty conservative institutions. The president must encourage new approaches. Educational reform is harder than the first task because any institution tends to hold together, but change is difficult; you must have a view of where the place ought to be going.

"Then, you fight some battles," he observed mildly. "You defend the institution and its essential character against attacks. The loyalty-oath controversy was an example of that, a threat to academic freedom, which I hope now is ended. The fact that the University is so public, and so big, and the nature of our state, have meant I have been involved in controversy more than any other university president in the country. There are some inconsistencies in my roles; coherence is inconsistent with progress in program; and in fighting the external battles you come to be controversial. Yet when you handle progress, you want as little controversy as possible."

Kerr was angry about his starring role in the John Birch Society's film, but he had—for the record—only calm rebuttal for the subcommittee report. "There is a widespread desire for the elusive tranquility of the past," he said. "But the record of the past reveals no time when the spirit of inquiry was secure against attacks from reactionary forces, and no time of which man can be proud in which he did not use his power to increase understanding. I see both hope and growth in change; there is only atrophy of spirit in the security of the outworn past."

The two major points on which all participants in the Los Angeles meeting agreed were society's need for better general education, with more generalists in this age of science and specialization; and that student unrest is universal and caused by a lack within the educational structure today, a vague lack which I do not believe the experts were able to define any better than the distressed student, the worried parent or the concerned society. Many of the educators, including Kerr, suggested that "dropping in and out" of college might give young men and women the combination of action and intellectual life they need.

Hutchins was as provocative as when he was the young president of The University of Chicago, but he was hardly encouraging about higher education (nor particularly realistic); his solution to the problem of the university—give up trying to improve on what we have and start all over again with a

new beginning, a model college, small—3,000 students—and perfect in every way. Other scholars obviously felt the university should give up educating large numbers of students and concentrate on an elite band of the future leaders. Kerr suggested that the university could either withdraw from the crisis area—the teaching of undergraduates—or it can improve within the existing structure, which he believes UC is doing in its new cluster concept at Santa Cruz and UCSD.

It is unfortunate that UCSD's Chancellor John S. Galbraith was not on the program. For one thing, he and Kerr are always interesting when they get together. More importantly, however, UCSD really represents—far, far better than Santa Cruz—perhaps the best hope for combining the research and graduate program (the University's task under California's Master Plan for Higher Education) and the cluster-college approach to teaching undergraduates without the impersonal and inadequate system which first students and now educators admit and decry.

"We don't see any necessary contradiction between high graduate standards and research and a commitment to teaching," Galbraith says. "I've had a lot of student complaints, but never about the dedication of the instructor."

UCSD has felt—as yet, at least—no loss of community support because of the Burns report, nor has the new film brought problems. Some San Diegans, who might otherwise be sniping, support UCSD for the wrong reason—not from real understanding of the importance of education and research, but from keen awareness that UCSD gets \$20 million each year in Federal research grants and is embarked on a steady growth program which will make the University here big business and attract important research-oriented businesses to help the economy. In addition, it is Berkeley at which most of the criticism is aimed.

In the Los Angeles convocation, Walter Lippmann's speech was almost a prayer that universities can fill the void mankind feels in the modern world with its old standards outmoded. He called for universities to be "sanctuaries for excellence . . . the last best hope for mankind." And in San Diego last week, there was an inspiring example of what such sanctuaries can produce. At UCSD, *Harold and Frieda Urey Hall* was formally dedicated. An honored guest was Urey's old Berkeley professor, the teacher whose example in research had inspired the great Nobel Prize chemist who himself still carries on the tradition of greatness. That's what a university is about.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join the gentleman from California, DICK HANNA, and my other California colleagues in extolling the virtues of our educational system.

In 1965 California was in the process of educating 14½ percent of all the college students in the country, or 866,000 students out of a total number in the country of 5.9 million.

In 1957 California had 444,000 college students; this year we had 940,000 and next year we will have over 1 million students enrolled in our colleges and universities, an increase in the space of 10 years of 125 percent.

Berkeley, say what you will, is rated the No. 1 graduate school in the United States over Harvard, Yale, MIT, Wisconsin, and other fine universities, with Stanford running a close second in many schools.

Since 1958 California has founded three new university campuses and six

new State colleges with four planned for the near future.

The eminence of California's higher education complex is but a reflection of California's number one standing in population, State gross national product, water development, personal income, and human rights.

Next year our colleges and universities will confer over 40,000 bachelor degrees, 2½ times the 1957 rate; and 3,000 doctorates, 3 times the 1957 rate; and many of them will be at the Davis campus of the University of California in—I am proud to say—the Fourth Congressional District.

The Davis campus of the University of California is known throughout the world for its eminence in agriculture—for both teaching and research. Nations in all parts of the world seek advice from Davis agricultural researchers, and students from all corners of the world come to Davis to study.

Since 1959, when Davis was declared a general campus of the university, the arts, humanities, social sciences, physical sciences, and engineering have expanded rapidly and are fast gaining even greater stature for the campus. The first law class is being admitted this fall, and a medical school is now being developed at Davis. Because of the campus' great strength in the agricultural sciences and veterinary medicine, Davis is particularly strong in biology. The strength in these sciences is evident in the recent American Council on Education nationwide evaluation of graduate education in which UCD ranked 5th in botany, 8th in entomology, 11th in bacteriology-microbiology, and 19th in biochemistry. Davis has far more biologists per faculty size than on any campus of comparable size. Our campus was a logical choice for the university's newest medical school. And it made Davis the choice for the federally-supported National Center for Primate Biology, now in its new quarters on the campus.

Throughout its more than half a century of existence, the Davis campus has built a reputation for service—first to the farmers and the farm youth of California and later to the Nation and the world. More recently, this role has expanded to serve other areas and students with other interests, as Davis develops toward a general campus of the University of California.

Since this campus opened in the early days of the century, it has developed into one of the great agricultural teaching and research centers of the world. During the past 7 years the Davis campus has been developing as a general campus of the University—and it has been striving to build other areas equally as eminent as the one built in agriculture. These areas include letters and science and engineering, and will soon include law and medicine.

This campus was built to service one of California's major industries—agriculture. In serving this basic industry it has served the State, the Nation, and the world. Out of our research labs, test plots and field trials—have come new varieties of fruits, vegetables, and grains,

new ways to grow them, and new ways to harvest and process them. And more recently, we have seen even new foods and new food products which were unknown only a decade or two ago.

This work, this vast research activity, has been to a large extent made possible through the contributions and cooperation of the farmers, manufacturers, and processors in California.

I would like to cite a few examples of some of our achievements in agriculture, indeed a few.

New varieties of grapes for the table and for wine. New varieties of fruits, such as peaches, and cherries. New methods of canning peaches and pears, which have developed a product with more of that fresh-fruit flavor, at a lower cost and increased case yield. We have freeze-dried food products, many based on research in our labs. And, of course, one of our greatest success stories in recent years, has been in the area of mechanical harvesting.

You are no doubt aware of the tomato harvester, which is so terribly important to the economy in this State where farm labor is short and expensive. This tomato harvester has meant that a new tomato had to be developed, and this was done by our plant breeding specialists here at Davis.

Among the other new harvesters are: a lettuce harvester that can feel the heads tenderly for maturity and cut the ripe ones and leave the others—it is an intelligent machine. We have improved machines for harvesting prunes and one about to be born that will harvest melons. Then again there is the grape harvester—awaiting a new long stem grape—and too, machines for beets, onions, corn, etc., and even more recently, an asparagus harvester, which was initially developed some years ago, but not considered seriously by growers until the past 2 years because there was ample labor.

Our water scientists in the department of water science and engineering are working closely with California water plan engineers by testing dam and canal models in the laboratory before they are built.

Another extensive study is being carried on by agricultural economists on land values and agricultural costs. They are scientifically analyzing the economics of land development, agricultural production and marketing, to get a truer and more accurate picture of our agricultural situation in California.

Our today looks very bright, but our tomorrow looks even brighter. With our law school opening this fall for its first students, we expect to see some interesting developments in research areas having to do with land and water problems. Our closeness to Sacramento will also be helpful to our law faculty and, we hope, it to the Government. And we will be able to train young lawyers to work in areas not possible on the other campuses of the university, water, agriculture, biology, medicine.

Our medical dean is working hard to gather a faculty and planning to accept the first students in the fall of 1968.

This will make a tremendous change in our campus and greatly enlarge our areas of research and service to the people of California.

Our new National Center for Primate Biology, funded entirely from Federal grants, is now in its permanent quarters, and the staff members are actively engaged in research on control for tuberculosis, malaria, and too are studying cancer, pain, and so forth.

Some of you may wonder about studying malaria, but on a worldwide basis it is still one of the major diseases facing mankind, and it is certainly a disease of major concern to our Armed Forces in southeast Asia.

Our new 76-inch cyclotron puts us right into the nuclear age, with tremendous potential for research and teaching in the area of nuclear physics. And our physics faculty, as well as those in other disciplines, are very much interested in the possibility of locating the large AEC reactor east of Sacramento.

Our institute of governmental affairs, which is fairly new, is concerned primarily with studies on problems relating to State and local governments. Already several important studies have been completed and published and many more are underway.

One of the strengths of this campus is the cooperation of scientists in many different fields and disciplines to solve common and overlaying problems. I mentioned the tomato breeders working with the engineers to develop a tomato harvester. Food technologists, microbiologists, plant nutrition experts, entomologists, and others are also involved in this project.

We have people in veterinary medicine working with people in human medicine in solving diseases of man, so-called zoonotic diseases which also affect both man and animals. This field of diseases common to both man and other animals is one of the most challenging facing us today. Another interesting example of such hybridization occurs in our food protection and toxicology center, where scientists from many fields are tackling important problems facing the food industry today. One of the newest developments in this center is a study of packaging, all aspects and particularly safety, and I am glad to say financed by grants from the industry. We like to promote scientific hybridization as we call it, or in other words, this bringing together of people from different disciplines to work on a single problem.

Our new college of engineering is fast gaining national prominence for its research in many areas. One of the most exciting of these is bioengineering where the engineering principles are applied to solving biological problems. Again, an excellent example of the cross-fertilization of ideas among our faculty members.

And we must not forget that members of our faculty are also actively engaged in research in the humanities and social sciences, as well as creative activity in the arts. For these areas also serve society. Our musicians, painters, and writers, all contribute much to our

culture. Our social scientists, sociologists, and our anthropologists offer new insights to many problems facing us in society today.

And we must not forget that the greatest service this or any campus can offer to its citizens is that of education itself. This year our enrollment was slightly under 8,000. This coming fall it will be about 9,200. We are planning to reach a maximum enrollment of about 15,000 by 1975-80 with an additional 3,500 in the professional schools—law, medicine, veterinary medicine, and perhaps others. Our great Gov. Pat Brown has submitted a 5-year construction program for Davis calling for a capital outlay of approximately \$70 million.

Indicative of the pioneering spirit of service at the Davis campus is the proposed international service faculty comprised of professors dedicated to a career of service in international development. The ultimate objective is to create a faculty constructed around the problems of development in the poor countries of the world. The faculty would emphasize research, development, and application in agriculture, but it would embrace all academic disciplines which can help solve or ameliorate the urgent problems of economic growth and contribute to improvements in living conditions for man in the less developed countries of our world.

The concept of an international service faculty is based upon the following assumptions:

That improved economic growth in the developing countries will serve the U.S. national interest and purpose.

That improvement in the agricultural sectors of the developing countries is essential to their economic growth.

That improved technology, which becomes an integral part of the systems of agricultural producing, processing, and distributing in the several countries, will provide a condition essential to economic growth.

That improved technology will be developed and applied by professionals who are educated not only in the principles of science but also in their application to their immediate problems.

That until the less developed countries can develop their own colleges and universities, the United States must help fill the gap.

To that end, the University of California at Davis will gather a faculty of dedicated scholars from all disciplines, but primarily agriculture, as feeding the hungry of the world is the most crucial problem of our times. These outstanding men will divide their time between actual work in a developing country implementing new methods and research at the Davis campus. For example, Dr. Clinton Chichester has been in Chile working on a project to develop a feasible means of preparing meals from fish; Dr. Sherman Leonard, on loan from the Davis campus, was the first director of the Food Research Institute at Campinas, Brazil, where significant work was done in both citrus fruits and the preservation of various dairy products.

All these men reflect the long tradition of service to the State of California, the Nation, and the world found at the great and always improving University of California.

THE IDEA OF AN INTERNATIONAL SERVICE FACULTY

At the University of California, Davis campus, we have developed a proposal for an International Service Faculty—ISF. Initially, the faculty would emphasize agriculture, but it would embrace all academic disciplines which can help solve or ameliorate the urgent problems of economic growth and contribute to improvements in living conditions for man in the less-developed countries—LDC's.

The idea of the ISF emerged from intensive discussions with the faculty and administration at Davis, including seminar-type meetings with nine faculties as well as with the Committee on International Agricultural Development. A proposal for initial financial support has been formulated but is omitted from the present paper in order to concentrate on the central ideas: the underlying assumptions, the nature of the ISF, how it would be geared into the university, how the ISF would be set in motion, and priorities in programs and areas.

UNDERLYING ASSUMPTIONS

First. Improved economic growth in the developing countries will serve the U.S. national interest and purpose. Orderly economic growth would nourish stability and peace within and among nations and will also fulfill the national purpose to share whatever genius this country possesses in the productive arts and sciences to the improvement of the human condition throughout the world.

Second. Improvement in the agricultural sectors of the developing countries is essential to their economic growth. Everywhere that agriculture forms the largest part of their economies, enormous efforts are necessary to bring population growth into line with possible economic development and more food will be needed for more people for as long as we can see into the future. While imports of food from outside may help, the poor countries must rely for their food supplies chiefly on their own efforts. India currently imports only 6 percent of her food consumption. Again, if improved efficiency is a main goal in the poor countries, improvements in the largest sector—agriculture—should be stressed. Finally, developing countries desperately need foreign exchange, most of which they must earn through exports. With few exceptions, agriculture provides most of what they have to sell.

Third. Improved technology, which becomes an integral part of the systems of agricultural producing, processing, and distributing in the several countries, will provide a condition essential to economic growth. In the United States, farm production increased at 1.1 percent a year from 1920 through 1940; in 1955 through 1963, the annual rate of increase more than doubled and, in the absence of acreage diversion programs, would have more than tripled. Four factors are

primarily responsible for the increased crop production per acre: increased farm power and better instruments; higher yielding crop varieties; more effective chemical control of pests and diseases; and increased use of improved fertilizers. All these factors result from long-term investments in research, education, and extension. In Japan, the return in agriculture from investment in rural education, research, development, and extension has been estimated at 35 percent per year for the period 1880 to 1938.

Fourth. Improved technology will be developed and applied by professionals who are educated not only in the principles of science but also in their application to their immediate problems. We recognize that the mere provision of trained and skilled people may not be enough. The developing countries need adequate farms; suppliers of seeds of improved crop varieties, fertilizers and other essential inputs; suppliers of suitable farm equipment including shop facilities, processing plants; laboratories; distribution systems; cooperatives; extension services; financial institutions; governmental agencies; and other organizations which can and will make use of people with applied science training. Much of this may require changes in public policies as, for example, to increase incentives for entrepreneurs in and out of agriculture. More profoundly, these developments may require changes in attitudes. But all such changes will be of no avail unless the educated and trained people are there to be used. To illustrate, in 1963 to 1964, the United States, with 190 million population of whom some 7,500,000 are classified as rural farm, graduated 7,050 with B.S. degrees in agriculture and closely related disciplines, 1,859 with M.S. degrees, and 569 with Ph. D. degrees. Colombia, a country of only 17 million but also with a rural farm population of 7 to 8 million, has annually graduated 80-odd ingenieros agronomos, whose degrees are comparable to our bachelors.

Fifth. Until the LDC's can develop their own colleges and universities, the United States must help fill the gap. As rapidly as possible, developing countries need to provide themselves adequately with schools, colleges, universities, and programs of research and extension. But the growing of institutions takes time, however intensive the encouragement. Meanwhile, students from developing countries will be coming to the United States in large numbers.

In 1957 some 30,000 aliens came to the United States on student visas, in 1962, some 41,000. Compared to proportions of U.S. students who select agriculture as a profession, a large share of the influx of foreign students enroll in colleges of agriculture.

By good fortune, the United States is now in a position to respond to this increased demand and increased need for training foreign students in agricultural technology. In the United States the technological needs of agriculture remain great and are by no means static so that more jobs await agricultural graduates than there are graduates to fill them. Nevertheless, our colleges of agriculture,

by judicious expansion and by allocation of resources, can accommodate a larger flow of foreign students.

Sixth. For the United States to help fill this gap in the numbers of trained people, it must project its applied sciences into the developing world as never before. It is one thing to enroll foreign students in courses in applied science, but it is quite another to train each student appropriately for useful careers in their home countries. While the principles of science are the same everywhere, their application differs with the environment.

The genius of agricultural education in the United States has been in bridging the gap between the laboratory and the field. Much of the effectiveness of applied science in farming, processing, and distributing systems in the United States has accrued because professors have had well-established roots in their local environments. This is true whether we consider research, teaching, or extension. In the proposal here advanced, the environment shifts to the developing countries. This proposal is designed to ameliorate a major flaw, long recognized by numerous commentators, as to the relevance of applied science education in agriculture to be had in the United States for realities of environment in the developing countries.

Although large numbers of United States professors have gone overseas on leave to work on the agricultural and related problems of development in the poorer countries while on temporary leave, they have done so only rarely as projections of their university. Upon their return, nearly all of these professors have felt impelled to lay aside and even to forget their foreign experience and to concentrate upon teaching and research at home in order to recoup "time lost." They have been so impelled by their sense of duty to their colleagues, to their colleges, and to their families, and also by normal aspirations to realize their fullest possibilities in their professions. Colleagues and colleges, generally have not been prone to accept service abroad as pertinent experience for purposes of promotion and merit recognition in their home institutions.

Seventh. If we are to achieve the above goals by an effective projection of the university into overseas development, we need drastic revisions in our conceptions of what is necessary in our commitment of resources and in our procedures. To achieve these objectives we propose to establish an International Service Faculty. We venture to hope that our proposal may prove suggestive to other universities and that the central idea may become one of the guidelines for legislation by the Federal Government to provide continuous support for expanded participation by land-grant universities in the development of the less-developed countries.

THE INTERNATIONAL SERVICE FACULTY

The ultimate objective is to create a faculty constructed around the problems of development in the poorer countries.

Initially, the faculty would emphasize agriculture in its broadest and most comprehensive sense. From the start we

would stress the economics and the institutional aspects of development as well as the relevant natural sciences. In time we should expect the faculties to change as the developmental problems of host countries change.

The core of this faculty would be professors dedicated to a career service in international development; this is the essential idea of this proposal. This faculty would be built not only on the conception of the need, already described, but also on the belief of the willingness of many highly qualified academic people to commit themselves to long terms and even to careers of overseas service if they can be assured of opportunities reasonably comparable to those they would enjoy if they remained at home. They should enjoy equality in academic standing and in professional advancement as well as in remuneration and sabbatical privileges. Their talents and performance must come to be rewarded equitably with those of their colleagues in their own departments and in their professional disciplines, including their professional societies which, we assume, will increasingly recognize scholarly performance in the developing countries.

The work of the International Service Faculty would be in the national interest, hence the faculty should be supported by the Nation rather than by the State government. Actually, the State has already made—and will continue to make—very large contributions to the ISF. The strength of the ISF will generate from its roots in the university—in its scientific manpower, its academic organization, its libraries, and its laboratories—which the State will continue essentially to support. But all the additional costs of the ISF should come from outside funds.

We expect national support to be authorized by the passage of the McGovern bill—S. 1212, 89th Congress, 1st session. This bill proposes to finance a substantial part of AID's technical assistance program by means of a permanent authorization in the form of Federal grants-in-aid to colleges and universities which develop qualifying overseas programs aimed at improving the developing countries. The McGovern bill results from a growing sense both of the urgency of the need for improvement in the LDC's and also of the inadequacy of past approaches to meet the need.

