

and John Loomis of the committee, as well as Carm Dye and Sukey Wray.

At this time I would like to close by calling on Bishop Tanner before he gives his benediction to tell us of a little sidelight on our honored guest.

Bishop TANNER. This will only take about a minute but it is a story that I think is important to illustrate Pete's character.

There aren't many people in this room who were adults in 1932, the black, desperate days of the depression. At that time I was in youth work in Milwaukee and we were graduating a class of about 75 young men from law school who could probably earn \$75 a month any place in town. Pete gave them a talk and an opportunity which I regret to say they didn't take. It amounted to this: He wanted them to get jobs in a shop

and not to mention they ever went to high school, and above all that they were graduated lawyers, but to work themselves up to be shop stewards and after that Pete would pull them up in the labor movement.

I have never forgotten it because in those days a union wasn't very popular and unions needed intelligent leadership. And Pete had the intelligence to offer it. (Benediction).

SENATE

FRIDAY, JULY 15, 1966

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

Rev. Edward B. Lewis, minister, Capitol Hill Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

O God of mercy and love, we are deeply disturbed this morning as we come before Thee in prayer. Life many times shocks us because of the actions of man's inhumanity. In this U.S. Senate, we are grateful that the individual citizen is remembered in his needs. The importance of the one person, the one opinion, the one conviction, the one vote, the one tragedy that affects all of us makes this government of the people, for the people, and by the people lasting and strong.

Today, this Nation, O God, is shocked by the murder, by a deranged person, of eight lovely girls training to be nurses in Chicago. It is for our own needed discernment that we recognize the evil facing mankind on every hand. We are a part of this evil because we do not sincerely seek a spiritual, moral, and mental development of our people to help in these days of tensions, despair, anxiety, and unrealistic evaluations of life. Forgive us and help us, O God.

We pray Thy strengthening and comforting presence upon the families who are numb at this moment. Only the Most High can bring them from the depths of despair and mourning.

Be with our President, this governing body, the Nation, and the individual citizen that all may contribute to the solution and prevention of personal and world tragedy. Shape us into a better nation, a peaceful people, and a world with a future. Mold us and make us after Thy will, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 14, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on July 13, 1966, the President had

approved and signed the act (S. 2950) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to maintain parity between military and civilian pay, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 15750) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The bill (H.R. 15750) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and placed on the calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. 3498. A bill to facilitate the carrying out of the obligations of the United States under the Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes Between States and Nationals of Other States, signed on August 27, 1965, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1374); and

S.J. Res. 167. Joint resolution to enable the United States to organize and hold an International Conference on Water for Peace in the United States in 1967 and authorize an appropriation therefor (Rept. No. 1373).

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

H.R. 318. An act to amend section 4071 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (Rept. No. 1375).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COM- MITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana, from the Committee on Finance:

Winthrop Knowlton, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

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

Executive F, Protocol to the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, relating to measures of control, and the protocol to the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, relating to the entry into force of proposals adopted by the Commission (Ex. Rept. No. 7).

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. PASTORE (by request):

S. 3617. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and the EURATOM Cooperation Act of 1958, as amended; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

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

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 3618. A bill to make certain expenditures for public facilities by States, municipalities, or other local public bodies more fully allowable as local grants-in-aid for purposes of title I of the Housing Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 3619. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the temporary suspension of duty on certain steel cylindrical tanks; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MILLER:

S. 3620. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to expedite and facilitate adjustments of payments under certain conditions; to the Committee on Finance.

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

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTI- CLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

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

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Address delivered by Vice President HUMPHREY to participants in the Fourth Annual National Youth Camp, and the address of the President at the commissioning of the new research ship, the *Oceanographer*.

Program, leadership seminar initiating Citizen Workshops on Clean Water for America, welcoming remarks by Reynolds T.

Harnsberger, president of Izaak Walton League of America; explanation of workshops by J. W. Penfold conservation director, Izaak Walton League of America; and keynote address by self.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements be limited to 3 minutes during the morning hour, which I understand will be concluded at 12:15.

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Labor, of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, let the record show that an objection has been lodged with the minority leadership by a member of the minority. I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The objection is noted.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, of the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, of the same committee, be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

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

CHANGE OF NAME OF ROLLA JEWEL BEARING PLANT, AT ROLLA, N. DAK., TO THE WILLIAM LANGER JEWEL BEARING PLANT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1372)

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I report favorably from the Committee on Government Operations without amendment, S. 3466, a bill to change the name of the Rolla Jewel Bearing Plant at Rolla, N. Dak., to the William Langer Jewel Bearing Plant.

This legislation was introduced by my good friend and colleague, Senator Young of North Dakota. I am particularly happy to be able to submit the report to the Senate because I feel that what this bill proposes is only just tribute to the memory of a famous North Dakotan who used his skills, persuasion, and untiring efforts to transform an area of North Dakota, located near an Indian reservation, from a relatively poverty stricken area to one where people have employment.

Those of us who watched the project develop remember vividly the many

months of work that went into it. Senator Langer was in the forefront, working with his congressional colleagues, in arousing interest, clearing plans, smoothing out details which resulted in the establishment of this jewel bearing plant.

The people of Rolla, N. Dak., and the Indian people on the Turtle Mountain Reservation are to be congratulated on the success they have made of this venture. Their work and management also serve as a monument to Senator Bill Langer, who made a dream come true in his home State.

It is especially appropriate that Bill Langer's longtime senatorial colleague should have introduced this highly appropriate resolution since Senator MILTON YOUNG was most helpful, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, in securing support for this highly useful project at Rolla, N. Dak.

The Rolla project was one of the first designed especially to utilize the unique and specific talents and aptitudes of our American Indians in industrial production. It has been a great success. Since its inception many other Indian reservations have become the host to industrial activities designed to utilize the talents and abilities of our Indian friends. Almost invariably the results have far exceeded expectations. The Indians have proved to be faithful, energetic, loyal workers, happy for the opportunity to earn respectable wages close to home and gratified over the sharp increase in personal income provided by these commercial jobs.

In South Dakota, we have a rapidly growing increase of interest being expressed by various manufacturing enterprises in America over the possibility of utilizing Indian laborers—both men and women—in fabricating plants located on or near the reservation. Among the enterprises already operating in areas where they have access to a dependable and ample supply of Indian labor which is available near the plant, undisrupted by labor strife or strikes, happy and proud to find at long last steady employment at respectable wages are producers of fishing tackle, laminated wood, automobile and truck mufflers, bed blankets, Indian souvenirs, sandals, and American built toys. Others are sure to follow as they learn of this unique and mutually profitable arrangement for locating fabricating plants in low-cost-of-operation areas where taxes and living costs are low, where recreational opportunities are vast, where there is always a supply of dependable labor, where the sky is blue, and where living is worthwhile.

Yes, Mr. President, Bill Langer set in motion quite a movement in America which is designed to expand and to grow. It is indeed a pleasure to ask unanimous consent that excerpts of the report and a copy of the bill, S. 3466, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the ex-

cerpts from the report, and the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The excerpts from the report are as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to change the name of the Rolla Jewel Bearing Plant at Rolla, North Dakota, in memory of the late Senator William Langer of North Dakota.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The following letter from Senator MILTON R. YOUNG of North Dakota gives the background information of the Rolla Jewel Bearing Plant at Rolla, North Dakota and explains the part played by Senator William Langer of North Dakota in having this plant established:

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Government Operations Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: As you know, I have pending in your Committee on Government Operations Senate Bill 3466 which would honor our late colleague Senator William Langer by naming the Rolla Jewel Bearing Plant, located at Rolla, North Dakota, the William Langer Jewel Bearing Plant.

This is recognition which the late Senator Langer richly deserves. This Jewel Bearing Plant, which is our only domestic source of jewel bearings for our defense and space programs, had its inception in the late 1940's when Mr. John Hart, then Executive Director of the North Dakota Indian Affairs Commission, came to Washington to enlist the late Senator Langer's help in getting some industry to locate in or near the Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation to provide badly-needed work for the Indians. Senator Langer's first thought was one of some industry to assemble watches or other similar intricate instruments widely used by our Defense Establishment. He had in mind utilizing the Indians' particular aptitude for native handicraft skills in the delicate work involved in this type of an industry.

Senator Langer very effectively sought help from every level of government from the White House on down. Securing this facility involved meetings with many important cabinet officers and executive agencies, including the Department of Commerce, the Department of Defense, the Office of Defense Mobilization, the Bureau of the Budget, and the National Security Council. Senator Langer very effectively coordinated activities of all of these departments and agencies in an effort to establish this important industry. To him must go the credit for the establishment of this industry. Had it not been for his determined, effective, and untiring efforts there never would have been a Jewel Bearing Plant at Rolla and, very likely, there would not have been one in this country.

I sincerely hope that you may see fit to approve this bill at the next meeting of the Government Operations Committee.

With warmest personal regards,
Sincerely,

MILTON R. YOUNG.

The bill is as follows:

S. 3466

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Jewel Bearing Plant operated and maintained by the General Services Administration at Rolla, North Dakota shall hereafter be known as the William Langer Jewel Bearing Plant, and any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such plant is designated or referred to shall be held to refer to such plant under and by the name of the William Langer Jewel Bearing Plant.

AMENDMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954, AND EURATOM COOPERATION ACT OF 1958

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, as vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy I am today introducing a bill incorporating the Atomic Energy Commission's proposed omnibus legislation for 1966. Since I have not had time to study the proposal as closely as I would like, I am introducing the bill by request. However, the Joint Committee will go into the provisions of the bill in detail when hearings are held on the bill.

The proposed legislation is intended to effect two substantive changes in atomic energy legislation. First, it is proposed to delete the requirement in section 41b of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 that the President make an annual determination of the quantities of special nuclear material to be produced by the AEC and the amounts to be available for distribution domestically and abroad pursuant to sections 53 and 54 of the act.

In recommending this change, the AEC states that because special nuclear materials and the source material from which they are produced are no longer scarce, it is not considered necessary or desirable to continue to burden the Chief Executive with the annual duty of making these determinations. The Commission also notes in this connection that with the repeal of these determinations the amount of special nuclear material to be produced by the Commission would continue to be controlled by the Congress and the executive branch through the normal budgetary process.

The other substantive change recommended by the AEC would amend section 5 of the EURATOM Cooperation Act of 1958 to permit implementation with respect to EURATOM of the Commission's authority, provided in the Private Ownership of Special Nuclear Materials Act of 1964, to contract for toll enrichment services. Presently the EURATOM Cooperation Act provides for the sale or lease of specified quantities of special nuclear materials to the Community, and it is thought that these terms do not encompass performance of toll enrichment services. The AEC contemplates that toll enrichment will be sought by EURATOM when such services become available after December 31, 1968.

The AEC proposal also calls for technical amendments to section 223 and 161n of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to correct what now are erroneous references in these sections to other sections of the act. Previous amendments to the referenced sections necessitate these technical amendments.

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

The bill (S. 3617) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and the EURATOM Cooperation Act of 1958, as amended, introduced by Mr. PASTORE (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT TO EXPEDITE ADJUSTMENTS OF PAYMENTS UNDER CERTAIN CONDITIONS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill, ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

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

The bill (S. 3620) to amend the Social Security Act to expedite and facilitate adjustments of payments under certain conditions, introduced by Mr. MILLER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3620

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 204 of the Social Security Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 204. (a) Whenever the Secretary finds that more or less than the correct amount of payment has been made to any person under this title, proper adjustment or recovery shall be made, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, as follows:

"(1) With respect to payment to a person of more than the correct amount the Secretary shall decrease any payment under this title to which such overpaid person is entitled, or shall require such overpaid person or his estate to refund the amount in excess of the correct amount, or shall decrease any payment under this title payable to his estate or to any other person on the basis of the wages and self-employment income which were the basis of the payments to such overpaid person, or shall apply any combination of the foregoing.

"(2) With respect to payment to a person of less than the correct amount, the Secretary shall make payment of the balance of the amount due such underpaid person, or, if such person dies before payments are completed or before negotiating one or more checks representing correct payments, disposition of the amount due shall be made under regulations prescribed by the Secretary in such order of priority as he determines will best carry out the purposes of this title.

"(b) In any case in which more than the correct amount of payment has been made, there shall be no adjustment of payments to, or recovery by the United States from, any person who is without fault if such adjustment or recovery would defeat the purpose of this title or would be against equity and good conscience.

"(c) No certifying or disbursing officer shall be held liable for any amount certified or paid by him to any person where the adjustment or recovery of such amount is waived under subsection (b), or where adjustment under subsection (a) is not completed prior to the death of all persons against whose benefits deductions are authorized."

AMENDMENTS TO FOREIGN AID BILL

AMENDMENTS NOS. 648 AND 649

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I submit two amendments intended to be proposed by me to the foreign aid bill,

S. 3584. The present foreign aid bill has two separate chapters, one dealing with development loans and the other with technical assistance. These two chapters limit the number of countries to which development loans can be made to the number of 10 and the countries to which technical aid can be made to the number of 40.