Among the landmarks in the emergence of the McGovern bill are John W. Gardner, "AID and the Universities"—New York: Education & World Affairs, 522 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y., 10036, 1964—the White House Conference on International Rural Development, July 27 and 28, 1965. Jointly sponsored by AID and NASUL-GC, see "Proceedings"—and "Policies for Promoting International Development," report of a conference on productivity and innovation in agriculture in the underdeveloped countries, MIT, 1964—the Millikan report.

We hope and believe that the McGovern bill will become law and will rival the Morrill Act of 1862 in historical significance.

Careers of academicians who become members of the International Service Faculty, while varying, will have in common an apportionment of time between the home campuses and the field which will make for excellent contributions in both. One type of career might be patterned on that of a distinguished private overseas agricultural research and development program. Members would serve overseas for long periods but with extended home assignments at least in alternate years. Home assignments, including vacations, would be for no less than 4 months and would normally include one academic quarter during which the returnee would give at least one course or seminar in his specialty and would be available for work with advanced students. Many other divisions of time between overseas and home service would be possible.

We anticipate that enough returned faculty members would be present each year so that the programs of foreign students would include courses by professors who, while presenting the principles of their disciplines, would include applications fitting the environments of developing countries.

As the name "International Service" implies, however, we would expect the chief contributions of the ISF to be overseas. Unless universities in the Western World take drastic measures to facilitate the flow of members of their faculties into these new institutions; that is, universities in the new and developing countries, over the next critical decade, the latter will either be stillborn or will emerge as caricatures of the great universities they should have become.

Report of Study Committee No. 1, chaired by Prof. James S. Coleman, 17th All-University Faculty Conference, April 1962, at Santa Barbara. See page 12. The report of this committee, the summary of discussion of the report, and the resolutions adopted on the subject—all these document the considered commitment of the university to international service.

Projected service by members of the proposed International Service Faculty would be heavily weighted in favor of periods overseas. We expect this faculty: First, to contribute to human knowledge through their own research in overseas areas; second, to play vital roles in the development of colleges, universities and other institutions which will give proper attention to problem-solving in teaching and research; third, to facilitate the application of science which will lead to quicker improvements in productive and distributive processes; and fourth, to aid in increasing the effectiveness of governmental research agencies whose policies often determine the success of innovations essential to substantial economic development. We wish to stress also the extension function, often sorely needed overseas.

We shall expect the ISF to help build strong extension services abroad. In developing countries where research results respecting improved varieties, tillage methods, and controls may still be unusually tentative, extension will need especially close integration with research.

EFFECT OF THE INTERNATIONAL SERVICE FACULTY ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNIVERSITY

Foremost is the point that this faculty would be an integral part of the university, college by college, and department by department. It is essential that the intention of the proposed program be clearly stated, thoroughly understood, and widely accepted. The intention is to project the university into the developing-country world. Often, at present, a professor undertaking a foreign assignment is only loosely identified with the university; under this proposal, he would be the university. What he does in the foreign field would then be as much a part of his departmental program, his college's program, and his university's program as anything performed by his colleagues who remain at home.

The intention is not only to project the university but to project its best. Professors will go overseas to realize careers dedicated in whole or in some significant part to overseas service. They will go in the belief that they can apply their science better abroad if they become steeped in the foreign environment—in knowledge of its institutions, its culture, its religions. But it is still their science that they apply, and science is organized by disciplines which are institutionalized in departments. Hence, it is better by far to insist that the present organization of scientific disciplines by departments be maintained, with international service being added as rapidly as feasible in all relevant departments, rather than vesting separate departments specializing in activities abroad. Departmental chairmen will be in strategic positions to share in the definition of the university's overseas program and to communicate to others the intention of projecting the university abroad. Inasmuch as the university, by nature, magnifies the independence of its academic staff, the aims of international service will be fully realized only through widespread acceptance and support of the program by professors, whether or not they themselves are actively engaged in the enterprise.

Nothing less than complete acceptance by key university people of the idea and the ideal of international service will assure participants that their rewards, professional and otherwise, for such service will be comparable to rewards at home. Given this assurance, we believe that a number of motivations will encourage academicians, who rank among the best, to enter international service. Names come readily to mind—names of outstanding academicians who, despite the substantial professional and academic risks which must now be faced, have already committed themselves significantly to such work. Spectacular as individual contributions have been, however, they must be multiplied, extended, and systematized. Commitments that go beyond individuals—commitments of universities—are required.

In terms of organization, then, we contemplate a university with a formal structure much as it is now, but with its administration, its schools and colleges, its departments, its libraries, its committees, and its councils all informed

by the commitment to an additional purpose. There will, of course, need to be an identifiable office to take responsibility for certain aspects of international programs.

Its name is not important except that the title should reflect the need, initially, to stress the role of agriculture in development. As noted previously, however, the program would be broader than agriculture from the beginning, and, as developing-country needs change, the name of the center might eventually be changed.

The new administration organization should provide the chief, although not the exclusive, point of contact for outside agencies seeking to draw university resources into specific programs. The organization would have a coordinating function for activities which cross disciplinary lines or which involve cooperation with other universities. The organization would provide a clearinghouse of information on international service activities carried on by other universities, agencies, and organizations. The organization should assist individuals, faculties, and teams of workers in the search for funds to broaden or extend their international service activities. The organization should be prepared to assist appropriate offices of the university in the acquisition of library and laboratory materials, in making available information about international services of the university to the university community itself and to the public, and in the reception of foreign visitors.

Finally, any university which engages heavily in international service will find itself involved in negotiating certain nonacademic details of agreements with granting agencies, with other universities and with agencies and universities in foreign countries. The systematic movement of academic personnel laboratory equipment, household furnishings, and transport equipment requires an efficient administrative organization. Professors and their families going abroad, as well as foreigners coming to the university campus for study and research, require assistance in finding housing and establishing households.

Assistance may be required in immigration and emigration as well as in complying with other kinds of governmental regulations. So far as the movement of personnel and equipment abroad is concerned, the university would expect to rely essentially, and probably wholly, upon the services and good offices of contracting agencies—government agencies, foundations, and private businesses—which are already experienced in these operations. There will, however, be an administrative burden for the university in negotiating for such services with contracting agencies. There will also be a responsibility to assume for assisting the movement of scholars, fellows, and students to the United States. Both these latter obligations could well be assumed for the university by this organization.

HOW THE ISF WILL BE SET IN MOTION

Through its appropriate channels, such as the deans of agriculture, of letters and science, and of veterinary medi-

cine, the university will announce the availability of funds—once these have been provided—for professorships in international service and invite interested faculties in agriculture, in the social sciences, and in veterinary medicine to consider whether they wish to participate. It is anticipated that interested departments will address themselves to the proposal either under the leadership of their chairmen or through a professor whom he designates as the department's representatives.

Departments wishing to participate will be asked to formulate statements of what they conceive to be their contributions to international service. Thus the departments might appraise present course offerings and indicate additional courses which international service professors might teach in order to increase the relevancy of the curriculum to the needs of LDC students.

They might also suggest the kinds of research or research-and-training programs which the overseas experience within departments shows would best fulfill the aims of the university abroad. They should give attention to preferential locations of overseas work. Where two or more departments are complementary, they may wish to develop joint statements on parts of their overseas programs. Departments wishing to participate will also be asked to nominate candidates for international professorships.

Programs and appointments will be approved through the normal channels of the university in accordance with normal procedures. However, the administration organization will have a special responsibility to review proposals for programs, personnel, and locations of work in order to advise appropriate authorities of the university concerning those undertakings which it deems will both expedite the development of a teaching program well designed for the needs of the LDC's and also make for a sound and defensible general program abroad.

We contemplate that initial appointments will be full professorships. The university thus shows its intention to appoint only ranking scholars in the field of international service. Confident that a number of its most eminent people will elect this service if it is available, the university is convinced that leadership from the very beginning must be drawn from the ranks of the most eminent.

What of those interested faculty members who have not yet attained their full professorships? Let us remember that we are here discussing only the first steps in the process of establishing a pattern of excellence in future expanded programs that will develop with funds from the McGovern bill, when passed, as well as from other sources. Later on, we expect the ISF to include all ranks. However, we believe that it is essential for the initial core of the faculty to be persons who, so far as possible, have proven eminence and who, in turn, will be discriminating in their evaluation and recommendations of personnel to fill out the program. We also believe that by

PRIORITIES IN PROGRAMS AND AREAS

beginning with ranking professorial appointments, this program will encourage younger members of the faculty who aspire to these positions—they will be encouraged to believe that their performance in international service, if it measures up, will enable them to advance to the higher professorial ranks in due time.

By the same token, senior staff officers will feel much easier about encouraging younger academicians who want to try foreign work to undertake assignments: the heavy present risks of foreign assignments to the careers of young staff members, risks to which the senior members feel the juniors should be alerted, would be greatly diminished—and eventually equalized by the ISF. Meanwhile, with the present cooperative program between the University of Chile and the University of California as well as in other prospective international activities we anticipate no lack of opportunities for aspirants at lower ranks than professorships to enter international service. Indeed, we believe that the problem will be, as it should be, one of selection from among numerous able candidates.

WHAT PROPORTION OF PROFESSIONAL TIME DO WE CONTEMPLATE WILL BE SERVED OVERSEAS?

Addition of the international service aspect or dimension to the regular research-educational functions of the university will require the commitment of individual professors to overseas careers. As already indicated, we believe that some professors would be willing to make a long-term and virtually full-time commitment, although at the minimum each would return for a month each year and for long enough every other year to teach a course in his field. Other professors may wish to divide their commitments and their energies between overseas and domestic commitments. No doubt differences among the disciplines will influence choices of professors. An anthropologist or a political scientist might wish to make his career essentially overseas, at least, for long periods of time. So might an agronomist or an economist specializing in marketing. A general economist, a soil scientist, or an entomologist might divide his time more equally.

We envisage that each department, in its proposal to participate will arrive at a policy respecting full-time and part-time service. Like other departmental proposals, this policy will have to be approved, and perhaps negotiated in the process, through the channels already described. The primary guiding principle will be the provision for sufficient allotment of time to insure that participating professors will be able to develop long-term commitments. There will be considerable individual flexibility, of course, and over their career spans, many ISF professors will find themselves spending considerable periods stateside. Normally, however, we would expect the bulk of ISF professors who enter the program to contemplate spending most of their time overseas for the next 8 to 10 years. Normally, half time in international service will be considered a minimum commitment.

We now turn to absorbing questions: What kind of programs will be approved? What criteria will be used in evaluating proposed programs in selecting alternatives? In what geographic areas will the university's International Service Faculty concentrate? As will be shown, the answers to these questions are related.

First, what kind of programs will be approved? What criteria will be used? In accordance with the assumptions with which we opened, we consider that the university will be strongly impelled to develop procedures and criteria which will emphasize expected contributions to economic growth. Initially, the focus will be on increases both in the efficiency and volume of food production, processing, preservation, and distribution, with due attention given to nutritional qualities and also to the acceptance of different kinds of food in consideration of native habits and customs. Further the stress will be upon food, fibers, and other agricultural products both for domestic use and for export.

Other criteria are involved, however. A major question is one of comparative advantage. Within a given country, is there a good *prima facie* case, at least, for the argument that the proposed development will represent a good use of the country's resources compared to alternative, available uses? The same questions apply to overseas trade—can the country profitably enter the world market with a surplus or, conversely, is the world price low enough to bring into question the country's stressing this line of production?

Then, too, there are institutional factors in judging whether a given proposal for overseas work is feasible. Perhaps first among these is the question whether a promising local institution—usually a university or a department within a university—is available, is anxious to cooperate, and has the present and prospective quality and size to provide reasonable assurance that the contributions of the U.S. university will take indigent roots.

There are other institutional factors, of course, and all these considerations argue for the designation of the administrative organization as a review committee—with the power to co-opt members freely—for proposed projects.

On proposals for the improvement of food and feed grains the judgments of geneticists, pathologists, and agronomists would predominate; on proposals for reducing the deterioration of soils through salinity, soil and water scientists and engineers would figure more prominently. On virtually all questions economists would be required. Economic talent will be especially necessary in light of the growing recognition of public policy as an important limiting or facilitating factor in development. Often such policies lie outside agriculture; for example, fiscal and monetary policy and foreign exchange control. But policies such as taxation and discrimination in exchange control may have a most direct effect upon agriculture. Policies on farm prices, on requisitioning farm produce,

on rationing of farm producers' goods—any and all of these may be of prime importance.

This stress upon the expected economic effects of the proposed programs and especially the significance of public policy suggest some answers to the second nagging question: On what geographic areas will the programs concentrate? Clearly, growth problems occur country by country. Insofar as the idea of stimulating growth is accepted, the stress will increasingly be in countries as countries—in extremely large countries like India and especially in federal systems, the stress may be more on the provincial than on the federal area. With allowance for important exceptions, we should expect the university to concentrate in a relatively few countries at any one time. We assume long-range programs: in one decade, the university may be working intensively in three countries and less intensively in three or four other countries; 10 years later, for example, one or two countries may have been dropped from the intensive list and two or three others may have been added.

At the same time, we should expect the university to be operating, often through individuals, in a number of other developing countries which may not be listed as countries of primary or even of secondary concentration. By nature, the university will include scientists whose interests and curiosities will range beyond and overleap efforts to provide a focus. In its International Service Faculty the university will encourage professional entrepreneurship especially in the greatly talented. We hope that ways can be found for our Mark Hopkinses to sit on their logs with foreign students with whom they may, indeed, return overseas. In promoting development in the poorer countries the individual approach should have a place along with the schematic.

To conclude the discussion of priorities and areal concentration; We posit that the focus will be rather heavily upon those activities which hold promise of immediate contributions to growth and that this focus will be compatible with considerable concentration in certain areas and, indeed, in certain countries. At the same time, we recognize that the searching, inquisitive nature of the faculty will often go off in unpredictable directions. Further, we believe that this inquisitiveness is closely related to the need for fundamental research which must not be overlooked in the search for immediate results. Acceptance of a need for urgency must not give way to a kind of opportunism which disregards the essential claims of science.

NEW EDUCATIONAL CONCEPT AT SANTA CRUZ

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am quite dissatisfied with the leadership and administration of the board of regents and a small portion of the faculty at the University of California at Berkeley.

The failure of the regents and the dean of the university at Berkeley to provide leadership and direction of the faculty and student body during the past

years has greatly prejudiced the whole of the University of California.

As only one example, one class was unable to meet 11 times during the semester of the Berkeley demonstrations. Such conduct deprived some students of classroom instruction and learning to which they were entitled. Such conduct is not excusable in a university.

Dr. Wallace Sterling, a great president of Stanford University, my alma mater, recently said:

But—universities stand, or should stand, at the pinnacle of any educational system. They are the institutions which combine the quest for new knowledge with teaching and training at undergraduate and graduate levels, a very few at the graduate level only. Their involvement with public issues and problems has long since torn the ivy from their towers and transformed their once cloistered ways. Yet, in my view, they will serve society best if they can retain an identity and an internal cohesion which somehow sets them apart from the commercial, industrial, social and governmental institutions which society has created; if they can retain, in John Gardner's phrase, "an inner city" which is calmer and more contemplative than the storms which swirl about it, where the value of discussion is measured not by volume but by information and knowledge and where the enterprise of learning is given primacy. Here is a moral commitment that is worthy of any university and any of its members. . . . For today's learning will go far to govern tomorrow's action. I do not know of any university—certainly in the United States—which is not beset by multiple problems. Nor do I know of any which is trembling on the brink of disaster.

Universities should serve primarily the student.

A public university has higher obligations to the student, its citizens and taxpayers than was displayed by the University of California at Berkeley in recent months.

I trust that somehow and soon, a new leadership, a new commitment, a new competence can be found and introduced at the University of California at Berkeley.

One of the major problems facing higher education today relates to the proper setting for undergraduate teaching—the whole relationship between student and faculty, the organization of undergraduate curriculum, the development of new methods and new organizational patterns. For these reasons, the entire higher education community has given a great deal of attention to the newest campus of the University of California located at Santa Cruz in my congressional district. While final answers may be years in the offing, the experimental nature of this new campus and the hopeful start already made under the superlative direction of Chancellor Dean McHenry and his staff guarantees an exciting and stimulating educational experience.

Although it opened its doors to students only last September, Santa Cruz has already created an extraordinary interest among students and educators alike. Having followed the development of this unique campus from its inception, I am hopeful that some of the approaches to undergraduate education being undertaken there will succeed and influence developments in higher edu-

cation throughout the country. The regents and administration of the University of California are to be commended for devoting some of its talent and resources to such a far-reaching project in undergraduate education. So much of our attention has been focused upon the advanced research findings that flow from the laboratories and libraries of our major universities that it is invigorating to find not only thought but resources as well being devoted to the problems involved with training undergraduates.

We, in the 12th Congressional District, are pleased that this newest campus of the university has been located in our area. The impact of the university and the community upon each other has already been manifested and the continued interaction between town and gown is certainly mutually advantageous. Located on 2,000 rolling acres of the historic Cowell Ranch, the University of California at Santa Cruz offers, in a setting of incredible beauty, a bold and adventurous approach to one of the major problems facing higher education.

The Santa Cruz concept has, I believe, great relevance to education in mid-20th-century America, and I trust my colleagues will be interested in this concept of higher education.

THE SANTA CRUZ CONCEPT

The Santa Cruz plan for a collegiate university has stirred the imagination of men everywhere who are concerned about the quality of undergraduate education. And it is widely regarded as a most exciting and promising innovation in higher education.

The Santa Cruz concept is a synthesis. Its intent is to combine in a single institution the best of the small college and the best of a large university—all within the framework and strength of a great State university system.

With the acceptance of the first class of 652 students in the fall of 1965, Santa Cruz consisted of a single undergraduate coeducational college, Cowell College. By 1995, it will have grown into a university of 25,000 or more.

But not as a monolith.

Santa Cruz will develop as a collegiate university, a cluster of small residential colleges on a single campus. It will add a college almost every year until there are some 20, averaging about 600 members each. Each will be a liberal arts college, but each will approach a liberal arts education from a different perspective. Cowell will emphasize the humanities, Adlai E. Stevenson College the modern social sciences, Crown College the natural sciences and mathematics. Subsequent colleges include ones with interests in international affairs, the arts, urban life, and other affairs of man.

Each will be headed by a provost, who, by his interests and personality, will put a distinctive stamp on his college. Campuswide guidelines will specify broad fields to be covered for the A.B. degree, but each college will determine how best to implement them in keeping with its identity and personality.

After early concentration on high-quality undergraduate education, Santa

Cruz will begin to launch the additional enterprises of a general university: graduate instruction, professional schools, and research institutions. Growth will be in a mode that preserves the integrity of the various units within the university. It will seek always the way to seem small as it grows large.

EACH COLLEGE WILL BE A WELL-ROUNDED COMMUNITY

Within the university, each college will be a relatively self-contained, semi-autonomous educational entity, with its own residence halls, classrooms, dining hall large enough to accommodate college gatherings, student common rooms, library-reading lounge, and faculty studies. Each college will include quarters for its provost and his family, apartments for 12 or so of its faculty fellows and preceptors, and guest suites for visiting scholars and lecturers and other distinguished visitors. Social and athletic events also will center in the colleges.

In these respects, Santa Cruz will retain and strengthen the best features of the small liberal arts college, but with an important difference.

For these small residential colleges will be clustered within the leavening and broadening influence of a large university. Interchange between the colleges, great scholars, excellent libraries and laboratories, and superior cultural events will provide a sophisticated setting that will counterbalance the parochialism which tends to develop in small communities, however excellent they may be.

BALANCE WILL BE BUILT IN

College membership will be assigned to achieve a balanced diversity of background, ability, and interests among the student members of each college.

Fellows and preceptors in each college will strike a similar balance, giving representation to the principle disciplines in the arts and sciences, but with a weighting toward the emphasis of the college.

Membership in a particular college will not impose on a student a particular major or field of specialization. Any student in any college can major—when he makes his decision—in any discipline he wishes. To further the principle of breadth, and to encourage the stimulation that results from exchanging different points of view, not more than half the student members of a college will major in its area of emphasis.

Students in each college will have access to the offerings in every other; and in the central campus for those subjects requiring facilities not available in a college—a laboratory course in biology, for example. This cross-fertilization through substantial exposure to courses in other colleges with different orientations is a further broadening influence the university provides.

THE COLLEGE AND WHOLENESS OF EXPERIENCE

Much attention has been given at Santa Cruz to the wholeness of the undergraduate experience.

It is a stale complaint in large universities that the student's life outside the classroom is ill-connected to the cur-

ricular enterprise and that major portions of his experience, therefore are educationally wasted. Or more charitably, that the educations which take place outside and in the classroom fail, by their lack of connection, to strengthen each other as they might.

The reasons for the lack of connection are clear. Students see little of faculty outside the classroom; students see little outside the classroom of the students they are involved with in class; the schedule of classes and requirements often defeats any inclination the student has to regard his experience of college as a coherent process.

The attempt at Santa Cruz to restore wholeness begins with the undergraduate college. The collegiate system is not new—what is new at Santa Cruz is simply our arrangement of its components and the fact that it is to be tried wholeheartedly in a public university.

The colleges at Santa Cruz are semi-autonomous. Each provides residence for a majority of its student members. Each provost has a major role in recruitment and promotion of faculty for his college. The faculty fellows have significant freedom in design of educational program, and much of the program is carried on within the college's facilities, although minimum requirements in each discipline are established by campus-wide boards of studies.

Where an undergraduate college has no voice in the selection of faculty, and no power to reward faculty for excellence of teaching, it falls often to a "soft core" of sacrificial faculty to give meaning to the institution's commitment to teaching. Where, at the other extreme, that commitment has been embodied in a separate undergraduate faculty, the resulting distinction between inquiry and teaching has again, directly and indirectly, weakened undergraduate education. Hence the importance attached, at Santa Cruz, to the college as a center of political power within the university.

Virtually every member of the faculty at Santa Cruz will be a member of a college. Most of his undergraduate teaching will be carried on there, his office or study may be located there, he will participate there in the determination of educational policy, and his salary, typically, will come in part from the budget of the college.

At the same time, however, he will normally be involved also in graduate teaching and research. He will have available research facilities appropriate to a university; and the nature of the undergraduate program—including heavy emphasis on independent work—will give him ample time to pursue his research interests.

The college at Santa Cruz has responsibility for educational policy in two areas:

First. General education, primarily but not entirely at the freshman and sophomore level.

Second. In advance areas that are beyond the basic campuswide requirements of the disciplines—here responsibility will be shared with the faculty in each discipline, campuswide.

In the realm between, where it is decided what will constitute appropriate basic work for a major in a field, the college is subject to the decisions of the discipline's board of studies.

IN SUMMATION

Higher education in the United States is fated to be massive. And an ever-increasing number and proportion of the total undergraduate body will be found in public institutions.

Santa Cruz is dedicated to the proposition that an educational offering to a large number of students need be neither impersonal nor ponderous.

Perhaps it is the most promising method by which the virtues of the small liberal arts residential college can be preserved and enhanced for future generations.

Perhaps its real significance is that it will make available to a substantial number of students—drawn from all sorts of cultural and economic backgrounds, and from a relatively broad spectrum of intellectual attainment—the sort of close instruction and enriched educational experience found for the most part only in exclusive private educational institutions.

Perhaps it can persuade others to break the lockstep of crowded classrooms, detached dormitories and impersonal instruction—and to adapt to their own circumstances the principles that guide us here.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, as a graduate of the University of California at Los Angeles, I want to join my colleagues today in paying tribute to that fine establishment.

Several of my colleagues have already talked about specific campuses of the university. I would like to speak more generally.

The university has changed in many ways since I was there. The enrollment has increased by thousands of students, and the physical plant has grown to include several more campuses. The system has changed from the semester system to the quarter system, but the important things have remained the same. The university has not sacrificed quality to quantity. It has not lowered its standards for either faculty or students.

The University of California is one of the most distinguished in the United States on the basis of quality of faculty and facilities for instruction and research. It leads all institutions in the number of Nobel laureates on its staff, has the largest number of faculty members who have won Guggenheim fellowships. The library of the university has been ranked third best in the Nation—following only the Library of Congress and Harvard Library—and the university recently won nationwide acclaim for the quality of its graduate school.

Equally important, the university has not sacrificed principle to controversy. The outstanding president of the University of California, Clark Kerr, once stated that the purpose of the university was not to make ideas safe for students but to make students safe for ideas, and the university has lived up to that ideal—although not without extensive criti-

cism. To the shock of many people, the university agreed to allow Communists to speak on campus. As a result of the free speech movement, the officials of the university agreed to compromise with the students and grant their request for the use of the campus for what had until that time been considered off-campus activities. The university has wisely accepted dissent as a valuable part of the educational process.

As a Californian, I am proud of the outstanding educational system of that State and am thankful for the generous support the people of that State have given to our entire public school system—which has at the pinnacle the University of California—and I am thankful for the provident government that the university has received from its regents and its presidents. I am grateful, too, for the valuable classes offered by the university extension service, which maintains adult education programs in some 200 California communities.

As an alumnus, I am grateful for the high quality education I received at UCLA—both in actual classes and in the enlightening atmosphere of the university. As a politician, I am grateful for the awakening I received in my years at the university. At the school which has the largest enrollment of foreign students in the United States, one is stimulated to look beyond his immediate world of books and exams.

As a husband, I am grateful for a wife who is also a graduate of the university—Berkeley campus—which undoubtedly helps to explain her tolerance for another graduate of the same institution.

As the university has expanded from its original size of 40 students, in 1869, to its present size of nearly 100,000—not including the over 200,000 part-time students in extension—it has grown from a good university to the great university that it is today.

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment my distinguished colleague who serves the district next door to my own in California. The gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA] is doing our State and the cause of education a great service by taking these special orders today.

My district is fortunate in having a new California State College at San Bernardino. Furthermore, it is evident that the majority of our students are among those who prefer to raise brains instead of beards.

I quote from a recent letter received from Dr. Joseph K. Thomas, dean of the college:

After eighteen years experience in California educational circles which were divided between secondary education, higher education, and college administration, in my opinion the University of California at Berkeley has without a doubt been the leader of higher education in California. Unfortunately, a few malcontents have tarnished some of the glitter in the last two years. It is also a disgrace that a few politicians in California are taking advantage of the situation in order to "feather their own nest".

Dr. Allan Carter, Vice-President of the American Council on Education, states in a very recent assessment of graduate education in the United States that the University of California at Berkeley is "... the best

balanced distinguished university in the country." Please refer to the May 27, 1966 issue of Time Magazine for further details on this study.

Fortunately, the distinguished faculty at Berkeley are confident that corrective measures are being taken in order to improve the undergraduate teaching concept. This is evident by the fact that very few faculty members are leaving the Berkeley campus.

I am confident that the parent campus of the University of California will resolve their undeserved criticism and once again return to its position of eminence. We in the California State Colleges are solidly behind them.

Mr. Speaker, many of the students living in my district attend the University of California at Riverside. Our students there, as in San Bernardino, are in fine educators' hands. Listen to the following from the Chancellor's Column a regular means Dr. Ivan Hinderaker uses in talking to the undergraduates:

Occasionally one reads something which, for him, has a special impact. The reaction is beyond just thinking the idea and style in which it is written are good. Rather, it is something like a loud "amen."

My latest experience of this came from reading an argument for liberal arts education by 38 year old Bell and Howell President Peter G. Peterson, writing in The Christian Science Monitor.

In two short decades, the world has been plunged in to the atomic, computer, and space ages. The most descriptive word about what is going on around us is "change." Our problem, then, is how to help educate men so they are best equipped to cope with change.

After noting several kinds of managerial skills which undoubtedly will be necessary in any future, Mr. Peterson observes that information, however important, is not enough.

"It is far easier to get people to absorb new knowledge than it is to get them to alter their conclusions. Most of us have an incredible talent in processing new facts in such a way that our prior conclusions remain intact.

"The new world demands, perhaps above all things, emotional flexibility and freedom. In this new world, rigidity may actually be a greater barrier to progress than ignorance.

"The late Paul Tillich said we must learn to be comfortable with ambiguity. Put another way, this world of ours is rapidly becoming a more unpredictable, ambiguous, and uncertain place, and we must come to terms with it.

"Can your educational environment, in fact, help provide the emotional security which enables you to recognize that life is indeed filled with risks and ambiguities, and that the great human achievement is to deal with them creatively and joyfully rather than be blind to change, or, even worse, fearful of change?"

Amen. For me, the impact came in three dimensions.

First, in politics, one of the greatest dangers flows from the far left and far right's crusade for the simple solution. In this complex world, any political problem worth calling a problem, however, isn't simple. More likely than not, neither is there an answer.

Second, in management, to anything not mentioned in the rule book or altering a little the comfortable routine of bureaucracy, without even an examination of the alternatives, too often the response is "no." That is not good. In large part, the quality of an institution is determined by what it is striving for, and by the vitality of the process of striving.

Third, in education, as important as what is taught is the manner in which it is taught. In liberal education there must be an open mind—questioning, weighing alternatives, making decisions, questioning. In addition to intellectual breadth, there must be emotional balance. This is no place for intellectual authoritarians.

It is my hope that students can gain from interaction with faculty the qualities of emotional flexibility and a passion for constructive change; that students can come to terms with ambiguity and unpredictability. It is my hope that we in the administration, older and perhaps more in need, can do no less.

And also:

In my first Chancellor's Column a year ago, I issued a challenge which I want to repeat now at the start of 1965-66.

"This should be a place never afraid of a steady flow of creative ideas, not only in matters academic but also in ways of doing things on the campus. Without such ideas, forward movement cannot begin.

"It should be a place of pressure, with departments and other units constantly pressing both sideways and up—to accomplish objectives they regard as important. Without such pressures nothing is likely to happen, even if ideas are good.

"It should be a place of challenge, with everyone stirred up enough about life and things to try to achieve always a higher level of performance. Without that stirring up, we can't be a university worthy of the name, and in addition, we won't have any fun."

That was the challenge. This is in part what followed.

A student developed the idea, suggested the place, lobbied with anyone who would listen, and can today claim parenthood of the new fine arts workshop nearing completion near The Barn.

The same student saw an unmet need in campus social life. So started the popular Friday night cabarets.

A student in search of a place which students interested in politics (liberals, moderates, conservatives) might call their own, set in motion some thoughts which produced the new political union next door to the new arts workshop.

A group of students interested in debate wondered why UCR didn't have a debate team. Organized debate got underway last semester. This fall the team will have its own office in the political union.

A group of students have carried a short-range campus FM radio station project (KUCR) to the point of being nearly ready to go on the air from their Canyon Crest apartment studio near Aberdeen-Inverness Residence Halls. The route for this project led from the campus through The Board of Regents and pending now is an application for a Federal Communications Commission license. We expect that KUCR will be in operation this fall.

The 150 students engaged in last year's tutorial project needed to make no argument in behalf of their hope for an office and lounge where they might interact. Space has been provided in the arts workshop building.

A student's question was a catalytic agent in a sequence of events which led to experimental language houses in French and Spanish last spring. German follows this fall.

A student inquired why the patios around the Library needed to be locked. They didn't need to be. One has been available for several months and, as soon as access walks can go in, the other two will be open.

If you haven't guessed it yet, we are searching, always for ideas, big or little, on how to improve this campus. We have only begun.

FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF FIRST USE OF NUCLEAR POWER IN SPACE

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is the fifth anniversary of the launching of the first atomic powered electrical generator into space. This atomic generator was launched from Cape Kennedy on June 29, 1961, in a Navy experimental navigational satellite. The atomic power supply is still supplying power to the satellite.

The launching of this atomic power supply 5 years ago was the world's first application of nuclear power in space. It was the vanguard of many applications of nuclear power in space which must follow if our Nation intends to be first in space.

I think it is most appropriate at this time to bring out some facts concerning the part played by Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, in assuring that the United States had this first in space. The Atomic Energy Commission had developed a nuclear power supply for use in space in 1959. Unfortunately, this development laid on a shelf because it was argued in some quarters of Government that a test or use of this device in space may have international repercussions in the event of an accident which would cause it to fall on the territory of an unfriendly nation. Chairman HOLIFIELD, recognizing the potential benefits of such an application argued for its use in space. He went directly to the Chairman of the Space Council who was then Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson, and laid out his thoughts concerning the importance of this test. He laid out the pros and cons and put the safety and international implication arguments in proper perspective. Fortunately, through the efforts of President Johnson, when he was Chairman of the Space Council, and Chairman HOLIFIELD of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the United States achieved a "first" in space over 4 years ahead of the U.S.S.R. Although we had no knowledge at the time, the Russians, of course, were also working on such a device. Their device was not launched until September 1965.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it would be appropriate and I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD following my remarks a copy of Chairman CHET HOLIFIELD's May 17, 1961, letter to the Vice President recommending the space test at a time when it was in danger of being delayed and even possible canceled. I also ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a news release published today by the Atomic Energy Commission

entitled "First Nuclear Power Generator in Space to Mark Fifth Anniversary June 29, 1966."

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC
ENERGY.

Washington, D.C., May 17, 1961.

THE VICE PRESIDENT,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: We have been informed by the Atomic Energy Commission of its request to the Space Council for approval of a space test for a small nuclear powered electrical generator (the SNAP-3 device). The AEC has also furnished us with a copy of their May 10, 1961, letter to you explaining the detailed safety reviews which were made and the limited conditions imposed upon the test for safety reasons.

We want to add our endorsement of the Atomic Energy Commission's statement concerning the importance of this test. The United States is a pioneer in the development of nuclear power supplies for space use. If we are to obtain the very practical benefits and great international prestige which will flow from being first in this field, then it is imperative that we follow through with necessary tests and actual applications of this development.

We believe further that a delay in carrying out this proposed experiment will ultimately have an adverse effect on other plans for the use of nuclear energy in space. This device has been subject to rigorous safety checks and, more important from a safety standpoint, its radioactivity content is insignificant. Any delay in this test would, in the long run, adversely affect the development of more exotic devices which may contain a great deal more radioactivity.

We understand that some quarters argue for a delay in testing this device on the basis of possible international repercussions in the event of an accident causing the device to fall on the territory of an unfriendly nation. We cannot challenge the validity of this consideration—we can, however, ask that it be put in its proper perspective. In addition to this negative aspect of international consideration, there is also a positive side in terms of the international prestige that the United States can realize from being first in the field of nuclear applications in space.

In summary, Mr. Vice President, one must balance risks against benefits. In view of the information we have obtained concerning the safety aspects of this test which have been extensively studied, we submit that the risks are slight and that there is reasonable assurance that this test can be conducted safely. On the other hand, the benefits this Nation can realize are perhaps immeasurable. In the net, these considerations argue for proceeding with this test now. Accordingly, we strongly recommend early and favorable consideration of the proposed test of the SNAP-3 device.

Sincerely yours,

CHET HOLIFIELD,
Chairman.

[A U.S. Atomic Energy News Release,
June 27, 1966]

FIRST NUCLEAR POWER GENERATOR IN SPACE
TO MARK FIFTH ANNIVERSARY JUNE 29

The first nuclear power generator in space will mark its fifth anniversary on June 29. This historic generator, developed by the Atomic Energy Commission, has traveled about 724,000,000 miles (over 25,000 times around the earth) and continues to provide power aboard the Navy's experimental navigational satellite 4-A.

The grapefruit-sized five-pound, three-watt nuclear generator was installed to supplement solar power on the 175-pound drum-

shaped satellite which is still signaling intermittently to tracking stations around the world.

The satellite was launched June 29, 1961, from Cape Canaveral. It became the oldest operating U.S. satellite in May 1964.

The Martin Co., Baltimore was the prime AEC contractor for the generator. The satellite was designed and developed for the Bureau of Naval Weapons by the Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory, Howard County, Md.

A second, similar Navy satellite with the same type of nuclear generator was launched in November 1961 and operated until July 1962. Two Navy navigational satellites were launched in 1963 from Vandenberg Air Force Base, California, with larger nuclear generators developed by the Atomic Energy Commission. These generators provided all the power to the satellites during their operating life.

All four generators were developed under the Atomic Energy Commission's SNAP (Systems for Nuclear Auxiliary Power) program. The aim of the program is the development of compact lightweight, reliable nuclear electric devices for unattended operation in all environments. A variety of radioisotopes may be used as the fuel for generators of this type. The heat generated from the radioactive decay of the fuel is converted directly into electricity through thermocouples which surround the fuel. A thermocouple is composed of two dissimilar metals joined together at both ends, producing a loop in which an electric current will flow when there is a difference in temperature between the two junctions.

Other SNAP generators are operating in the sea. One is supplying electrical energy for a Navy acoustic beacon located at the bottom of the Atlantic Ocean. The first nuclear powered Navy deep-sea floating weather station has completed over two years of operation in the Gulf of Mexico, and it still fully functioning despite encounters with two hurricanes.

To increase the applicability of these nuclear generators, the Atomic Energy Commission is developing more efficient and more compact versions. These advanced types of generators are designed to be economically competitive with conventional power sources in many instances. They are expected to see widespread use as power sources for space communications systems, instrument packages on the moon, weather satellites, navigational aids and remote weather and seismological stations.

PATMAN CHARGES REPUBLICANS WITH HYPOCRISY ON INTEREST RATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, once again, our Republican colleagues are launching their desperate election year search for issues.

Now, after all of their years of support for the high interest, tight money policies of the Federal Reserve Board, our colleagues are attempting to convince the people that they really believe in low interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, I predict that this blatant election year hypocrisy will backfire on our Republican friends.

The people of this country know that it is the Republican Party that has protected, defended, and encouraged the

Federal Reserve Board in its long campaign to give the big banks higher and higher interest rates at the expense of the public. They will not fool the people by this last-minute, election-year lip service to the cause of low interest rates.

My distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, TOM CURTIS, the leading Republican spokesman on monetary affairs, rose on the floor last Thursday to accuse the Democratic Party of supporting high interest. Yet, my good friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], has opposed every move which would have brought reform to the Federal Reserve System and justice for the people on interest rates and monetary policy.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Will you wait for just a moment?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I wanted to inquire at this point because I wondered whether the gentleman from Texas notified the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] that he planned to make this kind of an attack on him today.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, I did. I discussed it with him and showed him my speech earlier in the afternoon. We agreed that we will have a discussion of this on the 11th of July if I can have unanimous consent for the special orders. I will ask for this privilege for myself and for him on July 11. The gentleman from Missouri is fully acquainted with what I am saying. We are good friends although we have different views on the Federal Reserve. We are both on this Joint Economic Committee where the subject comes up often.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] and his Republican colleagues never mention the fact that it was their President, who, in 1953, let the Federal Reserve Board seize its independence. This independence, of course, is a fake. This so-called independence which President Eisenhower let the Federal Reserve take is the reason we have high interest rates today.

This seized independence is the result of a Republican administration. It has never been agreed to by any Democratic administration, including the Johnson administration. It is the Republicans—and not the Democrats—who let the Federal Reserve run away from the law and operate independently from the people and their elected representatives.

It is now absurd for the Republicans to loose a torrent of crocodile tears over high interest rates. They created them in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my Republican friends, if they are really serious in their concern about interest rates, to join me in efforts to reform the Federal Reserve Board and return control of monetary affairs to the people of the United States.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE POZNAN UPRISING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 10th anniversary of the Poznan uprising.

It was 10 years ago today, June 28, 1956, that the heroic people of Poland staged their determined uprising against Stalinist oppression in Poznan.

Mr. Speaker, this great uprising could have succeeded and the people of Poland could have carved for themselves a place among the free nations of the world, except for the fact that the Poles, badly outnumbered and using only clubs and their bare hands to fight for their freedom, were overwhelmed by Soviet tanks which were rushed into Poznan after 2 days of fighting.

Mr. Speaker, this uprising demonstrated the indomitable spirit of the Poles and it certainly gave the Communists a great deal about which to think. There were some concessions made after this 2-day uprising which cost the lives of 54 Polish patriots fighting for their freedom and the freedom of their country.

Mr. Speaker, this uprising took a great deal of courage, for these people well knew the odds against them.

These brave Poles have written a magnificent record for the world to follow. In this heroic uprising they demonstrated to the Soviets that the Poles owe nothing to Soviet communism.

Mr. Speaker, this uprising served notice on all Communists that indeed you cannot destroy human dignity and expect to carry on.