My amendments would allow, whenever the President so determines that it is in the national interest, extending the number from 10 to a number above in the case of development loans, and to a number above 40 in the case of technical aid assistance.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received and printed and will lie on the table.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS BY SENATE SECTION, JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I wish to give notice that a hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, July 19, 1966, at 4 p.m. in the Joint Committee's open hearing room S-407 of the Capitol, to consider the nomination of Samuel M. Nabrit, of Texas, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1970. The Senate section of the Joint Committee will also consider the nomination of Wilfrid E. Johnson, of Washington, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1967, of John G. Palfrey. Mr. Palfrey resigned from the Atomic Energy Commission effective June 30, 1966.

Without objection I will submit for the RECORD the biographical summaries of Dr. Nabrit and Mr. Johnson that accompanied their nominations.

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

BIOGRAPHIC DATA OF SAMUEL M. NABRIT

Age 61 (Born February 21, 1905 in Macon, Georgia).

Home: 3806 Tierwester Street, Houston, Texas.

PRESENT POSITION

President, Texas Southern University.

EDUCATION

In 1925, B.S., Morehouse College.

In 1927, M.S., Brown University.

In 1932, Ph.D., Brown University.

In 1944, Post-doctoral study, Columbia University.

In 1950, Post-doctoral study, University of Brussels.

PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE

From 1925 to 1931, Professor of Biology, Morehouse College.

From 1932 to 1955, Professor and Chairman, Department of Biology, Atlanta University.

From 1947 to 1955, Dean, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Atlanta University.

In 1955, President, Texas Southern University.

Also Ten summers at Marine Biological Laboratory, Woods Hole, Massachusetts.

In 1945, Science Work Shop, Columbia University.

In 1945, President, National Institute of Science.

From 1948 to 1955, Coordinator, Grants-in-Aid Program for Research, Atlanta University Center, Carnegie Foundation.

From 1951 to 1955, Member, Screening Committee, Ford Foundation Fellowship Program.

In 1954, Consultant to National Science Foundation.

From 1956 to 1962, Member, National Science Board.

From 1960 to 1961, President, Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

In 1961, Member, Fellowship Council, Danforth Foundation.

In 1961, Member, Board of Directors, American Council on Education.

In 1962, Member, Board of Directors, Southern Education Foundation. Author, numerous articles.

BIOGRAPHIC DATA ON WILFRID E. JOHNSON

Born: May 24, 1905, England.

Present Position: Recently retired as General Manager of General Electric Company's Hanford Atomic Products Operation at Richland, Washington.

Education: 1930, B. S. in Mechanical Engineering, Oregon State College; 1939, M. E. Professional Degree, Oregon State College; 1959, SCD, Honorary, Oregon State College.

Previous Experience: 1930-36, Design Engineer—Household Refrigerator, General Electric Company; 1936-40, Design Engineer—Commercial Refrigeration, General Electric Company; 1940-44, Section Engineer—Aircraft Supercharger, General Electric Company; 1944-45, Engineer—Aircraft Gas Turbine Department, General Electric Company; 1945-48, Manager—Engineering Air Conditioning, Department, General Electric Company; 1948-51, Manager—Design & Construction, Hanford Atomic Products Operation, General Electric Company; 1951-52, Assistant General Manager, Hanford Atomic Products Operation, General Electric Company; 1952, General Manager, Hanford Atomic Products Operation, General Electric Company.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of July 12, 1966, the name of Mr. McGovern was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 3602) to prohibit, without the express approval of Congress, any construction which would result in altering the proportions, changing the size, or modifying the U.S. Capitol Building in any substantial manner, and to establish a commission to study the existing and future needs of the Congress with respect to such building, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH on July 12, 1966.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] be added as a cosponsor to S. 3181, relating to moving expenses, and that his name be included in the next printing of the bill.

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

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next

printing of the bill the names of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] be added as cosponsors of S. 3602, a bill to prohibit construction which would modify the Capitol Building without the consent of Congress.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 3514, to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health, the name of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] be added as a cosponsor.

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

TRIBUTE TO DAVID E. BELL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a devoted and highly able public servant will leave the Government very shortly. I refer to David E. Bell, who has been outstanding as the Administrator of the AID program. This position involved directing one of the most difficult and challenging organizations within the Government. But Mr. Bell met the challenges, performed his duties with great effectiveness, and I wish to extend to him sincere gratitude for a job well done.

David Bell has been a credit to the various positions in which he has served. Yet, I can well understand his desire to leave. For his future will now be secured by a position which perhaps will be more lucrative and in which there undoubtedly will be some peace and surcease. All of this he has earned and richly deserves.

We shall miss him. But he goes with our congratulations and best wishes—and even more, with our sincere thanks.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wholeheartedly join with the majority leader.

David Bell is a great American. He is dedicated to his country and to the cause of peace with justice. His tenure has lasted longer than that of any of his predecessors. In a preeminently important governmental activity he has been able to demonstrate to a majority of the Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, with patience and painstaking devotion to the public trust, why assistance by this Government is necessary to nations of the world which are free, which wish to remain free, and which need the help and the assistance of the people and the Government of the United States.

Dave Bell now goes into a great private responsibility. He will be associated with an eleemosynary institution which bears a great American name, and will have the responsibility of helping to

guide the decisions of that institution for the betterment of mankind. As he leaves Government and as he enters what I know will be a splendid career in the private sector of our economy, all I can say is that the distinguished majority leader voices the feelings of all of us. I wish particularly to add my hopes that this fine man, this fellow Californian, will someday reenter the Federal service, where he has so distinguished himself in the past.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with my colleagues in their praise of David Bell.

As manager of the foreign aid bill in the Senate, and having been in charge of the hearings connected with this bill, it has been my happy opportunity to have had extensive contact with David Bell.

I daresay that I have never met a man who is more compassionate, more talented, and more devoted to his public trust than this fine gentleman.

I wish him well, and I join my colleagues in expressing our regrets that we have lost him as a trusted member of the executive department. But we know that his devotion and his dedication and his talents will continue to be used for the benefit and the grandeur of America.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank both of my colleagues for their remarks, and agree with them wholeheartedly.

The acting minority leader has said that he hopes Mr. Bell will return to Government. Others have similar sentiments. It has been said that one of the newsmen, on learning of David Bell's resignation, expressed the same hope, in these words:

Dave Bell is my candidate for the next Secretary of State.

Perhaps someday he will come back. We all can hope so. And if he does, he will be welcomed; not only because he is an outstanding administrator, but because he has already been through his ordeal of fire. And his initiation was with one of the most controversial agencies. Nevertheless, he has done a good job and he has performed it under the most difficult of circumstances.

As a further accolade to this able administrator, Mr. Bell, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Exit Bell: 'Bushed, Broke, but Not Mad,'" published in the Christian Science Monitor of Friday, July 1, 1966.

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

ABLE ADMINISTRATOR—EXIT BELL: "BUSHED, BROKE, BUT NOT MAD"

WASHINGTON.—With a laugh, he told a personal friend, "I'm bushed, I'm broke, but I'm not mad at anyone." To the last, David E. Bell was the rarest character in the high echelons of the national government: an able administrator who was always—so far as one could see—poised and disarming, candid, persuasive, and friendly.

The day before his resignation was announced, one of the best-informed newsmen

in Washington said, "Dave Bell is my candidate for the next secretary of state."

But he is leaving the federal government at the end of July.

His quip to a friend explained the very serious reasons why.

First, as to being "bushed": The top administrators all have man-breaking responsibilities nowadays. More, Mr. Bell headed one of the most controversial agencies in Washington, the Foreign Aid Administration. It takes a brutal hammering from opponents in Congress steadily, all during the year.

But on top of that, President Johnson is a peculiarly unrelenting taskmaster. He doesn't have the humorous, sporting touch of John F. Kennedy, tossing off a bad break or a slip or mistake with a quip, or with quick but short-lived irritation and anger.

He is a far more effective politician than Mr. Kennedy because he rides administrators and politicians hard, and doesn't forget or easily forgive.

He also stays mostly on the job, where Mr. Kennedy often took off for his country houses and rested, and let the whole government relax.

Second, as to being "broke": Washington salaries look quite good these days, particularly on the higher levels, provided the standard of comparison is that of the campus and not the top business administrator. The citizen with modest income would think an administrator like Mr. Bell could live comfortably.

But in Washington the top men cannot avoid a certain show of status. This is a government, after all. The standard of house and entertaining required of a man like Mr. Bell does not leave enough for his personal and family needs.

This is the reality for most of the best men here who do not come from wealthy backgrounds—the fact that lies behind the remark that Mr. Bell is "broke."

Many of them have to leave, not just for fancy salaries but to rescue their unbalanced personal budgets.

As for Mr. Bell's remarks that he was "not mad at anyone," this is the measure of how greatly the federal government needs this sort of man. There are not many of them around. Politicians and presidents lean on them.

But they still leave because they have to. Conditions are not yet right to induce them to stay.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I suggest that there is no better place he can come, if he returns to public service, than the Senate of the United States, where I believe we need him sorely.

Mr. KUCHEL. Let us not get into politics. I wish to say that since my friend Dave Bell has become acclimatized to the East, he may very well look with favor on becoming a citizen of Providence, so that the hopes for him of the Senator from Rhode Island might blossom.

Mr. PASTORE. Surely. And there is nothing wrong with that—15 or 20 years from now.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks which have been made about our very distinguished citizen and friend, David Bell.

When I first learned of his resignation I wrote him a letter expressing sincere regret that he had left Government service. As our distinguished majority lead-

er said, he has gone through a baptism of fire. I can assure anyone who goes through the hearings which we conduct on the foreign aid program in the Committee on Foreign Relations that that is a proper expression.

Dave Bell not only conducted himself in a gentlemanly and able manner but he was one of the finest administrators of the foreign aid program that we ever had. I wish him well in his new work.

THE AIRLINES STRIKE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, as each day passes the impact of the current strike against five of our major airlines becomes greater. Not only is it causing serious disruption in the transportation of people and products but the economic impact is of a tremendous magnitude. In my own area TWA employs some 8,600 people. Of this number 5,700 are now off the payroll because of the strike. These employees represent a monthly payroll of over \$3.6 million. The problem is equally serious in many other localities.

It should also be pointed out that many small businessmen are being seriously affected by lack of transportation for their products. If this strike is permitted to continue much longer it will truly be a major national catastrophe. Not only are we depriving 150,000 passengers daily air service but the strike is in complete disregard for the public interest. The airlines have accepted the recommendations of a Presidential Emergency Board which was headed by our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. It is most unfortunate that the recommendations of that Emergency Board are being ignored as a framework for prompt and equitable settlement.

The time has come for the President to use the persuasive powers of his office to bring an end to this disastrous strike.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram from Joseph H. McDowell, mayor of Kansas City, Kans.; a telegram from Louis P. Abrams, executive vice president, Chamber of Commerce of Greater Kansas City, Mo.; an article from the Wall Street Journal of July 12, 1966, entitled "Strike Against the Public"; an article from the Wall Street Journal of July 13, 1966, entitled "Airline Strike Plagues Many Firms as Mail, Shipments, Travel Plans Are Thrown Off"; and an article from the Daily News of Tuesday, July 12, 1966, under the heading "Capitol Stuff," by Jerry Greene, which deals with legislation introduced by our distinguished friend from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] in regard to the present airline strike.

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

KANSAS CITY, KANS.,
July 12, 1966.

The Honorable FRANK CARLSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please contact Joseph Ramsey, vice president of International Association of Machin-

ists and the five airlines urging them to meet and bargain in effort to stop the strike.

JOSEPH H. McDOWELL,
Mayor.

KANSAS CITY, MO.,
July 12, 1966.

The Honorable FRANK CARLSON,
U.S. Senator, State of Kansas,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Greater Kansas City business community deeply concerned about deleterious impact on area economy resulting from continuation of airlines strike.

Urge your influence and assistance in whatever manner possible to bring about a speedy termination to this increasingly grave situation.

LOUIS P. ABRAMS,
Executive Vice President, Chamber of
Commerce of Greater Kansas City,
Mo.

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 12, 1966]

STRIKE AGAINST THE PUBLIC

The nation's air transportation has been crippled by a new manifestation of a spreading mutation in traditional labor tactics. The walkout by the Machinists union is not ordinary economic warfare against the companies; it is a strike against the public.

The union's confidence in this tactic explains its refusal to budge in negotiations. The companies originally offered wage boosts of about 30 cents an hour, while the union demanded up to 53 cents over a three-year contract. A Presidential emergency board suggested 48 cents over a 42-month contract.

The airlines accepted this proposal as a basis for negotiation, but the union struck. Even so stout a friend of organized labor as Senator WAYNE MORSE, an emergency board member, denounces the union's position as "unconscionable."

But then, why should the union grant an inch when it has the power to create such great mischief at so little cost to itself? The strike has closed down about 60% of the nation's passenger volume, disrupting plans of some 150,000 travelers every day. Coming at the height of the public's traveling season, the result is tremendous inconvenience and no little grief.

Precisely this public burden is the union's immediate object. If there is any doubt, consider how the Machinists and their allies have thwarted Civil Aeronautics Board efforts to ease the crush on travelers. The CAB authorized airlines to exchange equipment to increase service, but the unions on non-struck airlines have refused to service additional planes. The Machinists said they "question" the use of leased equipment even if it does not come from the struck airlines.

The Machinists can easily see that creating a public crisis has been immensely profitable for other unions in the past. There was a time, for instance, when every emergency brought Government pressure on companies to give the union what it wanted.

Today the unions are so flushed with success that they often demand even more than the Government can stomach, but the upshot is usually the same. The union closes its ears to public cries for mercy. The companies, with greater consciences and greater contact with the public, are forced to listen. The result almost invariably will be a union victory.

To make everything even more unreasonable, the motivation behind today's typical strike is less the union members' economic needs than the political benefits their leaders find inherent in militancy.

Airline mechanics now make up to \$3.53 an hour. It's hard to believe that a raise of 53 cents instead of 48 cents will be worth

their own inconvenience in striking, not to mention the trouble they cause others. To offset organizing pressure from an independent union and the Teamsters, however, the Machinists chiefs need to bring home a settlement certified as fat by the fact that it took a crisis to win it.

Bloated with political as well as economic power, numerous unions seem to feel they have nothing to lose in assaulting the public even for such cavalier reasons. In the long run such irresponsible behavior, as the railroad firemen found out, invites drastic measures like compulsory arbitration. Yet, in general, the solicitude unions receive on Capitol Hill and in the National Labor Relations Board makes outbreak of arrogance eminently predictable.

In short, the record of union-management-government relations quite naturally tempts many labor leaders to conclude that they can get away with almost anything. Strikes against the public will continue increasingly frequent and blatant, we suspect, until that record starts to show that even labor has a need for restraint.

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 13, 1966]
AIRLINE STRIKE PLAGUES MANY FIRMS AS MAIL, SHIPMENTS, TRAVEL PLANS ARE THROWN OFF

The five-day-old airline strike, a severe annoyance to vacation travelers over the weekend, has become a major workaday nuisance for many of the nation's businesses.

Consider the difficulty it has caused John L. Daly, manager of the speaker-training service of Smith Kline & French Laboratories, Philadelphia. Scheduled to address a seminar in Spokane, Wash., today, Mr. Daly was forced to trek by train and plane from Philadelphia to New York, Toronto and Calgary, Alberta, where he spent the night. This morning, if all goes well, he will arrive in Spokane.

With five of the nation's major airlines closed down, Mr. Daly's circuitous odyssey isn't particularly unusual. Other traveling executives must take similar time-consuming detours if they want to reach distant destinations, and many of them have decided it isn't worth the trouble.

WIDESPREAD IMPACT

The strike is hitting business in a multitude of ways. Hotels, resorts and travel agents are losing peak summer trade. Scattered lags in air freight have caused production delays at a few plants that receive parts by air. Lobsters are going unsold in Maine, flowers are wilting far from the florist shops they can't reach and thousands of marketable mice are stranded in Wilmington, Mass.

The walkout has been a boon, of course, to railroads, bus lines, "air taxis" and the airlines that weren't struck, but the blessing is mixed. These carriers, most of them already operating at peak levels when the strike began, are straining their capacity to take up the slack left by the strike, which affects more than 60% of the domestic trunk airline service.

The nation's hotel and resort operators were among the first to feel the impact of the strike. The Florida Hotel Association figures the walkout is costing the greater Miami area \$400,000 a day in lost tourist business. New York City's Visitors and Convention Center puts the loss to the city at \$500,000 a day and an official adds that by Wednesday the tourist business, New York City's second-largest industry, "will really be feeling the pinch."

The Grand Hotel on Mackinac Island, Mich., had vacancies in 25 of its 300 rooms Sunday night because guests failed to show up. The Sahara Hotel in Las Vegas says its occupancy is down 7 percent. "There have

been numerous instances of guests being forced to extend their stays, but it hasn't offset the cancellations," an official says. Cancellations at the Pittsburgh Hilton are running to 27% of total reservations, compared with 5% normally, and the hotel is only half-full.

STRANDED SHRINERS

In San Francisco, some 10,000 Shriners still are stranded from last week's convention, but "no-shows" at the city's largest hotels are beginning to mount. Holdover guests offset the strike's impact in many places, but they also can cause problems, says Melvin Allison, executive assistant manager of the Biltmore Hotel in Los Angeles. He spent yesterday morning trying to get "a 185-pound, 84-year-old woman in ostrich feathers" back to her home in London. Pan American World Airways, which flew the woman to Los Angeles, can't get her a return flight until after July 22.

Despite delays in arrivals, however, most big conventions intend to go ahead as planned. The Chicago convention bureau is sticking to its initial estimate of 65,000 conventioners this week; the National Housewares Manufacturers Association reports that 30,000 visitors registered for its convention Monday, and the remaining 20,000 that had been invited were expected to check in yesterday.

Travel agents are singing the blues. "We're losing at least 30 percent of our business each day," moans Marilyn Bogart, a partner in Chicago's VIP Travel Agency. "If the strike continues, it could mean a 50 percent reduction in the number of people handled through this agency," groans G. M. Balta, vice president of Adams Travel Bureau, Inc., in Philadelphia. A travel agent at Paul Browne Associates in San Francisco adds, "One of our biggest problems is getting in touch with airlines that are still operating. We were on the hold button on the telephone for two hours and twelve minutes at Western Airlines Monday, just trying to call in for reservations."

"This strike couldn't have come at a better time for us, since the first two weeks in July are normally the slowest of the year," says a Boston-based official of Flying Tiger Line, Inc., which specializes in air freight. In Los Angeles, the line's director of sales, Paul J. Finazzo, says its westbound freight backlog is about 500,000 pounds, up from the 50,000 to 100,000 pounds normal for this time of year. He says Flying Tiger is "running the pants off" its fleet, but adds, "Even if the strike were to be settled today, it would be a minimum of a week before air freight traffic movements would get back on schedule."

PROBLEMS IN AIR SHIPMENTS

American Airlines, a major nonstruck carrier, also is carrying freight, and in some parts of the country air freight haulers are sticking fairly close to schedules. But in others, manufacturers dependent on air shipments are running into problems. Ampex Corp., Redwood City, Calif., says instrumentation-recorder parts being shipped from Tennessee were "bumped from the plane by mail" and held up for three days, delaying the company's production.

In Baltimore, the Martin Co. division of Martin Marietta Corp., which normally ships about 5 percent of its volume by mail, says delays are running a half-day to a day on both inbound and outbound shipments. Often freight has to be routed circuitously if it is to arrive at all. "Each day is a new problem," says a spokesman, "and the paperwork is building up tremendously because of extra bills of lading."

"We're using special delivery, air parcel post, railway express, as well as air freight to move our component parts, but were still

experiencing delays," says a spokesman for Motorola, Inc., Chicago. "We haven't had to shut down any production lines yet, but another week of this and we might get really bogged down."

LOBSTER SHORTAGE

Sometimes firms will go to extraordinary lengths to get freight through. Says a spokesman for Electronic Specialty Co., a Los Angeles electronics maker: "To get a hot order to New York, we sent a shipment of electronic devices along as excess baggage with an executive who had space on a New York flight."

Another victim of the strike is the lobster industry. John Hines of Hines & Smart, a large Boston-area lobster dealer, says the airline walkout is costing the three largest lobster dealers a total of about \$1,000 to \$1,500 daily in lost shipments. The shortage of lobsters and other East Coast seafood already is beginning to be felt in restaurants as far away as San Francisco.

New York's big wholesale cut flower business also has been hit hard by the strike. Carl Sauter of A. Sauter & Co. says flowers are "lying in the sun" at California airports because there aren't any planes to carry them. He adds that prices on many California flowers already have risen 5 to 10 percent. A New Orleans florist says roses shipped by air from California Thursday didn't arrive until Sunday. After such a delay, "all you can do is throw them in the garbage can," he complains.

Charles River Mouse Farm, Wilmington, Mass., also is "crippled" by the strike, according to Henry Foster, president. The farm normally ships about 80,000 mice and rats a week to research laboratories. Currently about half the livestock is grounded, but a World War II bomber pilot was hired to fly a specially delicate shipment—20 crates of pregnant mice to a University of Pittsburgh lab.

ALTERNATE TRAVEL JAMMED

Most railroads, bus lines and air charter services report they are jammed to capacity. In New York's Pennsylvania Station, the Pennsylvania Railroad stationed a man yesterday with a bullhorn and a walkie-talkie to direct passengers to proper ticket windows. Company planes also were in heavy use, traffic control officials at Chicago's O'Hare International Airport report departures of company-owned aircraft were running three times higher than normal.

Company planes couldn't take up all the slack, however, and many trips had to be abandoned. Ford Motor Co., for example, had to postpone the shooting of publicity pictures of its 1967 cars because it couldn't get its photographers from Detroit to Los Angeles.

Instead of traveling, many businessmen apparently are deciding to use the telephone, and American Telephone & Telegraph Co. says on Friday and Monday, the first two working days of the strike, the volume of long distance calls was 10 to 15 percent above normal.

The strike also is hampering the collection of checks drawn on commercial banks, but the slowdown may be a blessing to the bankers. Because the banks are given credit for the uncollected checks in computing their reserve requirements, the increase in the "float"—or total of checks in the process of being collected—promised to boost at least temporarily the amount of cash they have available for lending.

[From the Daily News, July 12, 1966]

HOW ABOUT THOSE NATIONAL STRIKE CURBS NOW?

(By Jerry Greene)

WASHINGTON, July 11.—President Johnson arrived back in the capital this afternoon

from his Texas vacation to learn that Sen. FRANK LAUSCHE (D-Ohio) had just relieved him of an onerous burden.

LAUSCHE introduced a bill in the Senate which kept the promise Johnson made six months ago to do something about solving the problem of crippling nationwide strikes.

No doubt the President had intended to take such steps when he figured the timing was right, or the polls indicated that such a move was in order.

In his state of the Union message last January, Johnson declared: "I also intend to ask the Congress to consider measures which, without improperly invading state and local authority, will enable us to deal effectively with strikes which threaten irreparable damage to the national interest."

The New York City transit paralysis obviously prompted that pledge, which seems to have been shelved after the subway began to run again. But LAUSCHE hadn't forgotten the New York debacle, as he reminded the Senate today. And now with the nation facing serious economic impairment from the airlines strike, the Ohio Senator felt the time had come for action.

LAUSCHE said the nation "cannot suffer any longer the stoppage of the transportation industry" and offered a bill to create a Presidential board with authority to make "A final ruling" in all transportation strikes.

Significantly, the Senator moved only a few days after the Teamsters' Union national convention voted Jimmy Hoffa full authority to call nationwide strikes against the trucking industry.

Any pretense that the airlines strike does not involve the national interest would be ridiculous. Apart from all other considerations, the movement of troops in the Viet Nam war planning is directly affected.

The Continental Air Command has had to institute an emergency airlift to carry soldiers returning from or en route to South Viet Nam and to facilitate other military operations.

The Lausche bill, of course, stands no chance of getting even perfunctory consideration by a committee unless it is given a strong push by the Democratic leadership. This isn't likely without a call for action from the White House.

But with this bill already introduced, right in line with his state of the Union pledge, Johnson has a ready made opportunity, to step in, embrace the measure as his own and throw his full weight behind it. The urgencies brought forward by the airlines strike would thus serve as an excellent springboard. Most of the promised Great Society legislation of this year is still pending in Congress and transportation could easily be given a priority position. And the implied Hoffa threat could be disposed of before it became a crisis.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, the mounting economic losses and hardship suffered by American travelers, workers, and businesses, as a result of the prolonged airline mechanics strike, compels me once again to renew my plea to the President to intervene personally.

The President did not hesitate to move in last fall to avert a threatened steel strike. After calling the union and industry representatives to talks in the Executive Office of the President, Mr. Johnson registered his determination that a strike must be avoided by personally looking in on the negotiations from time to time.

In this case, instead of moving in to prevent a strike, the President permitted

the strike to go into effect and he has so far failed to intervene personally.

So the strike has continued day after day until now the airline shutdown is more than 1 week old.

The press has reported the mounting toll of economic losses not only to airline mechanics and the airlines but also to other employees and other industries. The ripple of economic damage and personal hardship is ever widening—and still the White House maintains its hands-off policy.

I should like to remind the people of America that this administration has just moved in to roll back the price of molybdenum. Previously, this administration has intervened at the very highest level—the White House—to roll back aluminum prices and steel prices, when increases had been announced.

There were many reasons for such high-level intervention—including the desire to hold prices within the administration's wage-price guidelines and so help to hold down the mounting cost of living. Another reason was to prevent a setback in the Nation's economic progress and to prevent unemployment.

All of these objectives are present in the current airline strike dispute.

Why, then, I ask has the White House failed to exert every effort to settle the strike.

With each passing day the adverse impact of the airline strike becomes more heavily felt in Hawaii, where tourism is our second major industry and where the vast majority of tourists come by air.

Pan American Airlines, the only domestic scheduled airline still operating to serve Hawaii and the U.S. mainland, is striving valiantly to accommodate stranded tourists and persons who must travel on business or family matters. But obviously Pan American cannot overnight take care of the thousands of passengers formerly carried by the other two major airlines serving Hawaii and the mainland, who are now grounded.

Two days ago I reported in the Senate the Hawaii Visitors Bureau estimate that the tourist industry in Hawaii loses \$2,225,000 each week the strike continues. Based on this, the State of Hawaii could lose about \$2 million in secondary earnings and about \$200,000 in taxes, according to estimates of informed observers.