It is rather significant that today 10 years after this uprising, storm signals are up again in Poland. Demonstrations are being waged against any curtailment of Cardinal Wyszyński by the Polish police in his efforts to try and carry on his mission of religious freedom.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that the present conflict between church and state in Poland bodes no good for the present regime.

Poland is celebrating its 1,000 anniversary this year. During those 1,000 years the Poles have suffered much oppression. They have paid a heavy price for retaining freedom and human dignity.

This 1,000 years marks the beginning of Christianity in Poland. This 1,000 years is a constant reminder that various efforts have been made to separate the Poles from their church—and all of these efforts have failed.

I think it is safe to predict that any effort today by the present regime in Poland to try to restrict the freedoms won in the Poznan uprising of 10 years ago; namely, the liberation of Cardinal Wyszyński and the freedom for him to carry on his spiritual mission to the people of Poland will fail. Those freedoms must continue.

It would be my hope that the present regime in Poland would understand that to try to curtail these religious freedoms

will only produce still greater courage among the indomitable Poles.

The Poles are intelligent people. They know that the odds are overwhelmingly against them. But it is too much to ask people to restrain themselves after having won these concessions 10 years ago.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the whole world is watching what is going on in Poland today on this 10th anniversary of the Poznan uprising and it is fitting that we look to see what is happening in Poland today. The present Polish regime restored some degree of privileges to the Poles in 1956 after the Poznan uprising. It would be a catastrophic error in my judgment for this regime to try to take those freedoms away, particularly the privileges of Cardinal Wyszyński to carry on his spiritual mission.

We need only to look over the 1,000 years of Polish history to see the futility of any effort to destroy the spirit of Poland.

These people, Mr. Speaker, this year are observing their 1,000th anniversary. They know well the wealth and richness of their past, for indeed it is the glorious and heroic past of a people who have symbolized for mankind throughout the world the determination to be free.

I sincerely hope that this 10th anniversary of the Poznan uprising will serve to remind those who would try to drive a wedge between the Polish people and their church and who would deny the Poles their human dignity that they are only courting disaster, which would make Poznan but another plateau in Poland's uncompromising struggle for liberty and social justice.

THE RED CHINA LOBBY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the mere mention of the word "China" these days brings bursting onto the political and public stage a strange troupe of intellectuals, scholars, educators, labor officials, writers, newspaper editorialists, politicians, church leaders, and journalists—all of whom I would describe collectively as the Red China lobby.

Curiously enough, there are many old Communist-fronters and the usual Communist-satellites who advocate the Red China cause. They are a part of the Red China lobby but they are not the men, publication and organization to which I refer. The men, publications and organizations I mention in this address are not Chinese, nor are they "Red." They are loyal Americans, not part of any Communist apparatus working to subvert the Government of the United States. In their speeches, statements and writings, these lobbyists express no revolutionary desire to violently overthrow our Government. They may not even think they are part of a lobby. However, they do say that our Government should change the successful policy it has followed for 15 years

in combating one of the most revolutionary and violent dictatorships the world has ever known—the Communist government on the mainland of China.

Since the late 1940's when the Communist guerrillas of Mao Tse-tung forced the war-torn and weakened troops of Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist Government from the shores of the South China Sea and across the straits to Formosa, we have sought to keep the Chinese Communists from achieving their aggressive expansionist goals. We fought them in Korea in the 1950's and in Vietnam today we are fighting not only their conspiratorial influence but their direct logistic, tactical, and military support of the blatant aggression from the north. As a result of our vigilance and firm policy, the Chinese Communists have been held generally within their borders. Only when we relaxed our guard, as in Laos in 1962, or when it was geographically and politically unfeasible to move against the Red Chinese, as in Tibet in 1961, has the Mao government been able to extend its sphere of influence. Even in countries far from the Chinese perimeter where Peking has tried to gain a foothold, our policies have had their effect. Can anyone honestly doubt that our continued opposition to Red China was not at least partially responsible for the recent defeats suffered by Peking in Ghana and Indonesia?

OUR 15-YEAR POLICY A SUCCESS

Yes, I believe that every indication points to the continuing success of our policy toward Red China and now, as a result, the Maoist government is in serious trouble. It has just suffered two devastating political setbacks in Indonesia and Ghana. The Red Chinese-supported Vietcong are being constantly frustrated in their attempts to overthrow South Vietnam. Internally, Red China is being smothered by overpopulation, its food distribution is erratic, and its industry is greatly overworked and creaking at the seams. Red China has been dealt a series of damaging blows, but in the United States a dedicated band of propagandists want the administration to make an alteration in our China policy which would give Peking a chance to catch its breath. This is a breather which would probably undo all the accomplishments which our policy has achieved over the past 15 years. Communism still has its treacherous hold on more than 700 million Chinese so any accomplishment might seem minor. Yet, there are many positive and tangible benefits which have come from our nonrecognition policy. Everywhere in the world, Red China is considered as being outside of the respectable community of nations. Let us be realistic, Mr. Speaker. The United States is the leading Nation in the world. Any nation which does not have diplomatic relations with the United States is without the precise aura of respectability that the Red China lobby now wishes to bestow on this enemy.

These propagandists in the Red China lobby are an active, diligent coterie engaged in influencing American public opinion toward a softer posture on Red

China. Once this public opinion is altered, the lobby reasons, the State Department will surely follow. Indeed, there is little doubt that there is a sizable group within the State Department which for a number of years has been seeking to soften our policy vis-a-vis Red China. They would gladly retreat to a well prepared position. As one honorary member of the lobby has explained this strategy:

On any foreign or domestic issue there must be a long-term process of public education, leading to the public acceptance that is needed for effective Government policy * * *. Public interest and concern with China is great enough today for the American people to listen tolerantly to new approaches and realistic ideas."¹

Now, we might well ask, "Who are these men, publications and organizations which compose the backbone of the Red China lobby" and are conducting this "process of public education." Ironically enough, most of them are usually described as "intellectuals," men preoccupied with ideas and abstract concepts. I say "ironically" because the government which they argue should be freely accepted into the community of nations and treated with kindness is infamous for its dedicated persecution of intellectuals who differ—to the slightest degree—with its policies.

It is known that since 1964 the Peking regime has incarcerated over 160,000 writers and scholars² who have dared criticize and question Mao Tse-tung's leadership. These men have been sent to labor camps for reform and ideological instruction; for many of them, this has meant illness and death from overwork and starvation.³ We know from press reports that just this year several prominent intellectuals, notably Tien Han, composer of the Red Chinese national anthem, have been severely reprimanded and censored by Peking, and that officials of Peking's municipal Communist party, including the city's scholarly ex-Mayor Wu Han, have been purged and ostracized by the Red dictators.⁴

While it would seem ironic enough that these American intellectuals are seeking a more congenial relationship with an anti-intellectual regime, it is even more bewildering that many of the American scholars in the Red China lobby vehemently protested when the Soviet Union sentenced the Russian writers Sinyasky and Daniel to hard labor in Siberia this past April. But now these same protestors wish the United States to be more gentle with Red China where the persecution of intellectuals is pursued on a much broader and more inclusive scale.

THE RED CHINA LOBBY

When I refer to the Red China lobby, I mean specifically lecturers and journal-

¹ From speech by Sen. EDWARD KENNEDY on the Senate floor, May 3, 1966; quoted from CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

² From testimony of Dr. David N. Rowe, Yale University, before Senate Foreign Relations Committee, March 28, 1966; quoted from official hearings transcript.

³ "Red China: Frustrated and Alone," *Time* magazine, February 25, 1966.

ists like Felix Greene and Edgar Snow, two leaders of what might be called the "let us not be beastly to Mao" school of journalism.

Mr. Greene is a British subject who has traveled widely—and freely—inside Communist China and has returned to this country to lecture and write about how "misunderstood" and "persecuted" the Chinese Communists really are. His most notorious literary effort was his 1961 book, published here by Doubleday, called "Awakened China," which was praised by the Communist Daily Worker as a "rare combination of excellent reporting—objective yet human."

Mr. Greene's latest propaganda effort on behalf of the Peking cause—aside, that is, from his active participation in anti-Vietnam demonstrations—is his 65-minute film, "China." This film was made under the watchful eye of the official Chinese Communist government film company during Greene's visit to Red China in 1963, and is now being shown in movie theaters across the United States where it is advertised as an "objective" look at a "misunderstood" nation.

It should be noted that in making this film Greene spent a reported \$1,500 buying Red Chinese film clips, which would seem to be a violation of the U.S. law forbidding trade with Peking; yet, the State and Treasury Departments did not prosecute Greene for this violation and gave him a permit to distribute his pro-Red China film in this country. I would also like to add that Greene and the film's distributors hope to make this piece of blatant propaganda available for U.S. high school showings in the near future.⁵

Edgar Snow is a journalist who has been around much longer than Greene and was spouting the "be nice to Mao" line back in the 1940's. Snow was one of the few reporters of a nation to visit the Communist guerrillas when they occupied only a small section of northern China while Chiang Kai-shek's government held the rest of the country and fought the Japanese. After visits with Mao and his revolutionaries, Snow returned to this country to write, as he did in 1944, that the section of China which Mao then controlled "constitutes the closest approach to political, economic and social democracy that the Chinese have ever known." This statement must have surprised the thousands of Nationalists the Communists were assassinating at that time and those millions they would slaughter later. The brutal Communist masters liquidated an estimated 20 million of their countrymen when later they consolidated their dictatorial hold on the mainland.⁶

The theory propounded by Snow and others in the 1940's that the Communists were really only innocent agrarian reformers was to a great degree the cause for a shift in Sino-American policy in the late forties. The Red China lobby

⁵ All information on Felix Greene and his film taken from American Security Council's *Washington Report*, April 4, 1966.

⁶ All information on Edgar Snow taken from his book, *People on Our Side*, published in 1944.

succeeded in persuading our Government to withdraw its support of Chiang Kai-shek and attempt to persuade Chiang to join the Communists in a coalition government. Chiang refused to join with enemies sworn to overthrow him and was forced to retreat to Formosa when the U.S. State Department abandoned him. After the Communist takeover of China and the Red Chinese invasion of Korea, our Government belatedly reaffirmed its support of Chiang's Nationalist government and swore opposition to the Red Chinese. Now Edgar Snow would like us to change our policy again, just as he helped accomplish in the 1940's.

Second, when I refer to the Red China lobby I mean scholars like Doak Barnett, of Columbia; John King Fairbank, of Harvard; and Hans Morgenthau, of the University of Chicago, otherwise intelligent men who, I believe, fail to grasp the full intentions of the Red Chinese monolith.

CONTAINMENT WITHOUT ISOLATION

All three of these gentlemen testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee during its hearings on our China policy last March. All three scholars echoed the view that U.S. policy toward China should be one of military containment, but not diplomatic, cultural and commercial isolation. Since this testimony, the cry "containment without isolation," has become the favorite slogan of the Red China lobby.

Professor Barnett was the first witness before the Foreign Relations Committee and the first to urge a policy of "containment without isolation." Toward this end he proposed a series of policy steps which would supposedly end our "isolation" of Red China: First, get Red China into the United Nations; second, begin trade with Peking and also send scholars, businessmen, and doctors to China; third, "work toward eventual establishment of normal diplomatic relations" with the Mao government; last, continue to ally with Chiang Kai-shek, but without quite as much enthusiasm as before.

I will not attempt here to refute Dr. Barnett point-by-point. But, I feel it should be noted that Red China now has diplomatic relations with over 40 non-Communist nations; 70 percent of its trade is with non-Communist states, and the United States has made countless offers to Peking to trade scholars, send in journalists and negotiate military disputes. In spite of this nonisolation policy by other Western governments and American efforts to establish communications with Peking, the Mao government has continued its belligerent and revolutionary course. If Red China is isolated today, it has isolated itself. To change our policy now will only diminish the United States in the eyes of our allies and make Peking all the more aggressive.

Professor Fairbank advanced another theory often used by the Red China lobby when he said that, after we stop isolating Peking, "we may expect the Chinese revolution to mellow" and that "it would not be illogical for them to adopt a somewhat milder policy." To me these statements

and others I have heard constitute an incredibly risky and foolhardy approach to foreign policy. While I realize that risks are sometimes necessary in diplomatic relations, I do not believe that our policy toward a nation as aggressive as Red China should be based on gambles that it "may mellow" or on what or what not might be illogical. The fate of millions of southeast Asians depends on our policy toward Red China and I believe that this policy should be based on cold facts rather than "iffy" gambles.

Dr. Morgenthau went even further in his testimony when he said we should end our policy of military containment as well as isolation. After advocating withdrawal from Vietnam he stated that "the policy of military containment ought to be gradually liquidated. This policy is not only irrelevant to the interests of the United States but actually runs counter to them." To date, few of the other members of the Red China lobby have urged such a move, which would open the gates for Red Chinese control of all of southeast Asia.

The one and only thing stopping such a chorus of retreat is the present conflict in Vietnam. If the Red China lobby were to call for a pullout from Vietnam, it is quite probable that all their proposals would be discredited by the public. So, the lobby has apparently adopted a strategy of, first, urging an end to isolation, and then, after the Vietnam conflict has been somehow settled, calling for an end to containment of Red China as well.

Behind the Red China lobby scholars are the so-called academic organizations. These groups are composed of educators—of varying degrees of status—who may not be as prominent as those mentioned, above, but who share the same ideas and espouse the same proposals concerning our China policy.

I speak here of organizations like the Asia Society, the Association for Asian Studies, the Americans for a Review of Far Eastern Policy, and other organizations which conduct seminars and debates with the clear intention of criticizing and degrading our present China policy.

In recent months there has been a volcanic eruption of the seminars at which our China policy has been discussed. As Prof. David Rowe explained in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the individuals who speak against U.S. China policy at these gatherings are described as "objective scholars" from the academic world, while those defending our policy are officials of either the U.S. Government or of Nationalist China. The defenders are thus downgraded beforehand as official spokesmen, leaving the academic experts to speak for the public, or so they claim. This tactic has been used, according to Dr. Rowe, at seminars from Portland to Pennsylvania.

I should also like to mention that the guest speaker at the Harvard University conference on China policy was none other than Owen Lattimore, the discredited but still influential former China expert for the State Department

in the 1940's. He was found by a Senate committee to have been instrumental in paving the way for Mao's takeover of China by inducing the State Department to withdraw its support of Chiang Kai-shek. Mr. Lattimore, now a professor in England, obviously never gives up on his propaganda efforts on behalf of the Red Chinese. You will recall that early in the Kennedy administration he surfaced after years of oblivion and immediately championed the diplomatic recognition of Outer Mongolia.

Many of these seminars, Dr. Rowe reports, are sponsored by the Americans for a Review of Far Eastern Policy, an infant organization recently spawned by students and faculty members at Yale University. Among this group's other activities are circulating petitions, placing newspaper advertisements, supplying speakers and holding debates. All these activities, says Dr. Rowe, are "well calculated to advance the aims, purposes and interests of Communist China" and "at times, is heavily in derogation of our ally, the Republic of China, President and Madame Chiang Kai-shek, and so forth."

An organization older than the ARFEP, but equally pro-China, is the Association for Asian Studies. This group was formerly known as the Far Eastern Association, which was, in turn, a successor to the Institute of Pacific Relations, a Communist-infiltrated organization which heavily influenced our policy in the 1940's in favor of Mao Tse-tung.⁷

The Association for Asian Studies was most recently in the headlines for something a handful of its members did under the guise of speaking for the entire organization. I refer, of course, to the statement released on March 21 advocating a softer line on Red China and signed by 198 so-called China experts in the Association for Asian Studies.

Upon investigation it was found that the statement was circulated among only a small percentage of the association's 3,375 members and of the 300 or so who responded to the statement, only 198 signed it. Second, the statement, although signed by members of the association, had no official connection with the organization, as the statement's authors attempted to imply. The statement, which urged diplomatic recognition of Peking, U.N. admission and an end to our trade embargo, was drawn up by two members of the association and circulated with the assistance of three organizations outside the association. These three groups, all members in good standing of the Red China lobby, were the National Research Council on Peace Strategy, the Turn Toward Peace group, and the Council for a Liveable World, a pro-unilateral disarmament group.

THE INCREDIBLE NEW YORK TIMES

When the authors and circulators of this statement tried to pass it off as an objective study by alleged China experts in the Association for Asian Studies, most newspapers recognized it for what it was—a piece of pro-Peking propa-

ganda. Most newspapers, that is, except the most influential of all, the New York Times, ran its story of the statement on page 1 and gave a full inside page to the text of the statement.

The first sentence of the Times story began:

A large group of scholars on Asian affairs declared today—

And inside the newspaper reported that—

all the signers * * * were members of the Association of Asian Studies.

What the Times did not report was that several of the China experts were high school teachers and librarians. The liberal Reporter magazine, usually a good friend of the Red China lobby, later revealed the origins of the statement and charged the Times with "irresponsible journalism."

Why did the New York Times, one of the world's most prestigious newspapers, engage in such shoddy journalism? That question was answered 2 days later when the Times ran an editorial supporting the statement's concessionary proposals, and saying:

The statement . . . shows where the weight of informed opinion lies.

This use of distorted journalism to make an editorial point is one example of why I place the New York Times in the forefront of the publications serving as a mouthpiece for the Red China lobby. In its editorials it calls for Red Chinese "membership in the United Nations and peaceful trade with the United States as well as disarmament talks."⁸ And in its news stories, the Times plays up the statements of its fellow lobbyists and all but ignores the arguments of those who favor present U.S. China policy.

An excellent example of the Times tactic of ignoring those who disagree with it occurred one month before it gave so much attention to the misleading statement of the so-called Asian scholars. In February, 1966, two U.S. Senators wrote a letter to the editor of the Times taking exception to an editorial which had favored Chinese admission to the U.N. The Times declined to print the letter without explanation. But the obvious reason for the newspaper's refusal was that the two Senators had written as members of the Steering Committee of the Committee of 1 Million Against the Admission of Communist China to the United Nations, a 1 million-member organization which favors present U.S. policy toward Red China. While the Times refuses to publicize the views of two U.S. Senators who represent the views of 1 million people, it gives full page coverage to propaganda representing the opinion of 198 so-called Asian experts.

A further example of the Times irresponsible journalism, also involving the Committee of One Million, occurred last January. At that time the committee published a statement of "Declaration in Opposition to Any Concessions to Communist China." This statement was

⁷ From testimony of Dr. David Rowe, op. cit.

⁸ "China's Nuclear Test," *New York Times* editorial, May 12, 1966.

signed by 330 persons, not 198. And every one of these 330 was a Member of the U.S. Congress, the elected representatives of millions of American citizens. But, again, the coverage the Times gave to this statement was minuscule when compared to the full-page treatment given the Asian scholars.

The New York Times is certainly not alone in the publications arm of the Red China lobby. Other daily newspapers such as the New York Post and the Washington Post, regularly run editorials favorable to the lobby's positions, while magazines such as the New Republic and Saturday Review run articles echoing the propaganda of the Red China lobby members.

Allied with these scholars, academic groups and publications are organizations in two areas of special interest: religion and organized labor. I refer specifically, in the field of religion to the National Council of Churches, the Quaker's American Friends Service Committee, and the Unitarian Universalists Association. In labor, I wish to mention particularly two unions, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers and Walter Reuther's United Auto Workers.

First, let us examine the lobbying activities of the three church-affiliated groups:

The Unitarian Universalist Association, which claims to represent 250,000 members, held a convention in mid-May at which a resolution was passed calling for a negotiated settlement in Vietnam and, concerning our China policy, proposed U.S. recognition of the Peking dictatorship, U.N. admission, and end to our trade embargo of Red China, and inclusion of the Mao government in future disarmament talks.

The American Friends Service Committee conducted a conference in Washington during the first week of May at which were present some of the familiar scholar-members of the Red China lobby, notably Dr. Fairbank, of Harvard, and at which the usual denunciations of U.S. China policy were heard. Again, the only defenders of current U.S. policy were "official Government spokesmen."

The U.S. policy of containment by isolation can never be successful—

Proclaimed one speaker in the face of 15 years of successful containment. The Service Committee itself put out a report, entitled "A New China Policy," which restated another Red China lobby theme that despite the informed dedication of many U.S. officials, governmental policy has tended to become the prisoner of public ignorance and prejudice.