The Hawaii Visitors Bureau estimates that my State is losing between 1,200 and 1,400 visitors a day because of the airline strike. The average visitor stays about 2 weeks and spends about \$450 in the Islands.

Occupancy rates in hotels on one of our neighbor islands, Kauai, have dropped anywhere from 7 to 20 percent. Continuation of the strike impedes Kauai's strenuous efforts to build up its tourist industry, so desperately needed to create jobs for the people of Kauai and the economy of the Island.

All our major neighbor islands are suffering the backlash of this strike, which is curtailing tourism in Hawaii at the very peak of our tourist season.

Many people depend on income from the peak periods to tide them over during slack periods.

The chairman of the county of Hawaii, Mr. Shunichi Kimura, has advised me that the removal of some 34 scheduled flights daily to Hawaii will have a progressively deteriorating effect on our economy which is so closely geared to the visitor industry.

Furthermore, he says:

Our particular Island of Hawaii suffers in the matter of air agricultural export as well. Prolongation of the strike therefore hurts us badly in our two principal industries.

Mr. Sidney Kusumoto, President of the Japanese Chamber of Commerce wired me asking immediate solution to the airline strike "to avoid hampering of economy."

Some shops in Waikiki report a "drastic decrease" in business. One of Hawaii's leading department stores, Liberty House, advised me the strike "is affecting our tourist business movement of fashion merchandise from the mainland to the islands" and is also "affecting our Hawaii customers ability to mail merchandise to the mainland and movement of our personnel to mainland markets."

One of our inter-island airlines, Aloha Airlines, informed me the impact of the strike has been "already felt" and if the strike continues it "will seriously affect tourist industry and island economy."

The Royal Hawaiian Division of Castle & Cooke reports the airline strike is "causing great distress."

One tour service advised me it had just canceled reservations for 115 people who are unable to come to Hawaii because of the strike.

Another tour group asked for help in expediting a settlement, stating the administration has been "lax in allowing the situation to last this long." I certainly agree.

Mr. President, I could continue the sad recital of adversities occasioned by the airline strike, but I will instead ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks the wires and correspondence I have received on the strike, together with pertinent news stories on Hawaii's plight.

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

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,

July 13, 1966.

The Honorable HIRAM FONG,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Present airline strike causing great distress to Royal Hawaiian Division of Castle & Cooke. Respectfully urge your good efforts be directed toward rapid settlement.

FRED SIMPICH.

HONOLULU, HAWAII,

July 14, 1966.

Senator HIRAM H. FONG,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

On behalf of Hawaii economy please assist in expediting settlement of airline strike.

Feel administration lax in allowing situation to last this long.

E. PRESTON CHAPIN, Jr.,
President, Adventure Tour Travel
Service.

HILO, HAWAII, July 14, 1966.

Senator HIRAM FONG,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Japanese Chamber of Commerce requests immediate solution to airline strike to avoid hampering of economy.

SIDNEY H. KUSUMOTO,
President.

Senator HIRAM FONG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

This agency has just cancelled reservations for 115 people unable to come to Hawaii due to current airline strike. Urgently request your intervention in order to avoid continued loss of revenue to Hawaiian economy.

PAGEANT TOURS,
GERRY JORDAN.

HONOLULU, HAWAII, July 15, 1966.

Senator HIRAM FONG,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Existing airline strike is having damaging effect on tourist business large and small operators. If allowed to continue will create a disastrous economic hardship on all. Your continued efforts are imperative.

NATIONAL CAR RENTAL,
DUANE T. PROBST,
Executive Vice President.

HONOLULU, HAWAII,
July 14, 1966.

Senator HIRAM FONG,
New Senate Office Bldg.,
Washington, D.C.:

Appreciate your efforts in connection with current airline strike. Urge your continued efforts to bring immediate settlement. If strike continues will seriously affect tourist industry and island economy. Adverse impact already felt by Aloha.

CHAR ALOHAWAII.

HONOLULU, HAWAII,
July 14, 1966.

HIRAM FONG,
Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Surely there is something you can do to expedite an early settlement of airlines strike. We find it affecting our tourist business; movement of fashion merchandise from the mainland to the islands; also affecting our Hawaii customers ability to mail merchandise to the mainland and movement of our personnel to mainland markets has been curtailed. Will appreciate anything you can do.

E. A. ATTERBURY,
General Manager, Liberty House.

COUNTY OF HAWAII,
Hilo, Hawaii, July 11, 1966.

HON. HIRAM L. FONG,
U.S. Senator,
New U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HIRAM: I am well aware of your interest and concern in the matter of the airline mechanics strike now in progress. This strike has removed some 34 scheduled flights daily to Hawaii and will have a progressively deteriorating effect on our economy which is so closely geared to the visitor industry.

Our particular Island of Hawaii suffers in the matter of air agricultural export as well. Prolongation of the strike therefore hurts us badly in our two principal industries.

I know that you will do everything in your power to assist in bringing about an early strike settlement. Please use this message as you see fit to convey our expression of concern and dismay to all interested parties.

Yours very truly,

SHUNICHI KIMURA,
Chairman and Executive Officer.

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin,
July 12, 1966]

TOURIST ARRIVALS SLOWED BY STRIKE

The Hawaii Visitors Bureau estimated today that the State is losing between 1,200 and 1,400 visitors a day because of the airline strike.

The average visitor stays two weeks and spends about \$450 in the Islands.

"We're beginning to feel this effect right now," said Robert C. Allen, H.V.B. executive vice-president.

Hawaii has not yet lost a sizable number of convention groups, other H.V.B. sources said.

About 1,100 Shriners in five post-convention tour groups came here from California. About 1,500 were expected.

But only 40 of an expected 150 visitors in a United States Conference of Glaziers and Glassblowers Tour Group arrived.

Millions in losses to Hawaii could come from the strike, economists indicated.

The State could lose about \$2 million in secondary earnings and about \$200,000 in taxes, if the H.V.B.'s estimate of a \$2¼ million weekly loss of visitor industry earnings is correct.

Nora Kirkpatrick economist for the First National Bank, said that secondary dollar turnover from visitor money would nearly equal the amount visitors spend in the Islands.

She said that the state normally would derive taxes of about 10 percent on the money.

[From the Honolulu Star Bulletin, July 12, 1966]

STORES FEEL STRIKE PINCH

Island shops and inter-island tour services reported the first ill effects yesterday of the airline strike, but most hotels remained nearly filled and businessmen generally said that it was too early to determine any strike effects.

Doyle C. Alexander, of the Honolulu Chamber of Commerce, said Waikiki store owners reported conditions ranging from a "drastic decrease" to "not too bad."

"The shops are being hurt because the visitors that are here already have done their shopping," Alexander said.

Inter-Island Tours and Island Holidays tours services both reported cancellations, but said that they would not feel the full effect of the strike until the end of the week.

Meanwhile, Pan American Airways' standby space decreased, but a spokesman said the real pinch would not be felt until the weekend.

"If this strike goes on through the week, we're really going to have a problem," he said.

"United Air Lines flights for this weekend were booked full, and so basically were ours."

Pan American announced this morning that all regular flights to the West Coast are booked solidly but that an extra plane would be added to today's schedule.

Leaving at 5 p.m., the plane will carry 161 passengers. The Pan American spokesman said that about 200 persons were on standby this morning at the airport.

Pan American planes arriving from the West Coast have as many as 10 empty seats, an unusually large number for this time of year.

Airline-related businesses reported reduced volume yesterday because of the strike.

Spencecliff Corporation, which caters meals for some airlines, reported that it is preparing about 1,800 fewer meals each week.

Air New Zealand has stopped flying beyond Hawaii to Los Angeles because of the strike.

Flower lei sellers at Honolulu Airport also have felt the pinch of the strike as passengers worried more about getting aboard a plane than about flowers.

Martina Makalino, past president of the Hawaii Flower Lei Sellers Association, said vendors have cut back on the number of flowers they buy.

She said some of the airport lei stands are having difficulty earning enough to pay for their flowers.

Northwest Airlines has laid off 11 reservation and transportation agents, according to the airline's Hawaii sales manager Herbert H. Churchill.

But United has not laid off anyone yet, and Quantas, which handles maintenance for Northwest, has not trimmed its staff.

"It has not affected us at all, and unless it goes on indefinitely, we wouldn't expect it to," said Hartley E. Shannon, engineering manager for Quantas.

TICKET SALES

Even the struck airlines continued to do some business. A United spokesman said the airline's downtown ticket office sales had decreased only 23 percent, though Waikiki ticket sales were off 62.5 percent. The company sold \$7,000 in tickets Friday, the day the strike began.

Northwest also has kept its ticket office open. Churchill said the airline's real problem is in dealing with week-end tour groups.

The board has been flooded with calls from worried travelers. A reservation agent reported that some 5,000 calls came in on Friday. Calls have continued at twice the normal rate since the strike began.

Pan American has urged would-be passengers to check at a special standby desk at the airport.

Both the strike-grounded airlines have been shifting freight to Pan American and other carriers. United said its freight load for the week preceding the strike totaled 42,000 pounds.

Northwest Airlines shifted 10,000 pounds of freight to Pan American.

[From the Honolulu Advertiser, July 12, 1966]

KAUAI HOTELS BEGINNING TO FEEL STRIKE PINCH

LIHUE.—The airline strike is beginning to affect Kauai hotels, with occupancy drops ranging between 7 and 20 per cent.

Canceled tour groups appear to be the major cause of the empty hotel rooms.

Glenn Lovejoy, manager of the Kauai Surf, the Neighbor Islands' largest hotel, said, "We're beginning to show space, which normally is rare at this time of year."

"Instead of the expected 97 per cent, we're running about 90 per cent, and it will get worse as the strike gets longer."

"The first class rooms appear to be the most seriously affected."

A more marked drop was reported by the Prince Kuhio Hotel at Poipu. Manager Bob Lloyd estimated the resort is running about 20 per cent below normal.

Hardest hit were tour groups that came in over the weekend. Because of the strike, they had to be split into two groups, with some arriving Saturday and the remainder Sunday.

"As a result, we had plenty of empty rooms Saturday night," Lloyd said. "And we've had one entire tour cancel next weekend."

Most of the small hotels and motels were not hit as hard because they generally cater to Honolulu businessmen and visitors rather than Mainlanders.

Hanalei Plantation manager Barry Yap said, "It hasn't hit us yet, because we usually don't feel things until a week or ten days after Honolulu."

Lloyd was about the only one who saw a bright spot in the strike.

"We use a lot of college students as workers in the hotel, and as a rule they all quit right after the fourth of July."

"Their leaving this year coincided with the strike, so we've got a little breathing space to find new employees."

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, so that President Johnson may learn of the situation in Hawaii, I am sending him copies of these documents by special messenger today.

I conclude by once again urging President Johnson to forgo his hands-off policy and instead take a direct hand immediately in settling the airline mechanics strike. Negotiations should be held under White House auspices in around-the-clock sessions, as was done in last year's impending steel strike, so that strike will be quickly settled.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1967

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate, under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into yesterday, the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 14596) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows: On page 39, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

"Sec. 508. No part of the amount herein appropriated shall be available for price support loans or payments in connection with the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, in excess of \$50,000 to any one person, firm, partnership, or corporation, but not including any payments made to a producer under title III of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. How much time does the Senator from Maryland yield himself?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may need.

Mr. President, over the past 7 years, on many occasions, I have opposed our present agricultural policy. In all truth, I should like to see this country return to more of a free agricultural market. This, of course, is not entirely possible because of the policies we have pursued over the past 20 years and more; but I believe it is time to stop and take stock.

Therefore, I propose this very simple amendment which the clerk has already reported. It would impose a limitation that no one single producer, individual or corporate, could get direct payments or loans of more than \$50,000.

The Senate voted on this proposal last year and, if my memory serves me correctly, I believe it was defeated by some 49 to 42 votes. The vote was very close. But, each year I have served in Congress, we have heard reports that through high subsidies and price supports ultimately we will cut down the

cost of the agriculture program. The truth is, and I read from the first page of the committee report on this measure, that last year we paid \$6,381,488,500 to support our entire agricultural program, and now the Appropriations Committee reports a proposal this year that we pay \$7,022,638,000—an increase of nearly \$700 million for a program that the President said should be reevaluated.

I quote from the state of the Union message of the President 2 years ago:

A major effort to find new approaches to reduce the heavy cost of our farm programs and to direct more of our efforts to our small farmer who needs help.

I therefore suggest that if we are sincere and are trying to help the small farmer, this limitation on the big producer is entirely appropriate.

Less than 2 percent of the farmers of America gross more than \$100,000 a year, yet they take home 20 percent of the subsidy program.

I admit that the amendment I offer today will not amount to a tremendous saving—somewhere short of \$25 million—but it is a step in the right direction.

Mr. President, I have the facts on what was paid to American farmers in 1964, a complete list of all farmers who received over \$25,000 a year in either direct purchases or loans and the amounts that they repaid on loans that they did not fully redeem.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record this list by State, by commodity, and by name.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TABLE B.—1964 crop price-support loans made of \$25,000 or more and amount repaid, by producer

(NOTE.—The lists below include only those producers who received individual loans of \$25,000 or more on one commodity. It is possible that other producers received \$25,000 or more from CCC loans by obtaining several loans on the same or dif-

ferent commodities, each for less than \$25,000. It is also possible that the producers named on the attached lists obtained additional amounts on other loans, each for less than \$25,000. CCC carries out its loan operations on a decentralized basis at many

locations throughout the country and maintains all records on a commodity basis; therefore, preparation of lists showing the total amount received from CCC loans by a producer who obtained more than one loan would not be administratively feasible.)