The General Board of the National Council of Churches in February passed a resolution calling for U.S. recognition of Red China, U.N. admission and free trade. In connection with this resolution it is important to note that the general board does not represent the 40 million persons in the 30 churches affiliated with the national council. The board itself says, in a mild disclaimer, that it is only "broadly representative of its member church bodies," although this fact is often forgotten when the

board issues one of its pronouncements. Another factor concerning this particular resolution is that only 93 members of the 275-member general board were present when the resolution was voted on; the other 182 had no say at all. Such is the way the National Council of Churches frequently operates in making its policy decision.

Of the two labor unions mentioned, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers takes a softer and more subtle line in urging a change in our policy, ACW President Jacob Potofsky has said that "the time is coming when we must reexamine our policy toward Red China."

This type of innuendo is a favorite tactic of the Red China lobby. They like nothing better than to portray their ideology opponents as reactionary types who are opposed to any and all change. They always speak of their concessions to Peking as "new realities," and "modern ideas," with the inference that anyone who does not hold these views still lives in the Stone Age.

The second union is a much more open member of the Red China lobby. At its annual convention in May, the United Auto Workers passed a resolution calling for U.S. recognition of Communist China and UAW President Walter Reuther struck the familiar theme that recognition would only mean that this country recognized Mao Tse-tung's control over the country.⁹

Recognition, of course, means a great deal more than this and Reuther knows it. It would mean that some of our smaller allies, notably Thailand and the Philippines, would have to recognize Peking, and thus open themselves up to widespread subversion. It would give tacit legitimacy to one of the most terroristic military dictatorships the world has known. Mr. Reuther is aware of these consequences and has deceived his fellow UAW members when he stated recognition would mean only facing up to what he termed the "realities of the situation."

It is important to note here that the position on Red China taken by these two unions are counter to the foreign policy resolutions of the AFL-CIO. This federation, under the leadership of the strongly anti-Communist George Meany, has consistently opposed any concessions to Peking. Now, however, it appears that this once firm position is being undermined not only by individual unions affiliated with the federation, but by members of the AFL-CIO executive council itself.

The liberal bloc on this 29-member council, headed by Reuther and including Mr. Potofsky among others, is steadily gaining in strength. At the 1965 AFL-CIO convention several of the newly elected council members immediately lined up with the Reuther bloc. In addition, when President Meany retires, Walter Reuther is expected to replace him. Thus it appears only a matter of time before the Red China lobby will control the policymaking apparatus of the entire AFL-CIO.

⁹ *New York Times*, May 24, 1966.

¹⁰ *Washington Post*, May 22, 1966.

The last segment of the Red China lobby I would like to mention are those Members of the U.S. Congress who support changes in our policy.

Before the recent Senate hearings on Red China began, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator FULBRIGHT, stated that one purpose was "to provide a forum for recognized experts and scholars in the field of China." Senator FULBRIGHT then proceeded to bring to the stand a steady stream of Red China lobbyists, such as the aforementioned Barnett, Fairbank, and Morganthau.

At the beginning of these hearings the only rebuttals the public heard were press statements by "official administration spokesmen." Again the Red China lobby had successfully conveyed the impression that it was the informed opinion, as represented by so-called experts and scholars, who opposed present policy while only official spokesmen favored containing Peking. It was not until 20 days after these hearings had opened, and after continued demands by Republican members of the committee, that Senator FULBRIGHT invited experts to testify in favor of our present policy. Even then, there were only three of these propolicy witnesses, while the Red China lobby was represented by 11 experts.

Shortly after the hearings had ended, one of the most prestigious names in the U.S. Senate was added to the list of those urging consideration of changes in our China policy. In early May, Senator EDWARD KENNEDY proposed the creation of a special Presidential commission to study our China policy. In his speech, Senator KENNEDY also stated that a softening of policy would be a "new direction," implying it would be desirable simply because it would be "new."

The time has come—

He said—

for the American Government and the American people to make a major reassessment of our policy toward China.

Another popular theme of the Red China lobby voiced by Senator KENNEDY was that even though Peking would probably refuse every conciliatory initiative of the United States, such refusals "will demonstrate to our friends throughout the world the true nature of Communist China's isolation." However, Peking has already demonstrated time and again the true nature of its isolation; every initiative we have taken in the past—invitations to disarmament talks, offers of scholar exchange, visits by journalists—have been summarily refused by Red China. Just how many concessions must we make and how many refusals must Peking make before Senator KENNEDY and others will be satisfied?

Following Senator KENNEDY was Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN with a speech much more conciliatory and remarkable in its tolerant attitude toward Peking. Early in his remarks, Senator MCGOVERN stated that in the 1940's Mao Tse-tung's guerrillas were simply "revolutionary forces aimed at throwing off outside control and securing a better life for the people." And further on in his speech,

Senator McGOVERN argued that Red China has a right to fight "U.S. military power in Asia" and "establish a Monroe Doctrine that would give her the kind of role in Asia which we proclaimed for ourselves in the Western Hemisphere."

It is difficult to ascertain in this last statement whether or not the Senator was trying to justify Red China's aggression in Tibet, Laos, India, and South Vietnam, as being simply acts to keep outside influence out of Asia. This would seem very difficult to defend in view of the fact that the United States did not become involved in this area until after China made her move.

Another statement made by the Senator was:

While we do not approve of their (Red China's) system of government for ourselves, we could wish them continued progress in their efforts to organize and develop their vast country and conquer its staggering problems.

I would take exception to this remark and say that I, for one, am not about to wish continued progress to a regime that persecutes, executes, and enslaves the people under its tyrannical rule.

Senator McGOVERN then goes on to make proposals for conciliation with Red China, all of them to be found in the Red China lobby's lexicon. The Senator, however, goes further than his colleagues in his suggestions as to what policy we should take toward Chiang Kai-shek's government on Formosa. While most of the lobbyists believe we should continue to support Chiang, while recognizing Peking, Senator McGOVERN discusses abandoning our all-out backing of Taiwan. "We cannot lightly turn Formosa over to Peking" he says, but he does seriously consider the possibility. Senator McGOVERN's principal criticism of the Nationalist government is that it is not a perfect democracy, but he says absolutely nothing about the status of democracy on the mainland under Mao Tse-tung.

CONCLUSIONS

These are the major components of the Red China lobby in America today. These are the men, organizations and publications that are attempting to alter our foreign policy toward Peking and to give Mao Tse-tung's government an opportunity to further strengthen its hold over the people of China. The barrage of propaganda from the lobby has increased in volume and intensity over the past few months and has begun to have its effect on the administration and the general public.

One subtle indication of a change in the administration was pointed out by Professor Rowe in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. During the President's speech on South Vietnam at Freedom House in New York City in February, Professor Rowe notes, Mr. Johnson used the words "Red" and "Communist" only once each. This indicated, says Dr. Rowe, that the anti-anti-Communist Red China lobby forces "seem to have forced the administration to speak as though communism by and large was not involved in the Vietnamese war, thus robbing us of one of the chief

psychological supports and chief political bases of the war in Vietnam and the whole war against Communist aggression everywhere."

There are other, more obvious indications of a change in attitude of the administration as a result of the propaganda activities of the Red China lobby.

In May, the highly reputable Columnists Evans and Novak reported that President Johnson had ordered "a secret top-level study" of our China policy.

The President—

The columnists wrote—

is tapping the opinions of China experts in the universities and in all the United States embassies in Asia and Communist-bloc countries.¹¹

The outcome of this study is not yet known, but, if the report is true, it is obvious the administration is at least considering abandoning our successful policy of 15 years.

One final example I will mention shows the immediate influence of the testimony by the Red China lobbyists before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Two days after the first of the scholar-lobbyists had testified, the administration announced it would authorize travel by American scholars to Red China and would invite Peking scholars to come to this country. While it is possible the move was planned before the hearings began, it is significant that the administration felt it necessary at that particular time to show the Red China lobby it was not really being beastly to Mao. The proposal was quickly and predictably rejected by Peking and once again our Far Eastern allies had cause to wonder just how firm our Red China policy is.

The effect of the Red China lobby on the general public is more difficult to document but there have been indications in recent public opinion polls that some shifts have occurred. It appears that a portion of the public is accepting the Red China lobby's line that our continued opposition to Peking is a lost cause, that we have little foreign support for our containment policy and that we had better change our policy to keep up with the times.

Nothing, of course, could be further from the truth. Far from being a lost cause and lacking foreign support, our present China policy is clearly gaining the backing of people in other nations. Recent events in Ghana and Indonesia show this; the support of our stand in Vietnam by Far Eastern nations such as Japan, Australia, and Thailand shows this; the fact that Red China is currently faced with a number of internal crises—food shortages, intellectual dissent, and overworked industry among them—shows that our containment policy has put the Peking regime under great strain.

The public should not and must not be deluded into thinking there is widespread popular support in the well-informed academy for an alteration of our China policy. They must understand that the individuals who propose such changes and more American initiatives

are only a small minority skillful in the use of propaganda. If it is time for anyone to change, it is Communist China who must change; change its warlike aggressions in southeast Asia and elsewhere, change its belligerent anti-Americanism and, if it hopes to become a respected member of the community of nations, Peking must now take the initiative toward becoming a true peace-loving and law-abiding nation.

But, the Red China lobby refuses to urge Peking to make any such changes and continues its campaign to delude the American public with propaganda calling for an alteration in U.S. policy. Using a variety of tactics, slogans, and themes, the Red China lobby is attempting to delude the public—and through it, the administration—into thinking our China policy is outdated, misinformed, and harmful to our image.

These lobbyists speak of realities, but they themselves dwell in fantasy. They propose an East-West dialog, but engage in doubletalk. They ask for a new look in our China policy while theirs is the most dangerous vision of all, a myopic dream nurtured by naivete and lack of understanding of the nature of communism.

These men, organizations, and publications in the Red China lobby may be innocent, well-meaning, and loyal Americans, but their lobbying is aiding and abetting one of the most murderous and dictatorial governments the world has seen. Their counsel must not be allowed to replace a policy which has worked, is working, and will continue to work as long as the United States supports it with the vigor and determination it has earned over the years.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, one of the great organizations of America is the Disabled American Veterans. The members of this organization, composed entirely of Americans who have become disabled in the noble service of their country, have exhibited the fine quality of their patriotism by offering their lives and the giving of something of their bodies in the service of their country and all that it stands for. The purity of the patriotism of its members, their dedication to the cause of freedom and the high ideals of America, afford America the quality of leadership which does so much to keep it strong and free.

I was privileged to address the 39th annual convention banquet of the Disabled American Veterans, Department of Florida, at Miami Beach, Fla., June 18, 1966. That to me was an inspiring occasion. And especially so since I was privileged to hear the outstanding address of the Honorable Claude L. Calle-

¹¹ *Washington Post*, May 8, 1966.

gary, national commander of the Disabled American Veterans.

National Commander Callegary and his wife delighted all who were privileged to be with them on this occasion and the national commander stirred his audience with the inspiration of his address.

National Commander Callegary in the finest sense typifies America and Americanism. He is a man who has fought his way up the ladder of life to a position of leadership, confidence, admiration, and respect. It is such men who have made America great; such men will keep America great.

I insert at this point in my remarks an article about National Commander Callegary by Robert Blake upon his selection as Maryland's Veteran of the Year. This article appeared in the October 12, 1965, issue of the Baltimore Evening Sun.

SELF-EDUCATED LAWYER: DROPOUT AT 13, NOW VETERAN OF THE YEAR

(By Robert Blake)

A school dropout at the age of 13, who later returned to classes and became a successful lawyer and national commander of the Disabled American Veterans, has been named Maryland's Veteran of the Year.

Claude L. Callegary was the unanimous choice of the Veterans Brotherhood Committee composed of representatives of the American Legion, DAV, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Catholic War Veterans, Jewish War Veterans the Veterans of World War I.

The award is the highest one that the veterans' organizations of Maryland can bestow.

TO SUPPORT FAMILY

At the age of 13, after completing the seventh grade at Cathedral Elementary School, Mr. Callegary was forced to drop out of school completely to help support his family. He worked at the Mount Vernon Cotton Mills and then moved on, holding such jobs as a stock boy, plumber's helper and truck driver.

He entered the Army in March of 1941 and served in the Aleutian Islands during the Japanese attacks.

Mr. Callegary later served in the South Pacific and was also assigned to Biak in the Netherlands East Indies with an airborne signal unit.

PLANE CRASHED IN BIAK

While involved in the latter campaign, his plane crashed on Biak.

He was one of three survivors of the 14 men aboard the plane and was unconscious 14 days.

After hospitalization in areas that were under constant air attack, he was returned to St. Petersburg, Fla., for treatment of severe burns and other injuries.

The crash changed his entire life.

He took the Army's general education development test and, because of his extensive reading and studying since he was a "forced" dropout, he received unusually high grades.

Mr. Callegary was one of the first students admitted to the University of Maryland without having finished grade school or without having attended a high school.

After 2 years at College Park he transferred to the law school in Baltimore where after being in attendance only two years, he took the Maryland State Bar examination and passed it in the top ten of his class, again without benefit of grade school, high school or a college degree.

He opened his law practice in January 1950, but continued in law school to obtain his law degree in June 1950.

In the meantime, he married the former Catherine Briggs, of Oklahoma, and the couple now has six children—three girls and three boys.

JOINED BY BROTHER

Upon being admitted to the bar he began his own law practice and a year later was joined by his brother, Ray.

He has served in many civic and Bar Association activities.

In 1962, he assumed a national office with the DAV which culminated in his being elected national commander of that organization in its annual convention in New Orleans this year.

He was nominated by Senator BREWSTER, a law school classmate.

JOHNSON'S GUEST

In the course of his activities with the DAV, he has traveled the 50 States, been President Johnson's guest at the White House and at the President's Texas ranch.

He is frequently called into conference by Government leaders to discuss programs pertaining to veterans.

Despite this fame and good fortune, returning to school and becoming a lawyer are his proudest achievements.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert the able address of National Commander Callegary in the body of the RECORD.

SPEECH BY CLAUDE L. CALLEGARY, NATIONAL COMMANDER OF THE DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS, GIVEN AT THE 39TH ANNUAL CONVENTION BANQUET OF THE DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS, DEPARTMENT OF FLORIDA, MIAMI BEACH, FLA., JUNE 18, 1966

My friends in the DAV and friends of the DAV, it was very beautiful to hear the Star Spangled Banner sung as we opened the dinner tonight. The Star Spangled Banner was written in Baltimore by Francis Scott Key and his home is about two blocks from my office. I want to present to you and Commander Decker a small token of my esteem, an exact copy of the Star Spangled Banner, which is one of Maryland's most treasured possessions.

I want to thank you for the wonderful hospitality you have shown my wife and me here at the 39th Annual Convention of the DAV, Department of Florida, and I especially want to commend the Department of Florida State Commander Clarence J. Decker and his officers for the work they have done during the past year, both in the membership area, where you have exceeded your national quota and the activities of the Department on behalf of the many disabled veterans living in this state.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER has done us a great honor by attending the convention, and, Senator PEPPER I want to give you my personal thanks for your activities on behalf of disabled veterans in the Congress of the United States. We know that we can always call on you to help us and we are deeply grateful for your assistance.

To my friends and members here I bring greetings from the Department of Texas. I just spoke at their convention in Austin, the state capital, which is located roughly in the center of Texas. The beautiful Colorado River runs through it and it is surrounded by lakes. It is easy to see why Austin was picked as the capital of this beautiful state.

As your National Commander I have been privileged to travel to most of the states of the Union and many foreign countries. You have heard many speakers talk about what the DAV has been doing. You have heard from our National Service Officers, you have heard from some National Officers, you have a very fine Past National Commander here who spoke to you—Howard Watts—and you have one of my Junior Vice-Commanders here, Bob Gonzales, who has done a fine job, and of course you know that as a result of our combined activities our membership is

at an all time high of almost one quarter of a million members.

The primary obligation of the DAV is in three areas. Of course the first is the care of the wounded and their dependents. We do this through our National Service Officers.

The second is to seek out the problem areas that can be corrected by legislation either on a federal or state level and try to pass legislation that will help the wartime disabled veteran and his dependents. We do this through our Washington staff and you do it through your local representatives. Again, here I must commend Senator PEPPER; we know we can always call on him for help in these matters. From the simple statistics, we have roughly two and a half million disabled veterans.

The third area we get into is the area of public opinion. For example, while in Houston several months ago, my wife, Catherine and I spent an hour and a half on the radio with four young college students discussing and debating the war in Viet Nam, and then we answered questions for another thirty minutes or so. Many listeners called in to express interest in our views on the war in Viet Nam and to ask us questions.

You all know that I visited Viet Nam and that I traveled through the Orient, starting in Hawaii, up to Japan, Taiwan, Hong Kong, the Philippines, then by plane to Saigon and Viet Nam, and then by helicopter and plane I visited many of the wounded in the hospitals in all the battle areas.

There are two things I would like to tell you about Viet Nam in its relationship to us. I never realized it was roughly only 700 air miles from Manila to Saigon, and I know there are many of you in this audience who were in the Philippines in World War II. I fought in the South Pacific in World War II as a sergeant. At that time I am sure most of us had never heard of Saigon or Viet Nam.

The one thing we did determine, my wife and I, as we traveled through the far eastern countries, is that China is creating a huge war machine. It reminds me of Germany before World War II. Frankly, the people we talked to in the bordering countries of China—and they are all very close to China geographically—are very much afraid of this war machine.

While I was in Hawaii I visited the battleship *Arizona*, which still contains the bodies of its crew (and will for time immemorial) and visited the great national cemeteries in Hawaii, the Garden of the Missing and the Punch Bowl, and those in the Philippines. While speaking to our members and friends in the Philippines I reminded them that we have more than 20 million veterans of the wars in the United States who have fought for the liberty of people in other parts of the world and that we have four million men wounded in the wars. After the banquet many of those present thanked me and said, "We need to be reminded of the physical suffering of the American people in wartime; sometimes we forget."

I also traveled to Central America not too long ago, from Guantanamo Bay to Mexico, to Guatemala, Nicaragua, San Salvador, and finally Panama.

The central thought that comes to my mind after visiting these parts of the world where people are still living in primitive conditions and wondering where their next meal is going to come from, not worried about two cars in the family but just wondering how long the next child will live—after visiting these countries you suddenly realize what these 20 million Americans fought for and what these millions were wounded and died for.

The United States is like an oasis in the middle of the world. It reminds me of when I fly over the desert en route to California. Suddenly I see an area with water; it is green

and beautiful. We are living a life in the United States that is totally different from countries which are just a few hours away from us by jet. We have been given every blessing possible and we should never forget it.

While visiting these many countries I saw the Peace Corps workers and the projects carried out by the Alliance for Progress—the building of schools, homes and hospitals—and was impressed by the many other aid programs going on around the world, unselfishly paid for by the people of the United States. I tried to think of a word I can use to describe our country's activities in the world. Lawyers many times use the word "reasonable," and my friends here, I want to tell you tonight that I believe with deep sincerity that in view of our many commitments to peace in the world, the United States under President Johnson has adopted a reasonable course of action to try to insure peace in the world. If the United States' only foreign commitment was to war in Viet Nam I could not say this, but Viet Nam is just a small part of our policy. It is not as dramatic as the building of schools and hospitals, or supplying food for some country that needs it so badly.

So, I ask you tonight, when you are thinking about the third area of the DAV's responsibility, be assured that I feel the President's policy is a reasonable and responsible policy. We do not hesitate to arrest a dangerous criminal, even if we have to use force to stop his activities. The United States is trying to arrest China's aggressive activities in the world. We would be considered irresponsible if we did not do so.

Disabled veterans, more than any other group, know what war is all about. Many of you in the audience have sons or friends who are in Viet Nam tonight. The world would be a poorer place without the vitality and strength of the United States. That strength and vitality is in part a tribute to you who have fought to keep our country a vital and responsible force in the world.

While I was in Sterling, Colorado, speaking at the State Convention of the DAV last year, the State Commander, severely disabled, was in a wheel chair and there was a little nine-year-old shoe-shine boy in the hotel and he could tell that the State Commander was somebody important—and he knew I was somebody important because I had a red cap on. He was a cute nine-year-old who was helping to support his family and he had two shins—one for 20¢ and one for 25¢. With the 25¢ shine he spit on your shoes before he polished them! I knew the second day that he wanted to say something to me; he was looking around at the men with legs and arms off, and finally on the last day he looked up at me as he was giving me the 25¢ shine, and with his nine-year-old seriousness he said, "Gee, Mister, I hope I never have to go to war." I know we all hope with this nine-year-old that he never has to go to war, but I know and you know that if he does have to go to war and he is one of those wounded, the DAV will be there to understand him, help him and to be with him.

Thank you and God bless you.

URBAN RENEWAL AND METRO DADE COUNTY

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I share with my colleague, Congressman FASCELL, the honor of representing the first governmental structure established to represent a metropolitanwide area; namely, Dade County, Fla. This body, known as Metro, has encountered many obstacles in its desire to serve the areawide needs of its population, but it has successfully met the challenge and is making great strides in this connection. One of Metro's far-reaching programs has been a countywide urban renewal program which has recently taken off with great momentum. This ambitious program has received recognition by an article in the "American County Government," published by the National Association of Counties, in its June issue of this year.

I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of Congress this most interesting article concerning Metro's urban renewal program and request that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point:

URBAN RENEWAL AND METRO DADE

(By Paul Einstein, a reporter for the Miami News)

A \$55 million urban renewal program—one of the nation's first countywide redevelopment plans—has been initiated in Miami, Fla., by the Dade County Metro government.

Aimed at wiping out 800 acres of downtown Miami slums, the giant program officially got underway Nov. 20, 1965, when the first parcel of property was acquired. Subsequently, the purchase of another \$1 million in land was approved by the Metro Urban Renewal Agency.

Four separate projects are involved in the renewal program. The first project consists of 147 acres and requires the relocation of 1,660 families, mostly Negro.

Basically a residentially-oriented renewal program, the Metro project features plans for the accelerated rehabilitation of sixty-seven existing apartment buildings with 950 dwelling units in the first project area.

"Instead of waiting eight to ten years for voluntary rehabilitation," Myron Leff, executive director of the Urban Renewal Agency, said, "we are going to acquire all sixty-seven structures and cut down the time to about 3½ years."

The buildings, he explained, will be acquired from the present owners and resold to individuals or corporations who agree to bring them up to a minimum housing standard set by the Urban Renewal Agency and the Federal Housing Administration.

"We will write down the value of the building by the amount of the estimated cost of rehabilitation," Leff said. "Then we will offer it to anyone willing to buy it for that amount and rehabilitate it."

For example, an apartment building may cost \$3,500 per unit to acquire. After rehabilitation standards have been established, it may be determined that rehabilitation costs will total \$1,200 per unit. The Urban Renewal Agency will mark the value of the apartment building down to \$2,300 per unit and sell it for that price on condition that the new owner make the needed improvements, Leff said.

There is no restriction on the methods of financing the improvements, he continued. "If it is done by conventional methods, there is no limit on the rent that may be charged by the owner except the market."

FHA FINANCING SEEN

But Leff and the Urban Renewal Agency expect that most of the rehabilitation work will be handled through FHA 221-D-3 loans. With this type of financing, the charges can-

not exceed moderate income rentals. Those limits have not been set yet.

The 3 per cent or below market interest rates that will be available on 221-D-3 loans to non-profit, religious or charitable organizations and limited dividend corporations are expected to bring those groups into the project area, Leff said.

Most of the 950 units in the rehabilitated structures will be efficiencies and one-bedroom units. Plans call for construction of 550 new dwelling units in the first project area, which will consist primarily of three-, four-, and five-bedroom units.

The new apartments will be erected on cleared lands that are now the sites of slum units.

All land in the project area will be sold at a fixed price to developers, Leff said. Proposals will be invited from all developers interested in the project area.

"The proposals will be evaluated, since there is no question on land price, on the basis of architectural design, site layout, economic and social return to the community and the experience and financial qualifications of the developers," Leff explained.

Part of the economic return to the community will be a requirement that all property sold to private developers pay full ad valorem taxes.

Designed by Eric Hill and Associates of Atlanta, the project plans feature the elimination of existing grid-iron street patterns. Winding and dead-end roads to impede through traffic will be constructed.

Other features: Perimeter parking lots to keep automobiles from parking adjacent to the dwelling units and planned parks and gardens throughout the housing developments.

Dade County is only the second area in Florida to get an urban renewal project underway. Until urban renewal got a green light from the Florida Supreme Court, a Tampa project was the state's lone effort in the field. The county got its authority to establish urban renewal projects when the Metro Home Rule Charter was adopted May 21, 1957. The charter provision was later interpreted by then-County Attorney Darrey A. Davis to give the county exclusive jurisdiction in the field.

But it wasn't until Feb. 9, 1960, after the Supreme Court had "legalized" urban renewal in Florida and the City of Miami was attempting to inaugurate a slum clearance project, that Metro adopted its urban renewal ordinance. The County Commission promptly established a Metro Urban Renewal Agency and delegated to it the powers to make administrative decisions in all approved urban renewal projects. The commission retained the right to approve all projects, land acquisitions, final disposition of land and personnel changes.

EXPRESSWAY CLAIMED ACRES

Planning for the first urban renewal program, which will ultimately uproot 42,000 persons, has been slow but thorough. Along the way, several problems have interfered with the original timetable.

Working with Miami Housing Authority officials, the Metro Urban Renewal Agency was making plans for the orderly relocation of 1,660 families in the first project area when the State Road Department decided to accelerate construction of the Interstate Expressway and a giant interchange in the urban renewal area. Efforts of urban renewal officials had to be diverted to handle the immediate relocation needs of 274 families residing in the path of the expressway. The expressway is claiming 51 of the 147 acres in the first project area. For most of the families, eligible for public housing, new homes have been found in cooperation with the Miami Housing Authority.

The first \$1 million earmarked for land acquisition by the Urban Renewal Agency will go to purchase 6.69 acres in a corner of the project. Plans call for turning 4 acres over to an elementary school for playground expansion with a pilot development of 35 dwelling units to be constructed on the rest of the land.

Completion date for the first of the four projects has been set for July 30, 1970, with the second project scheduled to begin about 1968. A tentative completion date for all four projects has been set for the middle of 1976.

COOPERATIVE FINANCING

The cost of the first project in the \$55 million program is \$17.5 million, Leff said. Sale of land is expected to bring in \$3.4 million for a net project cost of \$14.1 million. The federal government will pay \$9,390,000 of the cost, Leff continued, with local agencies pledged to pay for the remaining \$4,695,000.

Local participation is a cooperative matter between Metro, the Dade County School Board and the City of Miami, where the project is located. Metro will pay \$1,852,000 in cash plus \$7,000 credit for traffic facilities to be installed. A credit of \$1,182,000 has been approved for schools, including construction of a new \$1,036,500 facility out of the urban renewal area to serve children from the project. Miami accounts for \$1,244,000 in credits, including new streets and water and sewer lines, \$788,000; supporting facilities such as parking, playgrounds and community center, \$433,500, and the removal of utility lines, \$13,000.

Relocation costs of \$750,000 are being borne entirely by a federal grant.

Leff, who came to Miami from the Redevelopment Authority of Allegheny County, Pa., said:

"I was impressed with the idea that this was the first urban renewal project of a substantial size that was not a Negro removal project. The whole design is for residential occupancy."

DESIGNED FOR PRESENT RESIDENTS

The project, he continued, wipes out bars, honky-tonks, marginal businesses and slum conditions. The tallest building will be a two-story structure for garden-type apartments.

"It is designed to accommodate the same economic class of people that live in the area now," Leff said, "who can afford moderate income rentals."

The first project will thereby be able to serve as a housing source for the people who will be displaced in the second project area.

Leff sees none of the problems of resale that have plagued many other urban renewal projects throughout the country. "Based on inquiries, I don't think there will be any difficulty in selling the land," he said. "One reason why it is not a big problem in greater Miami is that this is a glamour area and developers know they will get fine exposure here."

Many other metropolitan areas, the urban renewal official added, are stable or declining in population "while Dade County is expanding in population."

The Central Miami Redevelopment Area isn't the only urban renewal project that will be undertaken by Metro on a countywide basis. With its authority embracing all twenty-seven municipalities in the county as well as the unincorporated areas, the Urban Renewal Agency is now studying other sites in Hialeah, Miami Beach, Coral Gables, Miami and the unincorporated areas.

CIVIL RIGHTS OF THE INDIVIDUAL HOMEOWNER

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from Texas [Mr. Dowdy] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, in connection with title IV of the administration's proposed Civil Rights Act of 1966, I must state that such legislation is totally destructive to the civil rights of the individual homeowner. Title IV is contrary to traditional rules of evidence, for it shifts the burden of proof to the homeowner who must show that he has not acted in a discriminatory manner.

A more distressing aspect of title IV, though, is its design to prohibit a man from doing with his property as he chooses. Destruction of that freedom is disguised in this legislation which purports to give some people equal opportunity. Title IV is intended to provide equal opportunity in housing. Whether it would accomplish this is questionable, but to attempt equal opportunity in housing by depriving the homeowner of the free and unimpaired right to contract for sale or lease of his house as he sees fit is an injustice to every individual.

I would call attention to an editorial from the Athens, Tex., Review of May 26, 1966, entitled "Is There Another Way?" which I recommend to the Members of the House, for it reflects ample justification for rejecting title IV.

I include this editorial as a part of my remarks:

[From the Athens (Tex.) Review, May 26, 1966]

IS THERE ANOTHER WAY?

Owners of rent property are very much concerned with at least one phase of President Johnson's civil rights proposals.

This is the federal ban on housing discrimination which many who own property and many who handle real estate feel could have a most harmful effect on the long-recognized rights of property owners.

One of the main issues at stake is whether a person has the right to determine whether he will sell a piece of property, and if so, to whom he will sell it. There is the problem, too, of whether he will retain any right to determine who he will rent to, and in fact whether he will have to rent vacant property that he does not wish to rent.

Hearings have been underway this week before the House judiciary subcommittee that is considering the President's civil rights proposals.

Speaking before the subcommittee was Alan L. Emlen of Philadelphia. He represents the National Association of Real Estate Brokers. Among the statements he made was this:

"We are here to raise our voices against the injection of the element of legal compulsion—of the police expedient—in the relations of a homeowner or any other residential property owner and the one who seeks to buy or rent his property."

"We insist that nothing in the federal Constitution gives to one citizen the right to acquire property from another citizen who does not wish to sell to him, regardless of the reason."

"Compelling the homeowner or rental owner of real estate to enter into a contract with one not of his choice is an affront to the American tradition of freedom of contract, the very underpinnings of which rest

on the proposition no American, without his consent, need become an unwilling contractor with any other person."

As presently being discussed, the bill would require a property owner who has property to rent or sell to do so without discrimination as to race, creed, color, etc. This sounds like a fine thing, but it leaves all of the burden of proof upon the property owner to defend his reasons for not selling or renting to any person who might find out he has unoccupied property.

That person could say, "I want to rent or buy your property." If the owner refused to do either, the man can take him to court, and the government would pay to prosecute. The property owner pays to defend.

There are houses in Athens today that are vacant and they are that way because the property owner wants them vacant. He doesn't want to sell them, either. Wouldn't it be something if a man could tell the owner, "I want to rent that house. If you won't rent, I want to buy and if you won't do either, I'll take you to court."

If you own your own home and have it furnished and should have to go away for a period of time, you might choose to rent it. Would you rent it to just anyone? If you did, you'd be a fool. You would be discriminating as all get out if you had good sense. You'd pick a person who would look after it at least as well as you do.

There are people in Athens today who own property who have it for sale. They detest their neighbor who wants it or they don't care too much for some other person who is chomping at the bit to buy it. They won't sell it to them, and what's more, there shouldn't be any law that says differently.

There may be some people in a residential area who enjoy their gay parties. One decides to sell but refuses to sell to a minister or teetotaler so his neighbors can continue to enjoy their favorite pastime. How about the elderly couple who has a sick sister next door? The couple has to move to another town. They are not going to sell to a noisy person or just anyone who might even be quiet. They will use discrimination in selecting a neighbor for sister. They may want one who will look after her. And this is as it should be.

People should have the right to do with their property as they choose and it is wrong for the federal government to adopt laws that would prohibit this. The law that the President wants is supposed to correct the problems that face Negroes when they find they cannot buy a house in a white section or cannot rent an apartment that has been all-white. It may partially correct this, but in doing so it will deprive every person who owns property of the right to rent to whom they wish or sell to whom they wish . . . or keep vacant the property they wish to keep vacant.

More would be lost to the American public by such a law than could be gained.

The right to decide with whom you will do business, with whom you will associate, with whom you will contract . . . these are things that are basic in a free country and should not be victims to legislation that is aimed at correcting another problem.

TRUTH IN PACKAGING

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to add my name to the list of our colleagues who have introduced "truth in packaging" legislation. The bill I am offering today—H.R. 16002—is identical to H.R. 15440, introduced on June 2, 1966, by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

I am particularly pleased, Mr. Speaker, to join in sponsoring this legislation, which is similar to the bill for which the distinguished and very able senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] has worked so long and hard. I am optimistic that Congress will take final action on truth in packaging before the end of the 1966 session and when it does, it will be a great day for the consumers of America and for Senator HART who has led the battle for this legislation.

When the Senate approved its truth-in-packaging bill a couple of weeks ago, it was the culmination of a 4-year campaign by Senator HART and others for Senate approval of the bill. I hope now that the House will follow suit and approve this legislation.

President Johnson has called the truth-in-packaging bill one of the most important pieces of legislation before the Congress this year. I agree.

This bill, designed to prevent deceptive and misleading packaging and labeling, is important to every consumer in the United States.

Recent sessions of Congress have been variously described as the "education Congress," the "human rights Congress," the "health Congress," the "conservation Congress." If the 2d session of the 89th Congress should approve the truth-in-packaging legislation, it will win for itself the title of "consumer Congress."

Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues to support the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in his efforts to secure House approval of the truth-in-packaging bill.

STOP RACIAL HOSTILITY MAIL

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HELSTOSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, this and past Congresses have enacted many measures to assure the populace of the United States their civil rights, but have we gone far enough to curb the dissemination of material which tends to arouse the public toward racial hostility?

Present postal laws prohibit the mailing of defamatory, scurrilous, and libelous material, but only when it relates to identifiable individuals. As a result, one can put the most outrageous statements into a letter, brochure, circular, or book and mail it to many segments of our society without the fear of being prose-

cuted for this act, so long as no individual is named in this distribution of hate mail.

I fear that the lack of prohibition enables many fanatics, hate groups, and bigots to abuse ethnic groups, religious groups, and races through the spread of false propaganda and to fan the fires of intolerance. The U.S. mail should not be the tool of the spread of this hatred and intolerance.

This bill would plug this gap in our postal laws. Under its provisions, the Postmaster General would prescribe such regulations as he may deem proper to withdraw such mail from being conveyed from the sender to the recipient.

Penalties are prescribed against those who knowingly deposit for mailing or delivering any communication declared to be nonmailable, or who knowingly takes any communication from the mails for the purpose of circulating it among the public.

Outward demonstrations are a common occurrence, some due to the dissemination of such hate material. We can curb the spread of hatred by barring this type of propaganda from the mails. Congress in delaying action on this type of legislation can be called a party to the spread of hate among the citizens of our great Nation. Early action on my proposed legislation will signify our intention to disassociate ourselves from the laws which permit, or in other words, do not bar the spread of this matter.

Unless we take immediate positive action to prevent the use of the mails for this purpose, we can look forward that the Post Office Department will be used more and more to get this hate matter to the public. I am aware of the fact that it will be a problem to determine just what is hate mail and what is not. But, in the long run, I am sure that the Post Office can set up the guidelines and can be a great factor in keeping our mails free of racist, ethnic and religious bigoted communications.

This legislation is urgently needed in these days of turmoil and antagonism toward our fellow man. I hope that the Congress will take action on it before the end of the current session.

STREET LIGHTING AND CRIME

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FARNLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNLEY. Mr. Speaker, the rapid growth of crime and juvenile delinquency has become a subject of increasing concern to us all in recent years.

I have long believed there was a definite correlation between street lighting and crime and that adequate lighting in our cities and towns would do much to combat this problem.

For the past year I have been distributing to public officials and civic leaders in our largest cities copies of a report that was prepared at my request by the

Library of Congress which confirms the effective use of brighter lights as a crime deterrent, as well as an important factor in reducing traffic accidents.

The response to this distribution has been most gratifying. I have received a great deal of general informational material on the benefits of lighting as well as data on how various communities have acted to promote better lighting programs in their cities.

I would like to share the information I have received with my colleagues and plan to place some of the most interesting and informative letters in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from time to time.

Among the most helpful responses were those from law enforcement officers, and I would like to include one of these in the RECORD today. Following is a letter and article written by Mr. Joseph H. Farrand, chief of police, Lewiston, Maine:

POLICE DEPARTMENT,
City of Lewiston, Maine.

HON. CHARLES P. FARNLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I received your correspondence relative to lighting and could not help to be a bit amused at the parallel of our thinking.

This past month, I was contacted by the president of the Maine Chiefs of Police Association who requested that I submit an article for release in "The Maine Townsman" upon some subject related to the field of law enforcement.

I chose for the topic of my subject, "Lighting as it relates to the Incidence of Crime" and I am enclosing a copy of this for your information.

I have long been a proponent of better lighting and have seen its effects in many areas during my twenty-seven years in the field of law enforcement.

The City of Lewiston has a population of 43,000 people and its sister city, Auburn, a population of about 21,000 and it serves a conglomerate population of surrounding cities and town of an additional 40,000 people. I point this out to make you aware of the type of area with which we deal as a law enforcement unit.

The city in the past ten years has sprawled along the arterial routes in the form of shopping plazas, etc. Consequently, the extending of coverage along these arterials has made it imperative that mobile equipment be applied in the most judicious manner, so that security can be given to the persons and property existing there.

Good lighting along these routes has made our law enforcement job that much easier and is, in my opinion, one of the greatest deterrents to crime that exists.

I am enclosing a copy of the article I prepared for "The Maine Townsman" and I believe you will find it self explanatory and of some use in your pursuit of this subject.

Sincerely,

JOHN H. FARRAND,
Chief of Police.

LIGHTING AS IT RELATES TO THE INCIDENCE OF CRIME

For many years, I have had the opportunity to evaluate situations from a community standpoint, where inadequate lighting of areas has been the primary cause of pilferage from motor vehicles, breaks into business houses, and crimes against persons.

The incidence of these types of crimes usually has the common ingredient of "cover of darkness". It is obvious that this factor is considered by the perpetrator of the crime to protect his identity and afford him greater concealment so that his act will go undetected.

Streets, alleys and warehouses are often the targets of crimes against property and are often located in the railroad yards and adjacent areas, where there is very little population, so that the criminal can complete his act without danger of being observed thus making his position more secure against apprehension.

Today's society is composed of television watchers, to a great degree and neighborhood checks are less likely to turn up witnesses that might identify a suspect with the occurrence that is being investigated and this makes the follow up investigation a great deal more difficult.

Consequently, Police Departments are forced to rely on intensified patrol of these areas and the normal security measures of building inspection in the form of checking points of egress into the buildings that they are obliged to protect in the method used.

The individual officer relies to some degree on a hand light to check out these places of business, but this type of aid does not nearly eliminate the darkened areas, in which a person with an intent to commit a crime, might lurk in waiting till the officer has passed through the particular area in which he has chosen to do his deed.

In looking over these conditions with the thought in mind of eliminating potential, criminally attractive, darkened areas it seems obvious that one of the greatest tools of law enforcement is light. Recommendations, to those whose property is attacked, that they install lighting devices to brighten up these areas, I believe, will do a great deal to eliminate the problem.

This will also afford Police Officers assigned to motor and foot patrols a better opportunity to fulfill their obligations in the protection of persons and property against attack.

Observation is one of the principle functions of the law enforcement officers and certainly all of the assistance that can be made available in making him a more valuable instrument in serving this end should be afforded him. Adequate lighting will surely be of great aid in securing this end result.

ALMOST A WHOLE LOAF FOR LABOR

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FARNLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNLEY. Mr. Speaker, the minimum wage bill passed by the House has obtained a recommendation by the Louisville Times.