State, producer, and address	Quantity pledged	Amount loaned	Amount repaid	State, producer, and address	Quantity pledged	Amount loaned	Amount repaid
BARLEY				GRAIN SORGHUM			
Arizona:	<i>Bushels</i>			Arizona:	<i>Hundred-weight</i>		
Younger Farms Co., Buckeye.....	218,205	\$200,748.60	\$200,748.60	Jack Robison & Sons, Willcox.....	49,903	\$98,308.91
Gila River Ranches, Inc., Gila Bend.....	71,530	65,807.60	65,807.60	Kinard & Greer, Willcox.....	33,702	78,820.18
Enterprise Ranch, Inc., and Arizona Land & Cattle Co., Buckeye.....	30,057	27,652.44	27,652.44	Floyd H. Robbs, Willcox.....	25,561	62,075.56	\$1,634.41
California:				Gilmore & Riggs, Willcox.....	12,436	30,468.43	1,057.07
Westlake Farms, Stratford.....	971,333	937,336.20	937,336.20	Kansas:			
Five Points Ranch, Inc., Five Points.....	296,374	284,519.04	284,519.04	Glen C. Gaskill, Moscow.....	16,718	29,256.01
E. L. Wallace, Woodland.....	58,258	56,801.62	56,801.62	J. David Sullivan, Ulysses.....	15,886	26,052.87	26,052.87
J. H. Austin, Fresno.....	26,257	25,731.86	25,731.86	J. R. Kapp, Moscow.....	14,473	25,327.22
Idaho:				Nebraska:			
Robert W. Hubbard, Soda Springs.....	59,750	50,280.41	50,280.41	F. Lucille Hammond and Tad D. Hammond, Nebraska City.....	31,683	58,296.72
W. S. Shufeldt & Sons, Soda Springs.....	56,741	47,946.31	47,946.31	Guy J. Barr, York.....	22,176	39,473.28
Gaylen Christensen, Tremonton, Utah.....	36,180	30,753.00	9,238.39	A. L. Rosener & Sons, Daykin.....	20,868	37,979.76
Minnesota: Keith Driscoll and Raymond Driscoll, East Grand Forks.....	31,590	25,272.00	16,128.00	Dale Lovegrove, Geneva.....	20,966	37,948.46
Oregon: Tulana Farms, Klamath Falls.....	182,292	157,682.29	157,682.29	Wayne Lyon, Merna.....	22,261	37,621.09
Washington: S. T. S. Farms, Inc., Prescott.....	19,764	25,693.20	25,693.20	Kreutz Bros., Inc., Giltner.....	18,850	33,176.00
				Frank Higgins, Schuyler.....	18,954	32,411.56
				Sheridan Bros., Sutton.....	17,735	31,745.65
				Robert D. Lovegrove, Fairmont.....	17,136	31,022.16	6.00
				Forrest Binder, Table Rock.....	16,330	30,047.20
BEANS, DRY EDIBLE				Lamonte Sahling, Kenesaw.....	17,136	29,816.64	29,816.64
California: Gnesa Bros., Patterson.....	6,324	52,671.94	52,671.94	John E. Halloran, Hastings.....	16,378	29,152.84
Idaho: William Hepworth and Jack Duncan, Rupert.....	5,300	38,531.00	7,270.00	John Kroger, Jr., Rosalie.....	15,271	27,335.09
Michigan:				Schuriger Bros., Inc., and Shurigar Farms, Inc., Kenesaw.....	14,816	26,372.48
Michigan Cooperative Bean Marketing Association, Lansing.....	15,993	114,190.02	34,272.00	Marion Johnson, Loomis.....	16,127	26,341.36	26,341.36
Mable Graham, Breckenridge.....	3,985	28,451.11	Fred Schwindt, Jr., Clay Center.....	14,144	25,317.76
Frank Kulhanek, St. Charles.....	3,507	25,039.19				

TABLE B.—1964 crop price-support loans made of \$25,000 or more and amount repaid, by producer—Continued

State, producer, and address	Quantity pledged	Amount loaned	Amount repaid	State, producer, and address	Quantity pledged	Amount loaned	Amount repaid
GRAIN SORGHUM—continued				GRAIN SORGHUM—continued			
New Mexico:	<i>Hundred-weight</i>			Texas—Continued	<i>Hundred-weight</i>		
Delbert Holloway, Clovis	25,892	\$49,052.07		Meyer Bros., Wildorado	19,463	\$37,563.58	
Jewel Castor, Clovis	22,152	42,753.17		James Fangman, Hereford	17,695	37,474.07	
Texas:				V. H. Kellison, Lockney	18,523	37,230.44	
Tyline N. Perry, Kress	67,422	135,814.15		Ivan Block, Hereford	18,648	37,109.52	
Charles Heck, Jr., Nazareth	53,730	107,104.75		J. C. Mills, Abertathy	10,976	37,007.03	
J. Meredith Tatton, Refugio	46,111	96,832.90		Calvin Petty, Dimmitt	16,958	36,968.43	
Lloyd M. Bentsen, Mission	41,622	90,040.91		Donald J. Meyer, Hereford	21,199	36,886.73	
J. C. Mills, Abertathy	37,568	82,929.81		Bill Bourlon, Farwell	19,178	36,576.34	
Taft McGee, Hereford	44,853	78,044.31		Houston Lust, Dimmitt	16,744	36,501.93	
Carl Easterwood, Dimmitt	43,663	75,973.44	\$75,973.44	Roy Strasburger, Temple	16,119	36,490.57	
T. A. and K. G. McKamey, Taft	25,456	75,813.17		Clinton Glenn, Canyon	20,882	36,454.49	
Warner Reid, Tulsa	41,375	72,689.11		Jackson & Hoepfner & Driscoll Foundation, Corpus Christi	16,764	36,416.36	
Miller Farms Co., Tulsa	38,858	67,612.55		Wilbur Wilson, Plainview	17,883	36,330.47	
John A. Raymond Smith, Hereford	30,770	65,034.05		Tom Priestly, Corpus Christi	17,085	36,049.63	
Martin & Marion, Hereford	33,120	63,965.65		Charles and Mabel Elliot, Agua Dulce	20,712	36,039.23	
G. L. Willis, Dimmitt	31,378	63,294.95		Higgins & London, Hereford	19,000	35,881.24	
Simmons & Perry, Robstown	29,493	62,230.86		Jack R. C. Vincent, Amarillo	18,660	35,828.04	
W. J. Giles, Dimmitt	29,956	60,991.90		Adkins & Son, Amarillo	17,024	35,722.90	
Don Williams, Farwell	34,853	60,644.92		Jim Sam Howze, Robstown	17,171	35,724.07	\$30,360.08
Stiles Farm Foundation, Thrall	26,602	60,531.34		H. L. Wilson, Refugio	17,068	35,641.10	13,958.77
Miller Farms, Fort Worth	29,589	60,480.56		E. D. Chitwood, Jr., Muleshoe	17,085	35,583.99	
Corliss H. Currie, Happy	28,262	58,552.82		Gordon Taylor, Sunray	16,906	35,512.08	
S. A. McCathern, Hereford	33,504	58,297.13	28,910.10	Lyons Bros., Hereford	18,348	35,499.83	
Nelson D. Durst, Eleanor Chance Couch, and Patience Chance Thomas, trustees under the wills of George G. Chance, deceased, and Georgia Chance, deceased, Bryan	28,839	58,254.78		Charles Norfleet, Hale Center	18,231	35,186.60	
O. A. and C. E. Webb, and Charles Saigling, Abertathy	33,451	58,205.43		T. L. Abertathy, Jr., Tulsa	16,808	35,004.56	
J. L. Massey, Robstown	27,556	58,142.67		Don Motheral, Kress	20,117	35,004.45	
Gerald McCathern, Hereford	32,340	58,094.90		Clayton Bros., Springlake	20,115	35,000.10	
Autry & Baldridge, partnership, Dimmitt	28,690	55,945.89		John Range, Farwell	17,991	34,903.31	
Ware Farms Co., Dimmitt	30,435	55,375.37		T. C. Garner, White Deer	17,000	34,849.99	
John H. Goodwin, Sunray	31,740	55,227.25		Bob Anthony, Dimmitt	15,818	34,833.46	
J. C. Mills, Abertathy	25,056	54,883.26		R. D. and Billy McClellan, Sunray	19,791	34,436.69	33,436.69
Elmo Stevens, O'Brien	31,394	54,625.71		Robert E. Hooper, Plainview	17,739	34,414.82	
John Trimmer, Jr., Hale Center	31,249	54,373.97		Oscar Mayfield & Sons, Taft	16,291	34,373.50	
J. D. Kirkpatrick, Bovina	30,580	54,232.34		Harvey and W. A. Spurlock, Sunray	19,717	34,308.34	
L. G. Mahagan, Kress	28,920	52,620.89		Chester Clark, Hereford	19,627	34,151.75	
David Nelson, Hart	30,075	52,330.50		Jack Smith, Lazbuddie	16,924	33,101.83	
Mrs. Anna Blake Head, Ind. executrix, estate of Rand Morgan, deceased, Clarkwood	23,731	51,733.19		H. H. Parker, Hart	17,984	34,050.00	
Hosea Foster, Canyon	26,128	51,730.76		D. C. Dilley, Borger	19,517	33,960.42	
Aubrey Harper, Robstown	24,380	51,440.93		Calvin Robertson, Plainview	18,051	33,950.63	
George E. Bennett, Hart	24,396	50,662.54		Akin & Tunnel, Plainview	19,489	33,910.16	
Tom Miller, Dimmitt	26,767	50,335.03		Morgan Sturgess, Tulsa	19,459	33,858.20	
Floyd Webb and Smith Webb Burruss, Mathis	22,254	49,848.82		Mildred Lowman, Bishop	16,019	33,799.20	
Frank Wise, Dimmitt	22,717	49,522.86		G. A. Parr, Alice	19,299	33,580.66	
Jack Miller, Dimmitt	25,739	49,402.44		Wallace Corse, Sunray	15,388	33,544.93	
Amko Farming, Inc., Corpus Christi	22,458	48,958.75		W. G. Sanderson, Dimmitt	19,250	33,495.00	
C. B. Brittain, Sinton	23,027	48,586.33		Billy John Thorn, Friona	19,250	33,495.00	
Aubrey Harper, Jr., Robstown	22,808	48,125.24		Bill Brown, Lazbuddie	19,211	33,426.33	
Mrs. Ollie Knight Jackson, Corpus Christi	27,633	48,081.54		Gordon H. Branham, Plainview	19,000	33,060.00	
Monroe Bros., Sunray	22,296	48,013.36		Dalton Caffey, Friona	18,977	33,020.71	9,952.80
Tommy Stanton, Dimmitt	26,121	47,721.82		C. B. Womble and R. R. Strain, Hereford	15,135	32,993.64	
L. T. Wood, South Plains	24,308	47,457.23		Rayphard Smithson, Dimmitt	17,814	32,870.62	
R. J. Cluck, Dimmitt	23,449	47,133.19		Buford Carter, Vega	15,000	32,549.69	
Raymond Blodgett, White Deer	22,302	47,012.02		Garner Bros., Bovina	18,661	32,469.44	
F. J. Mears, Jr., Dimmitt	26,646	46,364.03		J. T. Holcomb and W. E. Uselton, Springlake	14,870	32,417.48	
Roy Montague, Silvertown	25,239	45,934.17		James Cannon, Lockney	18,563	32,300.31	
Marble Bros. and Paul Kropp, South Plains	23,109	45,647.74		S. A. Fangman, Hereford	18,535	32,250.81	
Brorman Bros., Hereford	21,115	45,400.78		Jack Middleton, Tulsa	16,868	32,196.97	
Wade E. Clark, Kress	23,454	45,265.63		Jack Robertson, Plainview	18,471	32,140.33	
W. W. Walton, Corpus Christi	20,430	44,458.29		R. R. Rule, Friona	16,649	32,046.54	
L. D. Griffin, Silvertown	23,966	44,216.53		Roy Browder, Sunray	18,404	32,022.41	
Allan Webb, Dimmitt	22,532	43,487.14		L. M. Britten, Groom	15,239	32,020.67	
C. H. Mayo, Taft	20,461	43,173.35		O. D. Jackson, Vega	14,738	31,891.73	
J. M. Dellinger, Jr., Alice	20,373	42,927.01		C. Ralph Blodgett, Spearman	15,247	31,866.02	
Bennett Bros., Pearsall	19,756	42,865.52		W. M. Shirley, Lazbuddie	18,295	31,833.30	
B. L. Moore, Dimmitt	20,067	42,668.28		A. L. Hartzog, Farwell	18,124	31,536.11	
W. H. Gentry, Hereford	24,135	41,995.25		Wallace Cannon, Plainview	14,652	31,500.94	
Una C. Dowd, Chapman Ranch	19,244	41,951.98		Leroy Robison, Sunray	18,006	31,330.44	
J. H. Burkett, Sunray	23,968	41,756.45		W. E. Burnett and Neal Burnett, Plainview	17,980	31,285.72	
Travis Dyer, Bovina	22,151	41,564.82		Dennis L. Allison, Happy	14,281	31,275.39	
Glenn Merritt, Hart	19,172	41,356.11		Andrew Price, Kress	17,010	31,060.60	
Don Dimball, Wildorado	21,227	40,967.41		H. C. Davis, Hart	15,339	30,991.80	
Fred Dunn, Dimmitt	20,259	40,914.17		Taylor and Fortenberry, Lockney	17,787	30,950.06	
John Cole, Waka	23,420	40,750.80		H. W. Sisamore and J. W. Treadwell, Hale Center	15,366	30,885.27	
Dan Heard, Dimmitt	18,718	40,640.21		Jimmy Cluck, Hart	17,649	30,709.78	
Palo Alto Farms, Bishop	18,956	40,636.93		Silvas Bros. and Alex Boyd, Port Lavaca	14,011	30,603.10	
Tide Products, Inc., Edinburg	18,511	39,880.29		Robert Huseman, Nazareth	14,988	30,557.88	
Merrill Dryden, Sunray	18,818	39,767.89		Edwin Adams, Plainview	15,796	30,443.46	
Dulaney Bros., Dimmitt	20,109	39,763.79		J. E. McCathern, Jr., Hereford	16,795	30,406.07	
J. H. Kirby & Sons, Hale Center	20,383	39,338.82		Joe P. Hart, Hart	15,702	30,305.62	
H. N. Keisling, Sunray	22,393	38,964.64		Jim Bob Curry, Hale Center	16,363	30,224.64	12,768.00
Roy M. Lamb, Amarillo	21,443	39,919.27		Herbert Friemel & Sons, Hereford	13,955	30,003.26	
Harlan L. Barber, Hereford	19,745	38,503.04		Luther Browder, Sunray	17,240	29,997.72	
Ralph W. Shelton, Friona	22,118	38,485.32		Jack George, Hart	17,226	29,973.46	
Epperson & Downing, Inc., Hereford	19,726	38,465.67		O. V. Wilson, Kress	17,208	29,941.75	
Lloyd Glenn, Tulsa	21,585	38,007.55		B. R. Bennett, Hart	14,158	29,872.87	
Ocker Bros., Corpus Christi	17,388	37,905.84		J. M. Kendrick, Nazareth	15,383	29,843.20	
John Renner, Friona	21,705	37,766.70		Dryden Farms, Robstown	14,526	29,788.90	
Joseph F. Green Heirs, Taft	17,882	37,730.98		Wright Bros., Robstown	14,114	29,781.18	5,727.18
Lester Cole, Friona	21,660	37,689.10		Don Sudderth, Bovina	17,057	29,678.48	
Berta Cunningham Estate, Chapman Ranch	17,268	37,644.58		M. N. Smith, Tulsa	15,287	29,657.56	
				Richard Lupton, Nazareth	15,543	29,615.04	
				Gilbert Wenner, Friona	16,943	29,480.48	
				Alton Morris, Muleshoe	13,992	29,459.24	
				Victor Harman, Happy	16,930	29,457.67	29,457.67

TABLE B.—1964 crop price-support loans made of \$25,000 or more and amount repaid, by producer—Continued

State, producer, and address	Quantity pledged	Amount loaned	Amount repaid	State, producer, and address	Quantity pledged	Amount loaned	Amount repaid
GRAIN SORGHUM—continued				GRAIN SORGHUM—continued			
Texas—Continued				Texas—Continued			
W. C. McDaniel, Sinton	13,932	\$29,396.67		Edgar Rathkamp, Tivoli	12,268	\$25,762.80	
Brooks & Brooks, Hart	15,125	29,342.49		C. F. Harris, Plainview	13,378	25,724.87	
R. W. Barton, Kress	16,862	29,340.23		Sam Rundell, Farwell	13,595	25,722.76	
Melvin Jennings and O. Sheppard				Floyd Tomlinson, Canyon	14,769	25,697.36	
Thomas, Tulla	14,787	29,339.38		Ralph Britten, Groom	12,596	25,646.36	\$7,113.27
Phillip Haberer, Earth	13,910	29,329.12		Jerry Young, Plainview	12,921	25,615.68	
L. A. Lance & Sons, Bovina	16,705	29,066.70		Jack Jackson, Abertathy	12,148	25,534.18	
T. G. and R. L. Jackson, Austwell	13,814	29,008.99		Everett Heller, Kress	11,634	25,496.45	
Fred Bruegel, Jr., Dimmitt	16,669	29,003.37		Roy Roberts, Olton	12,869	25,477.59	
J. S. Hays, Tulla	14,128	28,902.65		Leo Szydlowski, Happy	11,628	25,466.20	
R. W. Shelton, Friona	16,596	28,877.57		Paul Schniederjan, Bushland	13,217	25,376.56	
Walter E. Stone, Robstown	13,622	28,741.66		A. T. Kleman, Dimmitt	12,538	25,367.27	
Ray Groce, Petersburg	13,179	28,729.36		Mrs. Jessie Herring, Johnson Estate, Vernon	14,554	25,324.48	
Robert W. Kinkaid, Plainview	14,844	28,648.15		John A. Abbott, Harlingen	12,919	25,321.44	25,321.44
Lee Renner, Friona	16,413	28,557.92		Ted Richardson, Hereford	14,552	25,319.78	
Max Rarick, Bushland	14,799	28,413.90		Homer Bartram & O. C. Harris, Lockney	11,313	25,288.88	
Dick Gerles, Farwell	15,693	28,389.30		E. L. Howard, Friona	13,100	25,209.65	
Mike Allen, Friona	14,059	28,328.06		Bobby McCormick & Paul Cooper, Lockney	13,103	25,158.33	
Daniel P. Moore, Portland	13,417	28,309.12		Wayne Foster, Farwell	12,477	25,144.66	
Horne Bros., Plainview	16,255	28,283.79		Carl Bruegel, Dimmitt	14,479	25,138.48	
S. R. Hutto, Hart	13,078	28,232.44		Calvin Brock, Lockney	12,807	25,102.29	
G. O. King, Plainview	13,960	28,129.90		F. L. Eicke, Hereford	11,632	25,025.30	
Walter Mattiza, Robstown	13,525	28,128.78		Paul Toliver, Plainview	11,963	25,001.84	
J. F. Whitsett, Tulla	14,249	28,096.19					
P. F. Stubblefield, Kress	14,408	28,095.43		OATS			
Dehnisch Bros., Mathis	13,804	28,072.35		Georgia: C. T. Kersey, Sr., Elko	45,900	34,884.00	34,884.00
Earl Hillman, Kress	15,346	28,036.13		Idaho: Robert Myers, Bonners Ferry	62,100	39,744.00	
A. T. Frye and Steve Barousett, Dawn	16,072	27,964.55		Mississippi: Loyce Makamson, Sison	69,636	47,842.76	27,655.38
Walterschied Bros., Hereford	16,070	27,962.03		North Dakota: Ballantyne Bros., West Hope	57,150	29,718.00	
Ernest Sluder, Bushland	14,525	27,887.54		Oregon:			
M. A. Snyder, Jr., Farwell	14,429	27,848.75		Tulana Farms, Klamath Falls	953,125	691,015.62	555,078.13
Milburn Haydon, Hart	16,000	27,840.00		Murel A. Long, Merrill	61,875	43,312.50	393.75
Alban Farms, Hereford	15,984	27,812.51		South Carolina:			
C. C. Ellis, Hereford	15,984	27,811.81		Kirkland & Best, Ulmers	51,030	37,432.80	18,262.80
Iris Touchstone, Dimmitt	13,938	27,693.47		W. R. Mayes, Mayesville	44,959	34,168.84	
Odell Jennings, Tulla	14,137	27,666.64		J. C. Oswald, Allendale	39,478	29,791.95	29,791.95
A. E. Lewellen, Plainview	15,895	27,657.53		South Dakota:			
Vernon Garrison, Silvertown	14,199	27,609.18		Elkhorn, Martin	57,600	33,408.00	
R. K. Brooks, Tulla	15,836	27,554.22		J. E. Cheek Estate, Pierre	49,435	28,177.95	28,177.95
Paul Kropp and Mae Bryant, Lockney	14,169	27,538.25					
J. W. Setliff, Robstown	13,037	27,508.54		RICE			
J. M. Wright, Dimmitt	15,806	27,502.44	\$19,517.68	Arkansas:			
J. F. Clark, Nazareth	14,156	27,406.48		Arkansas Rice Growers Cooperative Association, Stuttgart	1,975,974	10,192,868.95	10,192,868.95
Melvin Barton, Hereford	14,362	27,363.50		Producers Rice Mill, Inc., Stuttgart	729,000	3,717,900.00	3,717,900.00
C. R. Kay, Plainview	14,103	27,336.35		McAlister Seed Service Co., Walnut Ridge	29,676	146,163.14	146,163.14
Howard Sharp, Tulla	12,682	27,266.75		Alice Sidney Farms, Lake Village	28,142	135,440.55	135,440.55
Deta Blodgett, Spearman	13,011	27,193.20		W. B. Bynum, Dermott	28,928	129,505.56	129,505.56
C. N. Cooke, Corpus Christi	12,473	27,190.61		Leo Wilson & Co., Wilson	23,007	110,560.13	110,560.13
W. H. Long, Friona	15,625	27,186.92		Charles J. Peacock, Jr., McCrory	16,793	89,832.61	83,810.99
J. M. Young, Dimmitt	12,877	27,183.76		James E. McDaniel, Jonesboro	17,817	86,621.09	86,621.09
Jack W. White, Summerfield	14,120	27,110.39		W. C. Bradley, Walnut Ridge	16,042	81,631.71	
Bob Kay, Dimmitt	12,428	27,093.92		Kehl Plantation, Marion	14,700	77,929.98	77,929.98
James D. Doan, Tulla	13,016	27,085.58		F. K. Bradshaw & Son, Hamburg	12,422	68,227.46	
Walter Taack, Lockney	14,318	27,014.02		W. H. Hanna, Montrose	12,895	67,377.46	67,377.46
Harold Ray Caraway, Tulla	13,472	26,977.40		Charles H. Smith and Charles Bullock, Boydell	12,958	66,557.45	66,557.45
J. W. Taylor Estate, Lockney	15,466	26,909.97		James E. McDaniel, Jonesboro	11,432	61,564.45	60,759.45
A. L. Hollingsworth, Hereford	15,464	26,906.66		Tucker Blankenship, Corning	12,592	60,854.50	60,854.50
O. W. Machen, Banguete	12,740	26,882.25		R. D. Williams, Jr., Diaz	12,633	57,879.95	57,879.95
Ray Copeland & Son, Olton	13,903	26,832.42		David N. and James D. Ford, Sherrill	10,570	57,872.64	57,872.64
Dennis Kotara, Panhandle	13,237	26,831.87		Taggart & Taggart, Inc., Augusta	10,470	56,474.64	56,474.64
Mrs. Mary A. Sanders, Corpus Christi	12,307	26,829.39		Hildebrand Farms, Inc., Stuttgart	11,051	55,288.12	55,288.12
Mrs. Gertrude Luby, Corpus Christi	13,538	26,827.07		Raymond Hildebrand, Moscow	12,186	53,876.35	53,876.35
John A. Williams, Canyon	14,914	26,780.93		Doyle & Wilmans, Diaz	10,526	53,487.70	53,487.70
Charles H. Friemel, Canyon	12,286	26,783.49		Leon J. Garot, DeWitt	10,671	52,604.25	52,604.25
George Heard, Hereford	15,301	26,743.07		Robert P. Lewis and Carl Price, England	10,225	50,305.77	
A. J. Givens, Plainview	15,607	26,728.49		C. E. Newman, Fair Oaks	9,921	48,323.36	32,743.55
Carl Pate, Kress	12,235	26,671.23		Powell Bros., Eudora	9,178	48,161.44	48,161.44
T. G. McKinney, Dimmitt	15,859	26,600.84	26,600.84	Pinchback Planting Co., Grady	8,856	44,645.40	44,645.40
E. M. Gossett, Jr., Dumas	15,991	26,545.06	26,545.06	Lester Feltzer, Hickory Ridge	8,297	43,295.45	43,295.45
Everett Wiseman, Vega	12,219	26,515.23		R. C. Gilbrech, Holly Grove	8,740	43,021.50	43,021.50
Roman Friemel, Hereford	15,210	26,465.40		Lawrence Dugman and Hines Dugman, Walnut Ridge	7,652	42,561.74	42,561.74
W. D. Howard, Jr., Farwell	13,785	26,426.46		Lovett Farms, Grady	8,185	42,065.99	28,589.75
Lorenza Lee, Hart	15,180	26,413.90		J. T. Carothers, Lake Village	7,868	41,543.04	41,543.04
Fred Mercer, Silvertown	15,172	26,399.72		John Schenk, Monticello	8,260	41,064.77	41,064.77
Virgil Marsh, Hereford	12,102	26,382.35		E. R. Coleman, Dowdell	8,145	40,684.95	40,684.95
Jimmy McLaughlin and Pete McLaughlin, Plainview	13,107	26,345.46		W. R. Smith, Lake Village	7,983	40,665.35	7,988.00
Robert E. and Eugene O. Heath, Hale Center	13,612	26,310.97		E. F. Smith & Sons, Readland	8,295	40,277.51	40,277.51
Doyld Davis, Hart	12,442	26,251.96		Ralph Wimpy, Harrisburg	8,819	40,213.63	
Alice B. Simmonds estate and L.S.T. Farms, Robstown	12,437	26,241.03		Truman Loftis, Bob Carlee, and Louis Carlee, England	7,841	40,000.07	40,000.07
Mercer T. Ivey, Taft	15,077	26,233.63		Nehon Hagler, Cherry Valley	8,403	38,396.97	38,396.97
Harvey Milner, Tulla	15,075	26,229.74	18,381.14	Tommy Hillman, Stuttgart	7,160	38,023.30	38,023.30
John C. Carter, Plainview	13,485	26,161.28		Southern Rice Farms, Carlisle	6,729	37,844.04	37,844.04
H. D. Moore and Vinita McClain, Wildorado	15,027	26,147.61		Ralph R. Watkins, Stuttgart	6,859	37,667.20	35,810.10
Forrest Vise, Happy	12,788	26,086.21		Geeridge Farm, Inc., Stuttgart			
Lewis Sharp, Tulla	14,550	26,064.18		Big Ditch Irrigation Co., Stuttgart			
Roma Boggs, Kress	13,553	26,022.35		Robert Johnson, Cash			
Felix Mote, Tulla	12,864	26,007.05					
Kenneth Heard, Littlefield	11,922	25,990.18					
Donal Akin, Floydada	12,638	25,974.64					
A. C. Glenn, Kress	13,441	25,940.95					
Young Bros. and R. E. Young, Floydada	13,290	25,914.73					
Melvin May, Hereford	14,859	25,854.97	25,854.97				
George Heck, Tulla	13,175	25,847.07					
Bob Hammonds, Farwell	14,847	25,833.43					
Clyde Bradford, Happy	12,177	25,808.63					
Nelson Burton, Sunray	14,820	25,786.88					
Claude Higley, Stinnett	12,211	25,764.64					