Neither the administration nor organized labor received everything originally sought in the measure, the newspaper comments. At the same time, the Times says in an editorial that the delayed scheduling of the second round wage increase seems insignificant when compared with the extension of coverage to more than 7 million additional workers.

All in all, the Times says, organized labor apparently has gained ground in the bill sent to the Senate. And it adds the belief that the country's interests have been served.

Since it discusses a subject of considerable interest, I offer this editorial from

the Louisville Times of May 28, 1966, for the RECORD:

[From the Louisville Times, May 28, 1966]

ALMOST A WHOLE LOAF FOR LABOR

Neither the administration nor organized labor received quite all they wanted in the House-approved minimum wage bill. But what they got was far more than what they were denied.

The House bill puts the wage floor, now \$1.25, at \$1.40 starting Feb. 1, with an increase to \$1.60 on Feb. 1, 1969. The labor-administration plan had called for the second increase to take effect Feb. 1, 1968.

That year's delay, however, seems insignificant when compared with what the bill provides in the way of additional coverage: more than seven million more workers, which would bring the total covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act to nearly 37 million. For the first time, coverage would be extended to employes of larger farms, laundries, hotels, motels, restaurants, hospitals, transit systems, and other hirers of labor, including the federal government.

The bill now goes to the Senate, where prospects of its passage, perhaps with even more liberal terms, are believed to be good. So organized labor, which has not had much to sing victory songs about at this session of Congress, apparently has a winner at last. And on this issue, we believe the country's interests, too, have been served by the House.

IF THE CITIES CANNOT OR WILL NOT ACT

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FARNLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Louisville Times is commendatory of President Johnson's proposal to make slum districts in otherwise healthy cities eligible for aid from the Economic Development Administration.

EDA was established to stimulate business development in areas of low income and high unemployment. But the newspaper notes that there are gaps in the scope of its activities. For instance, pockets of severe depression exist in some cities in which the overall level of income and employment is high.

These are the gaps which the President proposes to fill.

Some may deplore the growing influence of the Federal Government, the Times says in an editorial. But it appropriately adds that here is an example of the Federal Government's effort to do what local governments either cannot or will not do for themselves.

I submit this editorial from the Louisville Times of May 26, 1966, for the RECORD:

[From the Louisville Times, May 26, 1966]

IF THE CITIES CANNOT OR WILL NOT ACT

The Economic Development Administration was set up late last year as a replacement for the none-too-successful Area Redevelopment Administration. Its purpose: to assist, through loans and grants, business development in areas of low income and high unemployment.

An example of the kind of work EDA gets into is the \$18,000 grant it approved last

February to complete a project started by Spindletop Research of Lexington for the state of Kentucky and the American Restaurant China Council. The goal is to produce chinaware much stronger than that now available. If the project is successful, EDA said at the time of the grant, it should be a boon for the clay mining industry in Western Kentucky.

Last November, shortly after EDA had been set up, the agency announced a list of 1,280 areas (counties, high unemployment districts, sections with severe population losses, and Indian reservations) it had found eligible to seek assistance. They included a total population of some 50 million, and every state had at least one qualifying area. Between 75 and 80 Kentucky counties were included. Since then the list has been extended.

That provides an extraordinarily wide scope for EDA's activities, but there are some obvious gaps. For example, in some cities in which the overall income and employment level is high, pockets of severe depression might exist. As a matter of cold fact, they do exist in almost every large city, no matter how prosperous its average citizen is.

Los Angeles, New York City, Chicago—these are the most obvious studies in contrast. Each has within its city limits both great wealth and at least a relative degree of poverty. Moreover, as more and more of the middle class flee the cities for the suburbs, as they are doing in New York, Los Angeles, and Chicago, each city's ability to care for its own poor is to that degree diminished.

It is this gap which President Johnson this week proposed to fill. He asked Congress to make slum districts in otherwise economically healthy cities eligible for EDA assistance. Under the proposal, "urban development areas" having a population of 150,000 or more might become eligible. Thirty-four areas in 32 cities are likely candidates for this aid if Congress approves the plan.

This is, of course, another example of the growing influence of the federal government on local matters, and some may deplore it on philosophic grounds. But by the same token it also is another example of the federal government's effort to do what local governments either cannot or will not do for themselves. Those who deplore have some obligation to propose an alternative.

RED LIGHT ON THE TRACK FOR GELDZAHLER & CO.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, when the arts and humanities legislation passed the House on September 15, 1965, I supported that bill. At the same time, I pointed out that there were disquieting problems which might arise from improper implementation of this legislation. I said:

It does represent government intervention in a delicate and sensitive area. It does involve the expenditure of money and the creation of jobs on the basis of individual taste and private opinion. It represents a change in the manner in which the arts and humanities have been sponsored, supported and developed in the past.

Those who have studied the history of the U.S.S.R. and even that of modern France are aware of the frustrations and deficiencies

which inhere in bureaucratic administration of the arts. Now I am not suggesting that this would be the object of the excutors of this legislation or even the necessary result, but we must be aware of and guard against this danger which may come from operation by committees and boards with public financing. Unsatisfactory and even brutal, mercenary and rapacious as our present system may be, nevertheless it has the harsh benefits of a sort of jungle competition and has produced freshness and growth and dazzling beauty along with the tasteless, tawdry and vulgar that come inevitably from the freedom of expression that is part of our present system.

If, however, we have Government assistance, but not intervention; if we have support but not control; if we have stimulation but not participation, then we shall have constructive action in the best interests of the Nation.

I am sorry to say that from news stories it appears that a recent foray by Henry Geldzahler at the Venice Biennale has underlined the dangers involved in ill-considered government support of individual artists or particular movements. Since Mr. Geldzahler is consultant on the visual arts of the National Endowment for the Arts and was the U.S. Commissioner at the Biennale, his actions carried far more weight and significance than those of a private citizen or even an individual agent. They also have disquieting implications for the future if continued.

An article by Hilton Kramer which appeared in the New York Times on June 16, 1966, set forth these "machinations" in detail.

Certainly the State Department policy should not be flaunted in a case of this sort nor the opinion of the Smithsonian.

Perhaps it is just as well that this sort of happening has taken place early in the history of Federal support of the arts since it will provide an object lesson for the future.

The article by Mr. Kramer follows:

ART: VENICE MACHINATIONS—DENUNCIATION OF BIENNALE'S JURY SYSTEM THOUGHT PART OF LICHTENSTEIN BOOM

(By Hilton Kramer)

VENICE, ITALY, June 15.—Those who look to the Venice Biennale for a large admixture of controversy, politics and sheer gossip to go with the unending exhibitions of painting and sculpture have not been disappointed by this year's proceedings. At the center of the controversy are the American representatives who are repeating their feat of two years ago by stirring up a maximum of political as well as artistic excitement.

Henry Geldzahler, a curator at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York and the United States commissioner at the Biennale who selected the works of the four American artists showing here—Helen Frankenthaler, Ellsworth Kelly, Roy Lichtenstein and Jules Olitski—took the occasion of a press reception at the American Pavilion yesterday to denounce the whole system of juries and prizes that turns the opening days of the exposition into a political carnival.

In a statement that visibly discomfited officials from the National Collection of Fine Arts of the Smithsonian Institution, when this year is sponsoring the American Pavilion under its international art program, Mr. Geldzahler declared that "No committee or jury no matter how constituted can proclaim aesthetic quality. The prize and jury system must be abandoned."

Behind Mr. Geldzahler's denunciation of "the mechanics and politics of prizes" at the Biennale lay what looks to many observers here like a steamroller movement to capture the first prize for Mr. Lichtenstein, the only American pop artist represented in the Biennale. Mr. Geldzahler, who has been closely associated with pop art as a patron, critic and evangelist of the movement in New York, is apparently concerned with disavowing any personal role in this effort to win first place for Mr. Lichtenstein, insisting that the four American artists he selected for Venice are all equally "serious, weighty and worthy of international exposure."

Mr. Geldzahler issued his statement, in an apparent attempt to counteract the impression that the American show was designed simply as a set-up for the one pop artist in the group. All but Mr. Lichtenstein are abstract painters.

Certainly the campaign for Mr. Lichtenstein seems well organized. The bookshops here are prominently displaying a bright and hastily produced illustrated multilingual paperback anthology of critical writings on Mr. Lichtenstein's work by enthusiasts on both sides of the Atlantic. It is the only work on an American artist to be found on display. Three international art journals featuring Mr. Lichtenstein on their covers, *Artforum* (American), *Art and Artists* (English), and *Metro* (Italian), are very much in evidence, as is a fourth, *Art International* by an American. The last contains an article on Mr. Lichtenstein by Otto Hahn, the French critic, and has nothing about the other Americans showing here.

At yesterday's press reception the only man acting as a host in the American Pavilion was Leo Castelli, Mr. Lichtenstein's New York dealer and the man generally credited with "arranging" the prize for Robert Rauschenberg two years ago. Holding forth in the room devoted to Mr. Lichtenstein's paintings, with cameras clicking and questions coming in a half-dozen languages, Mr. Castelli was clearly a master of the situation. Compared to the crowd straining for a glimpse of the Lichtensteins or a word with Mr. Castelli, the rooms devoted to Miss Frankenthaler, Mr. Kelly and Mr. Olitski were islands of peace and quiet. At the end of the morning's hectic activity Mr. Castelli declared himself "very pleased" with the way things were going.

A good deal less pleased were the American officials who could be heard actively trying to dissuade Mr. Geldzahler from releasing his attack on the Biennale jury system. Originally, Mr. Geldzahler had planned to read his prepared statement to the assembly of journalists, artists, dealers and visiting dignitaries, but he was discouraged from doing this by various Smithsonian officials and State Department representatives. He simply handed out mimeographed copies of his statement. Later Mr. Geldzahler read his statement before the British Broadcasting Corporation television cameras and in response to a question from this reporter acknowledged that he was acting in response to the visible campaign building up on Mr. Lichtenstein's behalf.

Both the Smithsonian and State Department representatives appear to be embarrassed by what they regard as Mr. Geldzahler's breach of diplomatic courtesy. One also has the impression that the Smithsonian officials would not in the least mind bringing home a first prize from Venice so long as they are themselves not directly involved in the machinations of prizegiving.

Despite the machinations on Mr. Lichtenstein's behalf, however, the feeling here is that no American will be allowed to capture a top award this year. Resentment over the award to Mr. Rauschenberg two years ago still runs high and it seems unlikely that the jury, on which the United States is not rep-

resented this year, will want to risk another scandal.

Rumor persists that the first prize is likely to go either to Lucio Fontana, the Italian artist who exhibited at the Walker Art Center in Minneapolis last winter, or to the French sculptor Etienne Martin. One also hears some mention of the French pop artist Martial Raysse, whose exhibition in the French pavilion includes a pop portrait of Mr. Geldzahler and of Oyvind Fahlstrom, the Swedish pop artist. The prizes will be announced Saturday.

CREATION OF A DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, for some time now, I have made it my special concern to inquire into the law and regulations by which the Federal Government oversees the operation of air transportation to and from the State of Hawaii.

Hawaii is an island State. It imports virtually every necessity of life by sea and air. Without the free and most economic and inexpensive air transportation, its position as a rapidly growing and economically strong segment of our Nation would be precarious in the extreme.

Our fastest growing and strongest private industry, tourism, is wholly dependent on fast and inexpensive air transportation to maintain its vigor. The new research and development industries that have been moving into Hawaii have relied to a large extent on the fact that air transport provides ready and relatively inexpensive service between Hawaii and the rest of the Nation.

Hawaii's very prospects for continued growth—both in population and living standards—rest mainly on the same fact. Indeed, the mundane matter of transportation between the mainland and Hawaii has become of vital importance in such decisions as whether Hawaii students should travel to other parts of the country for their education and whether students from other States should partake of the ever-increasing offerings of our own University of Hawaii.

As air technology has advanced, Hawaii has been in the forefront of development of air cargo and passenger service innovations. These in turn have led to development of new patterns of economic growth, both between the State's islands and between those islands and the mainland. I need only cite the recent spectacular growth of tourism as a major economic endeavor of Hawaii's neighbor islands to point up the revolutionary changes that improved techniques of air travel have brought to my State.

Scientists who only a few years ago considered Hawaii too distant from the great centers of learning in the older sections of the country now have no hesitation in locating themselves in Hawaii, secure in the knowledge that the intel-

lectual refreshment they desire and need is but a few hours away.

Working people to whom a vacation in Hawaii was but a wistful dream a few years ago now plan routinely to spend their annual rest periods in our islands.

Tropical fruits that once were expensive rarities in the cities of the northern mainland now are flown routinely to supermarkets everywhere, for sale at prices far below what they once required to make their shipment profitable.

Ideas that once had to travel slowly across our mother continent now are cross-fertilized almost instantly by intercontinental contact and the fresh, young point of view that we in the Pacific offer our fellow Americans.

A vigorous and lively Hawaiian clothing industry now outfits the cities of the east with sportswear. The great cultural organizations of the east now bring to the islands the finest in dance, art and theater, receiving in return the gaiety and innovative charm of Hawaii and its multiracial heritage.

Because of all this, it is essential that Hawaii share equitably in our national transportation policies. Only if Hawaii can come on equal terms to the agencies that regulate and underlie our national transportation systems can it continue to build on these so-promising beginnings.

I have been concerned for some time, as I say, with an investigation into the framework of transportation policy that regulates how Hawaii fares under this Federal regulation, specifically as regards air transportation policy.

I have searched the law and studied the regulations of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

My concern grew as I discovered that in some ways Hawaii apparently did not receive what would be regarded as equitable treatment.

When half-fare plans for youngsters were put into effect by some transnational air carriers, for example, I was distressed to find that flights between Hawaii and the west coast were not included. It was only after considerable urging that carriers were persuaded to end this discrimination.

I have given considerable thought to possible remedies to this intolerable situation.

Among those that I considered was a drastic revision of the Federal law governing the CAB.

I also gave intensive scrutiny to the possibility of taking these matters directly to the CAB.

I found, however, that the corpus of law and quasi-legal regulation that has grown up through the years now affects so many interests—legitimate interests, I hasten to add—that only the most searching and delicate and time-consuming action by the Congress could fairly and equitably redirect its thrust.

And the necessary status of the CAB as an independent regulatory agency is such that one cannot with propriety intervene in its proceedings because virtually every matter before it bears directly on the activities of private concerns.

The breadth of the problem and its complexity are made readily apparent when we note that for two decades the

Nation and its Government have been concerned with development of strong, coordinated and equitable national transportation policy.

Yet, I have become heartened in recent weeks by the appearance of new hope that our national transportation program will grow into an integrated and equitable system under which Hawaii can live and grow in contentment.

President Johnson has proposed the establishment of a new Federal Department of Transportation.

This Department would draw under one guiding agency the functions of the Bureau of Roads, the Federal Aviation Agency, the Coast Guard, and the Maritime Administration, as well as several minor transportation agencies. It would take over the scattered promotional functions of several regulatory agencies. It would be responsible for the safety functions now administered by the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Interstate Commerce Commission.

It would set up a new independent National Transportation Safety Board.

All of this would go far toward carrying out the stated intent of the Department to implement national transportation policies conducive to fast, safe, and efficient transportation at low cost and in the public interest.

There is also, in the proposal as set forth in the President's message, a way of moving toward solution of the problems I have stressed.

While the CAB would retain its airline subsidy program, the Secretary of Transportation would be given the duty of developing principles and criteria for the CAB to consider in making its decisions.

In other words, there would be available a tribunal, not preoccupied with the day-to-day adjudication of individual cases and the safeguarding of individual interests, to which the State of Hawaii or any other State could apply for redress of any inequities.

The promise inherent in this proposal is buttressed by the contemplated duty of the department to develop national transportation policies and programs and to make recommendations for their implementation. And it is reinforced by the proposed departmental function of setting standards and criteria for the formulation and economic evaluation of proposals for the investment of Federal funds in transportation facilities or equipment.

Legislation embodying this far-reaching and much-needed concept has been introduced in both Houses of the Congress, has been the subject of hearings and is under consideration by the appropriate committees.

I am most confident that, should it be enacted, the proposed Federal Department of Transportation would be truly a key to the solution of those problems of equity in the administration of transportation policy to which I have applied myself.

And I am most hopeful that the Congress, in its wisdom, will give its approval to this legislation in a comprehensive, reasonable and workable form.

From this beginning can come a truly national program of transportation policy that is fair to every sector of our economy, every section of our geography, and every interest in our Nation.

From it also can come the great strides in technical achievement, in safety, in economy and in efficiency that we as a Nation—and Hawaii as a State—must have to continue to grow and prosper.

I am determined to continue my efforts to assure Hawaii the most equitable treatment available under Federal transportation policy and regulation as it exists today.

At the same time, I shall work unceasingly to bring to reality this new concept of a nationally based, integrated framework within which such policy can be applied with equal force and effect on all our country at the same time as the entire national effort is directed toward refining and improving our total transportation structure.

NEED FOR MORTGAGE MONEY AVAILABILITY TO PREVENT HOUSING SLUMP

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the housing industry is one of such fundamental importance to the economy of the country that everything possible must be done to assure its continued vitality.

There have been indications that the tight money period through which we are passing has had an adverse effect on the industry. In fact, the Commerce Department recently reported that housing starts last month fell to their lowest point in nearly 3½ years. I believe that the steps that are necessary to reverse that condition and to prevent it from becoming a long-pull trend must be taken as soon as possible. What is obviously needed is to rapidly inject more resources into the mortgage money market.

I have, therefore, joined in cosponsorship of a bill to remedy this situation and am urging the leadership in the Congress to speed floor action on the original measure, H.R. 15639, which was reported out of the House Banking and Currency Committee last Wednesday. That bill increases the authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association to make an additional \$2 billion available to the mortgage money market. Access to such funds would alleviate the tight money condition which results in reduced construction and the consequent curtailment of housing availability to prospective homeowners.

I realize that this legislation may be more of a palliative than a cure-all—but if it will keep the housing patient well or bring it through a crisis, that is precisely what we should presently seek.

And this action which is advocated by both the Federal Reserve Board and the National Association of Home Builders should be taken now without awaiting ultimate action on the related tight money problems, including the interest rate wars between different types of lending institutions and money media, which are receiving active attention from the Congress, the Federal Reserve System, and other agencies of the Government.

H.R. 16018

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, on June 24, 1966, the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina, SAM J. ERVIN, JR., introduced S. 3555. I am today introducing an identical bill with the hope that more expeditious action in the House of Representatives can be had. With my bill pending in the House, it is my hope that the Judiciary Committee can have prompt hearings simultaneously with the hearings which I am advised will be held by the Senate Judiciary Committee.

This legislation will make it a Federal offense for a parent or husband to move or travel in interstate or foreign commerce with the intent of evading his or her legal obligation to support a wife and children.

Legislation of this type is very greatly needed in order to meet a national problem which cannot be met under existing law. We are advised that in 1961 a study revealed that two-thirds of the families receiving aid for dependent children welfare money were those in which the father was absent from the home and not providing support for his wife and children. This great expense to the taxpayers can be greatly reduced if the bill which I have introduced today is enacted into law. At the present, it is estimated that dependent children aid is being paid to about 761,000 families, with 2,286,209 children in cases where the father was not present and furnishing support.

Various Federal agencies, such as the Veterans' Administration and the Social Security Administration are reluctant to provide information as to the whereabouts of fleeing parents under present conditions. It is believed that the enactment of my bill will remove that reluctance.

Efforts to meet this problem by State action have been unavailing. We have seen the adoption of the uniform reciprocal enforcement of support legislation in every State in our Nation. Many of us advocated that approach with the hope that it would result in a solution to the problem of the fleeing parent. The results have been disappointing.

Prior to my election to the House of Representatives, I had an opportunity

as district prosecuting attorney to deal with this problem quite extensively. I can say to you that the results were most unsatisfactory whether we were approaching the problem with a criminal prosecution of a father who had fled or whether we were proceeding civilly under the Uniform Act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge prompt consideration of this proposal in the interest of meeting a national need which is evident to all.

LIBRARY AND CONSTRUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1966

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased with the final adoption today of H.R. 14050, the Library Services and Construction Act Amendments of 1966, so that this important legislation can go to the White House for the President's signature.