TABLE B.—1964 crop price-support loans made of \$25,000 or more and amount repaid, by producer—Continued

State, producer, and address	Quantity pledged	Amount loaned	Amount repaid	State, producer, and address	Quantity pledged	Amount loaned	Amount repaid
RICE—continued				RICE—continued			
Arkansas—Continued				Mississippi—Continued			
H. B. Chambliss, Pine Bluff	6,894	\$37,046.70		J. L. Wilson, Jr., Rosedale	8,617	\$39,772.43	\$39,772.43
Chester Rutledge, Leon Rutledge, and C. S. Castleberry, Newport	7,737	26,209.16	\$36,209.16	L. F. Foreman, Clarksdale	7,293	39,127.69	12,698.98
Clinton and Harold Anderson, Sherrill	6,716	35,766.27		Robert E. Smith, Cleveland	7,135	38,660.18	38,660.18
B. O. Geunther, Sherrill	6,716	35,766.22		Glenn E. McCoy, Clarksdale	7,329	38,417.17	
McAllister Seed Service Co., and Clifford Micklish, Cash	6,281	34,929.29	34,929.29	Joseph H. Theunissen, Hollandale	7,458	38,177.10	38,177.10
Raymond Barrett, Jonesboro	6,802	32,873.18	32,873.18	H. D. and T. A. Tharp, Isola	7,123	37,503.75	
Guy M. Beene, Wynne	6,718	32,649.48	32,649.48	E. D. Strain, Jr., Morgan City	6,989	36,802.72	26,802.72
Ray Weaver, Cash	5,750	32,568.10	32,568.10	Homewood Farms, Inc., Greenville	7,269	36,566.46	33,078.96
Noble Lake Planting Co., M. D. Morgan, and M. N. Rush, Pine Bluff	6,446	32,399.49	3,916.60	W. B. Tackett, Belzoni	7,119	35,858.70	35,858.70
Erskine Harriman and Harry Lauson, Hamburg	5,994	31,807.89	31,807.89	Gerald and Henry Frey, Hollandale	6,582	35,819.48	35,819.48
Sam Abowitz & Son, Arkansas City	6,723	31,655.61	31,655.61	A. and N. Fioranelli, Cleveland	6,753	35,538.97	
David Knoll, Stuttgart	6,075	30,946.05	30,946.05	F. P. Unkel, Shaw	6,822	34,502.04	1,940.33
Ray and Don Daugherty, Stuttgart				Charles Berry, Memphis, Tenn.	6,057	33,439.95	
R. G. Holden Land Co. and John L. Conner, Newport	6,388	30,941.50	30,941.50	Harris & Wilson, Inc., Hollandale	5,953	32,830.16	32,830.16
R. A. Greer, Weldon	7,038	30,753.00	30,753.00	L. A. Peoples, Merigold	6,526	32,644.33	
Otmar Hageman and Joe Freeman, Gould	5,629	30,446.43	30,446.43	S. R. Phebus, Banks	6,480	31,112.10	31,112.10
Mary O. McGregor, Sherrill	5,521	30,035.87		Eckward N. McKnight, Cleveland	6,099	30,638.18	
Paul Young, Sherrill	5,265	29,694.60	29,694.60	Wade, McCollum, Hollandale	5,606	27,908.50	27,908.50
Leland Jones, Alietta	6,073	29,447.99	29,447.99	F. H. Nance, Cleveland	4,932	26,879.40	26,879.40
Eldon Simmons, Harvey Simmons, and Rudy Jones, Minturn	6,276	28,430.28	28,430.28	H. B. Mullins, Merigold	5,273	26,692.26	
Paul Gaines, I. N. Arnof, and G. L. Morris, McCrory	6,109	27,694.39	14,102.07	Joe B. Dakin, Skene	4,924	26,638.84	22,814.92
H.S. Bramlett, McCrory	4,770	27,027.90	27,027.90	L. B. Wilkinson & Purvis Richardson, Shaw	5,182	26,635.48	26,635.48
Burns Bros., Palestine	5,221	26,874.81	26,874.81	Sunrise Dairy, Cleveland	4,891	26,365.59	12,365.53
Albert Bullard, Minturn	5,702	26,713.84	26,713.84	Josephine Plantation & Charles Lawrence, Merigold	4,990	25,919.40	25,919.40
Carl Simms, Hoke	5,527	26,495.77	26,495.77	J. C. Willis, Jr., Hollandale	4,762	25,655.25	
Keiser Supply Co., Keiser	5,062	26,477.87	26,477.87	M. D. Dossett, Beulah	4,957	25,558.14	25,558.14
David Knoll, Stuttgart	4,860	25,952.40	25,952.40	M. B. Litton, Shaw	4,786	25,411.61	
Ralph and Anna Wood, Cherry Valley	4,859	25,825.53	25,825.53	Turner Arant, Blaine	4,653	25,172.73	
Lamar and Willie L. Miles, Monticello	4,657	25,816.02	25,816.02	L. B. Pate & Sons, Cleveland	4,693	25,093.69	
Robert Johnson and Joy Ledbetter, Jonesboro	5,670	25,636.50	25,636.50	Texas:			
J. C. Emenhiser, Eudora	4,737	25,554.01	25,554.01	Anderson Farming Co., Lissie	45,419	217,422.39	171,935.02
E. W. Hahn, Hazen	5,262	25,546.54	25,546.54	Chocolate Bayou Rice & Canal Co., Alvin	36,261	162,066.47	162,066.47
Raymond Hahn, Stuttgart	9,983	43,925.20	43,925.20	J. A. Jenkins, B. M. Jenkins, and W. E. Jenkins, Jr., Hankamer	29,932	146,707.21	146,707.21
Ethan Dodd, Minturn				E. J. Stoesser, Dayton	25,837	135,318.09	135,318.09
California: Thomas Mezger, Woodland				Texas West Indies Co. Farm, El Campo	23,825	126,776.96	126,776.96
Louisiana:				J. O. and G. F. Dennison, Liberty	24,105	118,435.45	118,435.45
Mayo Romero, New Iberia	25,380	114,509.70	114,509.70	T. F. Jenkins, Glen M. Kolemey, and Jeffrey Jenkins, Winnie	24,268	117,526.71	117,526.71
Zaunbrecher Bros., Jones	16,799	80,654.19	45,933.54	Pfeiffer & Son Farms, Houston	22,876	115,106.88	74,701.45
W. P. Tomlinson, Lake Providence	15,307	76,433.63	76,433.63	A. J. and J. R. Carter, Victoria	23,781	114,153.04	114,153.04
Rheindolt J. Leonard, Lake Charles	14,027	64,799.55	64,799.55	J. H. Clippson, Sr., Eagle Lake	19,663	107,755.82	107,755.82
Open Al Ranch, Inc., Lake Charles	12,028	62,034.56	62,034.56	Harry Hafesnick and T. J. Babb, Edna	21,808	107,317.20	107,317.20
Brady Oswalt, Lake Providence	10,934	56,934.30	56,934.30	Henderson Farms, El Campo	20,825	103,911.28	103,911.28
James B. Lingo, Oak Grove	11,916	52,978.21	52,978.21	R. M. Middleton Estate and Ed. Roy, George, Shirley, and L. E. Turner & Son, Anahuac	18,583	94,573.58	95,573.58
Larry Guidry, Oberlin	10,170	50,737.14	50,737.14	Floyd & Kenneth Henderson, El Campo	19,785	93,608.27	93,608.27
Byron L. Rye, Pioneer	8,298	38,813.33	38,813.33	Martin Bros. & Son, Houston	19,591	92,253.42	92,253.42
Arthur Loewer, Branch	7,971	36,532.49	36,532.49	Jess Mathews and Katherine Vance, Beaumont	18,694	90,315.03	90,315.03
Orin Andrepoint, Kinder	7,944	35,459.38	35,459.38	Eddie Blackman, Sr., and Hornbeck Bros., DeKalb	18,023	85,871.06	85,871.06
Ashton S. Pettigrew, Rayne	7,364	33,442.87	33,442.87	Henry Huff, Edna	19,170	84,903.48	84,903.48
Eve Fontenot, Oberlin	6,412	31,781.17	31,781.17	Francis Koop, Edna	16,719	82,209.12	59,301.63
Weston Monceaux, Oberlin	6,531	29,648.32	29,648.32	J. R. Reed, El Campo	16,979	80,982.04	56,619.23
Clarence LaPoint, Reeves	5,393	26,813.58	26,813.58	J. R. Thomas, Eagle Lake	15,365	80,765.10	80,765.10
Louis Fuselier, Mittle	4,859	26,156.52	26,156.52	Marvin Wiede and John Koop, Edna	16,689	80,751.53	41,526.53
Elmo J. Bollick, Jones	5,832	25,150.93	25,150.93	E. P. Duke, Elmo Duke, Jr., and Anthony Duke, Rosharon	15,870	80,554.08	80,554.08
John R. Denison, Iowa	4,962	34,720.65	34,720.65	N. & M. Farms, Linke Nolte, and Rupert Myrell, Anahuac	14,578	78,461.48	78,461.48
Sagera Bros., Bonita				R. L. Clippson, Eagle Lake	14,714	76,802.20	
Mississippi:				Joe R. Anderson and T. L. Davidson, East Bernard	14,005	74,226.50	74,226.50
Albert Prevot, Dwight McCollum, Frank Orlick, and Thounissen, Hollandale	32,649	172,872.07	39,332.82	W. C. McBride and J. C. Emenhiser, Stowell	12,968	73,095.80	73,095.80
Nott Wheeler, Cleveland	25,054	130,965.82	130,965.82	Harold Koop, Edna	15,394	72,837.90	72,837.90
J. A. Howarth, Jr., Cleveland	24,473	130,349.73	130,349.73	Clinco Ranch, Clodine	14,915	70,798.35	57,409.05
Allen Gray Estate, Benoit	24,600	122,516.13	122,516.13	Blue Creek Rice Farms & Kountz & Couch, El Campo	13,394	68,576.00	68,576.00
Laudie & Cole Farms, Boyle	23,057	122,298.32	122,298.32	Blue Creek Rice Farms, by Frank L. Ramsey, agent, El Campo	14,105	66,915.21	66,915.21
Dominic P. Rizzo, Cleveland	22,030	112,191.51	112,191.51	Euel Dugat & E. J. Dugat, Winnie	13,058	64,888.70	64,888.70
J. and V. Aguzzi, Cleveland	19,504	108,565.57	108,565.57	E. P. Duke & Sons, Rosharon	12,575	63,057.58	63,057.58
Greer Bros. & Son, Hollandale	21,056	103,205.64	103,205.64	Curtis A. Seaberg & Seaberg Farms, Inc., Dayton	12,095	62,117.14	62,117.14
Mills Bros., Benoit	18,726	96,112.86	96,112.86	Henderson Farms, El Campo	13,173	61,849.40	61,849.40
J. C. O'Neal, Jr., Cleveland	15,636	83,012.98		Floyd & Kenneth Henderson & Clyde DeFoor, El Campo	13,003	61,447.79	61,447.79
W. P. Skelton, Rosedale	16,121	76,467.32	76,467.32	Roger C. Brown, Dayton	12,633	60,817.17	60,817.17
Richard Bros., Doddsville	15,530	73,920.94	73,920.94	Walter A. Virmann & Sons, Sealy	11,808	60,122.40	60,122.40
Edward A. Lyons, Cleveland	12,423	67,005.50	67,005.50	T. E. Reidland & Son, Crosby	12,575	60,106.63	60,106.63
Maryland Planting Co., Clarksdale	12,311	65,444.87	17,151.95	A. G. & M. T. Simons, Jr., Edna	12,167	59,972.14	47,991.26
Hall & Hawkins, Merigold	11,576	64,308.04		Robert Rasmussen & D. W. Beck, Louise	12,442	59,536.86	59,536.86
W. J. Chudy, Cleveland	12,376	63,290.09	63,290.09	Harry and Everett Anderson, East Bernard	11,569	58,847.28	23,519.82
Barbour & Parker, Cleveland	12,812	60,492.08	60,492.08	Ed H. Helwig, Fulshear	12,090	58,206.39	45,509.78
Wilton Richard, Greenville	11,235	60,130.52	21,196.02	Cinco Ranch, Clodine	11,993	57,732.22	57,732.22
Dan Seligman, Shaw	10,910	59,284.88	59,284.88	John Clippson, Eagle Lake	10,755	57,080.05	17,732.85
Raymond Murrell, Avon	10,044	54,257.16	54,257.16	Marsalia Bros., Eagle Lake			
Kenneth Frey, Hollandale	9,247	48,824.16	48,824.16	P. D. Gertson, Sr., Lissie	11,897	56,990.15	56,990.15
A. R. Mann, Jr., Skene	9,362	47,818.16	47,818.16	John Pearson and T. J. Babb, Edna	11,750	56,323.26	56,323.26
David E. Greer, Hollandale	9,169	47,788.46	47,788.46	J. H. Taylor, Hamshire	13,181	55,051.68	55,051.68
Harden Farms, Cleveland	10,419	47,456.28	47,456.28	Joe R. Anderson, East Bernard	10,598	54,960.11	10,937.08
Cone & Richard, Greenville	8,465	46,652.47		Ike, Morriss and Woodrow Prejean, Winnie	11,201	54,893.67	54,893.67
Patterson Bros., Merigold							
Isabel S. Welshan & W. A. Welshan, Jr., Rosedale	9,241	46,339.29	46,339.29				
Heins & Heinz, Shelby	8,495	45,582.30	45,582.30				
McGarrh & McGarrh, Merigold	8,481	45,461.91					
Ewing & Son, Inc., Robinsonville	8,856	43,690.59	42,903.09				
Veri Fullen, Shaw	7,754	42,702.66	9,934.80				
Edling Farms, Hollandale	7,983	42,179.64	42,179.64				
George F. Stock, Hollandale	7,766	41,553.18	2,395.50				
L. E. Grant, Isola	8,434	41,486.09	41,486.09				