In accepting the Senate amendments to the House-passed bill, the members of my subcommittee felt that since the Senate amendments did not make substantive changes in the House bill, and particularly since the Senate kept in the bill the two new titles—III, Interlibrary Cooperation and IV, Specialized Library Services—we should not delay final passage. These titles provide a beginning on desirable new programs and will open new fields of activities and a new concept in our efforts to provide good library service to all of our citizens. In providing for the establishment and maintenance of local, regional, State, or interstate cooperative networks of libraries, the maximum effective use of funds in providing services to all library users will be possible. It is this title which provides the greatest assurance that all funds, State, local, and Federal, will be invested in the most productive manner possible. And, when an interlibrary system is completed within a State or a region, scholars and researchers will have at their fingertips all the knowledge available in libraries within that system to assist them in completing their studies or research.

The new title IV provides funds for State institutional library services to persons in State correctional, health, aged, blind, and orphanage institutions and for services to handicapped persons outside of institutions. This will mean that persons confined to such institutions will be able to use regular community library facilities, a service long neglected because of inadequate funds and one that is greatly needed by those individuals who will benefit from the establishment and improvement of library services available to them. Also provided will be improved library service to the blind and other physically handicapped persons.

Because of the cost of such service, and because the program heretofore has been limited exclusively to the blind thousands of our physically handicapped citizens have virtually no library service available. This provision will complement the present Library of Congress national-books-for-the-blind program and assist in meeting an urgent need of our other handicapped citizens who are not able to handle conventional library material.

Another important feature of this legislation is the specific authorization of funds for each of the 5 years authorized by the act so that State governments and local communities can make long-range plans for orderly library development. Through such long-range planning not only orderly development will be achieved, but also economy in operation.

It is my belief, Mr. Speaker, that all of the titles of this act will result in the development of imaginative new programs and the creative use of existing materials. With our expanding population and with the number of educated people in this country increasing at a greater rate than the population generally, greater and greater burdens are being placed upon our Nation's libraries. The enactment of this legislation will do much to ease that burden and stimulate new innovations in improving public library service.

I am proud to have been the sponsor of this important legislation and am most grateful to my colleagues both in the House and in the other body for their support.

TUNNEY ASKS FOR ADEQUATE PROTECTION OF THE CONSUMER

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TUNNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, I favor the enactment of legislation designed to provide adequate protection for consumers with regard to labeling and packaging.

Today's consumer spends one quarter of his total expenditures on the purchase of food. The amount spent on packaged products alone equals that spent by Americans for private medical care and exceeds the amount expended on the U.S. public schools.

Packaging has made many beneficial and time-saving products easily accessible to the consumer—notably frozen food and detergents—but it has also been used to deny the consumer the opportunity to examine the product itself or ask a seller about it. Rows of plastic containers, cardboard boxes, and cans have replaced the live salesman. The consumer is thus forced to depend on a container and a label to help him select the best product for the best price. Often the container is designed to hide the product's true worth and utility under

misleading adjectives or chemical names for food additives and preservatives. At times illustrations do not accurately portray the content of the package and frequently there is confusing language describing the net weight of the product.

Today's consumer is faced with having to choose from among approximately 8,000 items which are stocked by supermarkets. This is a figure more than five times larger than the number of items stocked less than 20 years ago.

Confusing, uninformative containers make comparing the relative worth and value of different items almost impossible.

The phenomenon of slow shrinkage in the size of "standard commodities"—from the 20-ounce can to the 16-ounce can to the 15-ounce can—while the price remains the same is gradually eroding more and more of the shopper's budget. He continues to pay the same price but gets less and less for his money.

Deceptive packaging must be eliminated, not to the point of monotonous conformity but, since the package must sell itself, it must be informative—simple, direct, and accurate—a policy in the best interest of consumer, retailer, and producer.

"PEACEFUL" TRADE A MOCKERY

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, repeatedly we hear claims that it is to our advantage to deal in what is proclaimed to be "peaceful" trade with the Soviet Union and other Communist countries as a means of "building bridges" to Communist countries. The term "peaceful goods," it turns out, is often used to embrace practically anything that cannot be labeled as weapons.

To see what a mockery the Soviets can make of so-called peaceful trade let us look into an example of an export license that was issued authorizing shipment of certain automotive parts to the U.S.S.R., and examine the possible significance of a sale such as this in the light of subsequent developments.

On May 25, 1966, the Department of Commerce issued an export license authorizing shipment to Soviet Russia of 20,016 sealed beam headlights for installation in Soviet manufactured automobiles. These parts were authorized for shipment to Moscow.

In response to my inquiry, the Department of Commerce said that its conclusion is that—

Export of the subject automotive parts would not make a significant contribution to the economic or military potential of the Soviet Union which would be detrimental to the national security and welfare of the United States.

Additionally—

The Department states—
the Department of Commerce considers that sending the subject parts to the U.S.S.R. is consistent with President Johnson's desire to "build bridges" to Eastern Europe by encouraging trade in peaceful goods.

Only about 2 weeks later, on June 6, a press report came out of Moscow that the Soviet Union will raffle off more than 4,000 new automobiles.

And what are the proceeds of the raffle to be used for? To finance military training?

According to the report, by Vincent J. Burke, Moscow correspondent for the Los Angeles Times, the money will be used to "finance a Kremlin decision to intensify military training for civilians." The lottery is to be operated by DOSAAF, a military training society for civilians which has millions of members.

The DOSAAF is known formally as the Voluntary Society for Aid to the Army, Air Force & Navy and provides training to Soviet youth in rifle shooting, motorcycling, parachute jumping and flying.

A Government-Communist Party decree dated May 19, the report states, directed the DOSAAF to take immediate steps "for strengthening the military defense capability of the Nation, for increasing the vigilance of all Soviet people and training them in constant readiness to defend their homeland." The announcement said that the lottery proceeds would be used to improve mass defense proceeds with the populace, build new training and sports facilities, and develop sports which have military application.

This is a good example of how the Kremlin planners callously and ruthlessly can and do manipulate their resources to advance Kremlin goals. Consumer type goods are being brazenly exploited to benefit Soviet military preparations.

In closed, totalitarian countries such as the U.S.S.R. and other Communist bloc nations the possibility and probability always exist that this type of manipulation occurs.

It indicates the extreme caution that must constantly be exercised in any selling to the Communist bloc and the potential danger involved in attempts to open up the gates on trading with the Communists on the basis that we should send them "peaceful goods."

BILL TO CREATE A NATIONAL COMMISSION ON REFORM OF FEDERAL CRIMINAL LAWS

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SMITH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, last July the President established a Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. The Execu-

tive order creating the Commission charged it with inquiring into the causes of crime and the adequacy of the existing system of law enforcement, criminal justice and corrections. Following these inquiries, the Commission must report to the President by January 1967, on how Federal, State, and local governments can make law enforcement and the administration of justice more fair and effective.

Conspicuously absent from the mandate of the President's Crime Commission is the requirement to recommend legislation. Accordingly, I have joined several of my colleagues in introducing a bill which will establish a National Commission on Reform of the Federal Criminal Laws. This Commission is the next logical effort to follow from the work of the President's Crime Commission.

The National Commission on Reform of the Federal Criminal Law is ideally constituted to reduce to statutory realities the findings and recommendations of the President's Crime Commission. The Commission I am proposing is made up of six Members of Congress—three each from the House and Senate—three Federal judges, and three private citizens. Assisting the Commission will be a 15-member advisory committee made up of lawyers, U.S. attorneys, and others who are daily involved in the processes of Federal criminal justice. I believe that the forum of this National Commission on Reform of the Federal Criminal Law will provide an anvil upon which to forge the recommendations of the President's Commission into law.

It must be noted that the proposed Commission will do more than merely reduce existing reform suggestions into legislative proposals. It will also carry forward the work of revising the existing laws. The Commission will be authorized to study the entire spectrum of the Federal criminal laws and within that context it will suggest appropriate revisions of and additions to the Federal Criminal Code. It has been 18 years since the criminal laws were last revised and the men who undertook the 1948 revision may have been unduly confined in their authority to truly improve upon the law.

This proposed Commission will not be restrained to merely restating the existing law, which was the scope of the 1948 revision, but rather its mandate will permit it to expand and improve those provisions—or all provisions—of the criminal code which it deems desirable.

LOUIS C. CRAMTON

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HUTCHINSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACKIE] in tribute to the

life and career of my friend, Louis C. Cramton.

He had finished his long career in this House and had served a 6-year term as one of our State circuit judges before I first became acquainted with him.

It was in 1949 that he came to the Michigan Legislature, representing his home county of Lapeer and it was my privilege to serve with him there until he left the Michigan House and I left the Michigan Senate at the end of 1960.

It is not often that a former Member of Congress offers himself for service again in his State legislature, but Lou did so, and with enthusiasm. He represented the people of Lapeer County ably and effectively, and with the calm firmness born of experience.

He was a Republican progressive and even in his later years continued to look ahead with the courage to accept change. He believed with all his heart in the principles of political equality constitutionally guaranteed to all Americans, regardless of their race or religious convictions, and fought successfully in the Michigan Legislature for a State FEPC and other civil rights measures.

Allow me one further recollection. It was during Judge Cramton's second term in the Michigan house. We had before us a State constitutional amendment to provide for annual rather than biennial sessions of the legislature. After serving in Congress for 18 years, where bills introduced have lives concurrent with the duration of the Congress, former Congressman Cramton was determined in one thing. Even though the State legislature was to meet annually, he wanted to make certain that bills introduced into a legislative session would not survive that session. He did not want the congressional practice implanted in Michigan's legislature. He offered an amendment on the floor to make that plain. And he won the day. Not until the present legislature did Michigan experience legislative bills with 2 years of life, and that came about as a provision of the new State constitution, written after Lou Cramton had retired as an active participant on the political scene.

Mr. Speaker, lengthy as it was, Lou Cramton's legislative career was a reverse

of the norm. He began with a single term in our State house of representatives, back in 1909 and 1910. He was elected to Congress in 1912 and served here 18 years before being defeated in a Republican primary battle in which the issue was prohibition.

He then served with distinction as a State circuit judge and, subsequently, began a long and productive career in our State legislature. He was a public servant in the truest sense of the term and he will long be remembered by the people of Michigan and especially of Lapeer County in whose service he devoted his long political career.

BILL TO AMEND INTERNAL REVENUE CODE TO EXCLUDE CERTAIN REIMBURSED MOVING EXPENSES

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, this House has acted to help the productive member of society who is pulling his weight and it must do more to help him if he is to survive as a self-sustaining, taxpaying member of the Nation.

This spendthrift Congress has concentrated upon various forms of charity and dole. Fortunately, it has acted a little, too, to help the millions of individual Americans who must support this effort, and there is simply no doubt it must go much farther on this.

Unanimously, for instance, the House recently passed a bill to double the tax exemption for the many self-employed persons setting up retirement plans for themselves. This measure would permit the small businessman and woman to deduct three-quarters of their payments to retirement instead of one-half.

Frankly, I believe that the small businessman needs more relief and assistance. But then, so too does the much

maligned taxpayer in the gray flannel suit—the corporation man—who is moved hither and yon about the country, along with technicians with special skills, to keep production rolling for our huge and expanding American industrial complex. We are particularly aware of this in fast-growing California into which thousands upon thousands of new workers and hopefuls move each year.

Accordingly, I am today introducing a bill which will amend the Internal Revenue Code in such a way as to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses.

THE PEOPLE OF THE SEVENTH DISTRICT OF ALABAMA EXPRESS THEMSELVES ON THE ISSUES WE FACE

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MARTIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, recently I sent 131,000 questionnaires to the people of the Seventh District of Alabama seeking their views on some of the more vital questions facing our State and Nation. I want to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues the thinking of the fine people of Alabama it is my privilege to represent in Congress. At the same time I would like to pay tribute to these same people for their vigorous interest in government and the problems of this day in history.

The unusually high percentage of returns to my questionnaire and the care with which the questions have been answered, together with the additional comments offered by many of my constituents, is a tribute to the intelligence and wisdom of these folks from my beloved State and the district.

The results of the questionnaire follow:

Questionnaire—Congressman Jim Martin, 7th District, Alabama

	Percent		
	Yes	No	Undecided
NATIONAL ECONOMY			
1. Do you favor setting aside a small percentage of Federal revenue each year to reduce the national debt?.....	95.0	3.0	2.0
2. Do you favor Federal control and regulation of agriculture?.....	7.6	86.8	5.6
3. Do you favor a reduction in Federal spending to produce a balanced Federal budget?.....	96.0	2.0	2.0
4. Do you believe the Federal antipoverty program will reduce poverty in this country?.....	2.0	95.5	2.5
5. Do you favor income tax credits for parents paying expenses of children in college?.....	76.0	17.0	7.0
6. Do you favor Federal control of prices and wages?.....	7.1	84.7	8.2
7. Do you favor the administration bill for the Federal Government to pay part of the rent for those qualifying and who prefer better housing?.....	4.4	91.7	3.9
Are you better off or worse, financially, than you were a year ago?			
Better.....			Percent
Worse.....			21.6
Same.....			61.6
			16.8
CONSTITUTION AND BALANCE OF POWER			
9. Do you favor Federal aid to education?.....	43.2	47.0	9.8
(a) Higher education?.....	50.3	39.5	10.2
(b) Elementary?.....	51.1	43.2	5.7
10. Do you think the people of each State have the right to determine their own kind of legislation?.....	97.5	1.0	1.5
11. Should the Federal Government prohibit State right-to-work laws?.....	1.0	95.0	4.0
12. Do you think the Federal Government should order an increase in minimum wages?.....	8.0	86.5	5.5
13. Do you favor a Federal law to control selection of juries as is now proposed by President Johnson?.....	2.5	95.5	2.0

Questionnaire—Congressman Jim Martin, 7th District, Alabama—Continued

	Percent		
	Yes	No	Undecided
FOREIGN AFFAIRS			
14. Do you think the United States should be fighting in Vietnam?	32.7	43.6	23.7
15. Are you satisfied with the way the President is conducting the war?	3.1	89.5	7.4
16. In fighting the war in Vietnam do you favor—			
(a) Increasing our land forces with more and more American boys to fight a jungle war?	4.2	85.6	10.2
(b) Increasing the use of our airpower in strategic bombing of military targets in North Vietnam?	90.8	3.9	5.3
17. Do you favor trade with Soviet Russia and other Communist nations?	10.2	85.2	4.6
18. Do you favor our present foreign aid program?	2.7	91.2	6.1
(a) Should we increase it?	2.3	93.1	4.6
(b) Should we decrease it?	86.4	8.9	4.7
(c) Should we give aid to Communist nations?	0	98.3	1.7
19. Do you favor admitting Communist China to the United Nations?	10.0	81.0	9.0
20. Are you in favor of the Johnson policy toward Communist Cuba?	3.9	82.3	13.8
(a) Should we make a deal with Castro?	2.8	94.4	2.8
(b) Should we take action to get the Communists out of Cuba?	74.3	10.9	14.8

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

- Mr. PUCINSKI, for 15 minutes, today.
- Mr. PATMAN, for 1 hour, on July 11; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.
- Mr. CURTIS (at the request of Mr. PATMAN), for 1 hour, on July 11, 1966, following the special order of Mr. PATMAN; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. PATMAN), for 1 hour, on July 11, 1966, following the special order of Mr. CURTIS; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin), for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin), for 30 minutes, on Monday, July 11; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina to include extraneous matter in the remarks he made during consideration of House Joint Resolution 1180.

Mr. MAHON to revise and extend his remarks on House Joint Resolution 1180, and to include certain tables and tabular information.

Mr. LAIRD to revise and extend his remarks on House Joint Resolution 1180, and to include excerpts from the committee record, tables and other extraneous material.

Mr. STANTON.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. McCLORY in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) and to include extraneous matter:)

- Mr. EVINS of Tennessee.
- Mr. McVICKER.
- Mr. MOORHEAD.

SENATE BILLS AND A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 231. An act for the relief of James W. Adams and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1571. An act for the relief of Kermit Wager, of Lebanon, S. Dak.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2076. An act for the relief of Kil Ja Chung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2295. An act for the relief of Guisepppe Rubino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2317. An act for the relief of Dr. Albert Victor Michael Ferris-Prabuh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2720. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to develop, through the use of experiment and demonstration plants, practicable and economic means for the production by the commercial fishing industry of fish protein concentrate; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 2784. An act for the relief of Doreen Delmege Willis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2997. An act for the relief of Noriko Susan Duke (Nakano); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3083. An act for the relief of Dr. Rafael A. Penalver; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3189. An act for the relief of Dr. Alonso Portuondo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 99. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1611. An act to transfer certain functions from the U.S. District Court for the

District of Columbia to the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions and to certain other agencies of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLERSON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 11439. An act to provide for an increase in the annuities payable from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement and annuity fund, to revise the method of determining the cost-of-living increases in such annuities, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLERSON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on June 27, 1966 present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 136. An act to amend sections 1, 17a, 64a(5), 67(b), 67c, and 70c of the Bankruptcy Act, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 13822. An act to provide for an additional Assistant Postmaster General to further the research and development and construction engineering programs of the Post Office Department, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 29, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

OATH OF OFFICE

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives,

the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

"I A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 89th Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the 80th Congress entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (U.S.C., title 2, sec. 25), approved February 18, 1948: JEROME R. WALDIE, 14th District, California.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

2522. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for U.S. standards and a uniform national inspection system for grain, and for other purposes, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: Committee on the Judiciary. H.J. Res. 903. Joint resolution to establish the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1672). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 15996. A bill to amend the act of June 30, 1954, as amended, providing for the continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DYAL:

H.R. 15997. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 15998. A bill to strengthen and improve programs of assistance for our elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 15999. A bill to amend section 203 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 16000. A bill to amend titles 10, 32, and 37, United States Code, to remove restrictions on the careers of female officers in the Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'BRIEN (by request):

H.R. 16001. A bill to amend the act of June 30, 1954, as amended, providing for the continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 16002. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce by preventing the use of unfair or deceptive methods of packaging or labeling of certain consumer commodities distributed in such commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 16003. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance to certain non-Federal institutions, agencies, and organizations for the establishment and operation of community programs for patients with kidney disease and for conduct of training related to such programs, and other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 16004. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that any 5-year level premium term plan policy of national service life insurance shall be deemed paid when premiums paid in, less dividends, equal the amount of the policy; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 16005. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize an incentive tax credit allowable with respect to facilities to control water and air pollution, to encourage the construction of such facilities, and to permit the amortization of the cost of constructing such facilities within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:

H.R. 16006. A bill to establish a National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 16007. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 16008. A bill to provide for the establishment of a study commission to consider methods for conserving, protecting, and developing the Long Island Wetlands Conservation Area; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 16009. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit States, under Federal-State agreements, to provide for coverage for hospital insurance benefits for the aged for certain State and local employees whose services are not otherwise covered by the insurance system established by such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 16010. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce by preventing the use of unfair or deceptive methods of packaging or labeling of certain consumer commodities distributed in such commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 16011. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit the transmission through the mails of matter calculated to arouse racial hostility; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McVICKER:

H.R. 16012. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965 to raise the family income limitation with respect to Federal payments to reduce interest costs on insured student loans; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 16013. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 16014. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce by preventing the use of unfair or deceptive methods of packaging or labeling of certain consumer commodities distributed in such commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 16015. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 16016. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 16017. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to approve an agreement entered into by the Soboba Band Mission Indians releasing a claim against the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California and Eastern Municipal Water District, California, and to provide for construction of a water distribution system and a water supply for the Soboba Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHITENER:

H.R. 16018. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to make misdemeanor the fight, in interstate or foreign commerce, by any person who is the parent of a minor child or who is a married man, if such person so flees with the intent of evading his legal responsibilities with respect to the support or maintenance of his minor child or of his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARNSLEY:

H.J. Res. 1187. Joint resolution designating February of each year as American History Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H. Con. Res. 803. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on the holding of elections in South Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 16019. A bill for the relief of Mahry Khavidi Mafee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 16020. A bill for the relief of Myrtle Dyer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16021. A bill for the relief of Victor Rodriguez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 16022. A bill for the relief of Henry Hual-Tseng Mu and his wife, Lee Jun-Chin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 16023. A bill for the relief of Andreas Nikolaos Kanalouptis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.