TABLE B.—1964 crop price-support loans made of \$25,000 or more and amount repaid, by producer—Continued

State, producer, and address	Quantity pledged	Amount loaned	Amount repaid	State, producer, and address	Quantity pledged	Amount loaned	Amount repaid
RICE—continued				RICE—continued			
Texas—Continued				Texas—Continued			
Jack Stoesser, Dayton.....	Bushels 11,781	\$54,623.76	\$54,623.76	Denver Poland and Doornbos Bros., Winnie.....	Bushels 7,495	\$33,803.55	\$33,803.55
L. D. Ware, Fulshear.....	11,585	53,589.73	46,061.38	Ivo Phend, Sr., Russell Phend, and Marie Weir et al., Hamshire.....	6,734	33,772.94	33,772.94
B. D. Fussell, Eagle Lake.....	9,774	52,779.60	52,779.60	J. W. Gober, Nome.....	6,659	33,496.98	33,496.98
Blue Ribbon Mills, Inc., Houston.....	10,682	52,550.02	52,550.02	W. J. Winzer, Winnie.....	6,407	33,472.36	33,472.36
Johnson & Johnson, West Columbia.....	11,237	51,813.78	51,813.78	P. W. Douglas, Sour Lake.....	6,939	33,374.81	33,374.81
Marsalis Bros., C. C. Brasher & T. L. Davidson, Eagle Lake.....	10,370	51,331.50	51,331.50	P. D. Kinser and R. M. Middleton Estate, Anahuac.....	6,802	33,126.72	33,126.72
L. G. Raun & Sandy Creek Ranch, El Campo.....	10,578	50,034.65	50,034.65	Charles and Quintin Shult, and Frank L. Ramsey, El Campo.....	6,398	32,895.26	32,895.26
Mitchell Bros., Beaumont.....	10,645	49,433.25	49,433.25	Mrs. Maggie Wisegerber, Lester Ray Wisegerber, and Seaberg Farms, Inc., Dayton.....	6,672	32,834.52	32,834.52
Jarrell E. Brown, Edna.....	9,757	48,942.88	48,942.88	Chester Hicks and Frank S. Bulher, Edna.....	7,211	32,789.01	32,789.01
K. Saibara & Son, Webster.....	10,260	48,619.63	48,619.63	M. D. Shillings, Port Lavaca.....	7,508	32,738.40	32,738.40
Jack C. McBride, J. F. Guldry & W. S. Edwards, Winnie.....	9,868	48,435.66	48,435.66	Jesse Copeland and M. L. Shellham- mer, Hamshire.....	6,186	32,723.94	32,723.94
Billy Halfen, Collegeport.....	9,495	47,911.32	47,911.32	James R. and Henry J. Hlavinka and Boettcher & Wasick, East Bernard.....	5,955	32,690.75	32,690.75
Lowell G. Raun & Stockton Estate, El Campo.....	9,153	47,318.68	47,318.68	E. E. and H. L. Adams, Alvin.....	6,981	32,690.50	32,690.50
H. E. Moor & J. T. White Estate, Anahuac.....	10,295	46,863.70	46,863.70	Norris Raun, El Campo.....	6,371	32,681.43	32,681.43
Adolph S. Hankamer, Hankamer.....	9,774	46,812.50	46,812.50	Ben McCormick, Alvin.....	6,876	32,549.99	32,549.99
Jack B. Willis, Eagle Lake.....	9,040	46,498.29	46,498.29	Jay and Dexter Anderson, Lissie.....	6,572	32,282.53	32,282.53
Paul McGown, Winnie.....	9,470	46,071.14	46,071.14	W. W. and J. S. Winzer and Edward C. Devillier, Winnie.....	6,611	32,133.46	32,133.46
Clark Farms, S. J. Clark, Sr., and Gerald M. Clark, Edna.....	9,249	45,818.94	45,818.94	Alvin E. Johnson, Louise.....	6,744	32,129.52	32,129.52
George Way and J. T. White Estate, Stowell.....	9,053	45,749.48	45,749.48	Billy Ray Smith, Ganado.....	6,854	32,048.84	32,048.84
Frank A. Higgins, Eagle Lake.....	9,285	45,699.45	17,665.45	J. C. Lewis, E. L. McDonald, and G. R. McKelvey, Bay City.....	6,570	31,829.76	31,829.76
Maurice Willis and T. L. Davidson, Eagle Lake.....	9,320	45,667.56	45,667.56	Joe F. and Raymond Terry and George Musselman, Victoria.....	6,774	31,758.84	31,758.84
Ferdinand J. Leonards and John Oscar Devillier, Winnie.....	9,099	45,657.41	45,657.41	Wilfred Le Blanc, Winnie.....	6,091	31,423.29	31,423.29
R. M. Middleton Estate and I. Jett Hankamer, Hankamer.....	8,635	45,579.56	45,579.56	J. B. Miller, Jr., Beaumont.....	6,575	31,186.31	31,186.31
E. B. Kirkham and H. B. Haynes, Anahuac.....	8,770	45,166.64	45,166.64	J. K. and R. G. Allen, El Campo.....	6,275	31,141.93	31,141.93
Emmett Herbert, Stowell.....	9,371	45,014.49	45,014.49	Pete Eaton and B. D. Anderson, Rock Island.....	6,563	31,107.38	31,107.38
Noel Clark, Edna.....	10,934	44,799.35	44,799.35	Richard Hahn, Ganado.....	6,797	30,518.53	30,518.53
J. B. Wyatt, Clovis H. Cox, and Seaberg Farms, Inc., Dayton.....	10,129	44,457.90	40,809.75	C. D. Fenner, Paul Slatter, O. B. Fen- ner, A. J. Carter, and Floyd Slatter, Edna.....	5,574	30,376.66	30,376.66
Joe F. Terry, Victoria.....	9,182	43,971.67	43,971.67	A. J. Hungerford, Midfield.....	5,915	30,315.81	28,145.78
Wilfred LeBlanc, Doris LeBlanc, and S. D. Fontenot, Winnie.....	9,730	43,365.33	43,365.33	Adolph Jr., and Calvin E. Ebner, Orange.....	5,830	30,097.67	30,097.67
N. S. Bean, Raymond.....	9,225	42,385.95	42,385.95	Pat H. Flowers and Seaberg Farms, Inc., Dayton.....	5,637	30,092.30	30,092.30
Naomi L. Kole, Winnie.....	8,118	42,166.32	42,166.32	Elroy J. Ortego, Alta Loma.....	6,399	29,971.23	29,971.23
J. S. and W. W. Winzer, Winnie.....	8,392	42,156.63	42,156.63	B. G. and F. M. Elkins, Devers.....	5,847	29,629.34	29,629.34
Donald Henderson, El Campo.....	8,579	42,139.84	42,139.84	Alfred J. Ash and Sophie Graves Estate, Dayton.....	6,606	29,580.72	29,580.72
Alfred J. Ash, Dayton.....	9,094	41,857.30	41,857.30	Warren Craigen, Beaumont.....	6,353	29,544.33	13,256.77
Howard Watson, Angleton.....	7,690	41,310.46	41,310.46	B. F. Metzger, Katy.....	6,053	29,517.05	20,474.75
C. A. Kiker, Beaumont.....	7,573	41,059.56	27,404.04	Ethel M. Campbell, Welsh, La.....	6,274	29,331.46	29,331.46
C. W. Sisk, George, William D., and H. E. Dishman, Beaumont.....	8,159	40,401.44	40,401.44	F. J. Merta, Louise.....	6,710	29,322.70	29,322.70
Seaberg Farms, Inc., Dayton.....	8,129	40,252.34	40,252.34	Schiurring Bros., Garwood.....	6,143	28,968.30	28,968.30
A. W. Peveto, Flurry Joe Peveto, and Lutcher & Moore Lumber Co., Orange.....	8,492	40,122.02	40,122.02	J. T. Hare, Crosby.....	6,289	28,866.51	28,866.51
Carlton W. Trant and W. H. Keenan, Liberty.....	8,490	39,994.56	39,994.56	Eugene Bourque, Rosharon.....	6,557	28,315.37	28,315.37
William H. Whetstein Farms, Alvin.....	8,383	39,477.30	39,477.30	B. F. Troxell, Dayton.....	5,759	28,275.21	28,275.21
Daniel J. Hankamer and R. M. Mid- dleton Estate, Wallisville.....	7,574	38,930.36	38,930.36	George V. Miller, China.....	6,152	28,106.58	28,106.58
Louie L. W. Lunday, Alvin.....	7,554	38,831.78	38,831.78	N. T. Stansbury, Beaumont.....	6,068	28,094.84	28,094.84
Arthur Lemke, Jack Daigle, Loranzo Daigle, and W. E. Bogan, China.....	6,866	38,728.35	38,728.35	C. S. Brown, Devers.....	5,639	28,079.06	13,460.82
Bobby Shellhammer and M. L. Shell- hammer, Hamshire.....	7,897	38,685.26	28,685.26	Jack Duke, Rosharon.....	6,049	28,056.59	28,056.59
Albert, Jewell, and Albert Dutcher, Jr., Wells Farm, and Frank C. Gordon, Lissie.....	8,022	38,522.59	38,522.59	Duward Harper, Alvin.....	5,970	27,843.06	27,843.06
Mrs. P. H. Sherer and Phil Baker, Anahuac.....	8,051	38,504.00	38,504.00	O. C. Devillier, Jr., Winnie.....	6,000	27,779.12	27,779.12
E. A. Turner and W. M. McBride and Son, Winnie.....	7,808	38,486.43	38,486.43	Curtis S. Penick, Anahuac.....	5,398	27,771.75	25,211.01
Ivan Hebert and E. L. Chaney, Beaum- ont.....	7,485	38,398.05	38,398.05	R. B. Christ, Sr., Hamshire.....	5,237	27,608.80	27,608.80
James Weaver, Hankamer.....	7,811	38,125.00	38,125.00	J. C. Wall, Beaumont.....	5,708	27,398.40	27,398.40
C. W. Smith, Louise Sample Germer and W. F. Germer, Ganado.....	7,947	37,800.35	37,800.35	Raymond Randel, Liberty.....	5,475	27,375.00	27,375.00
Lester J. Craneck, Garwood.....	7,826	37,773.25	37,773.25	C. T. Wiese, Eagle Lake.....	5,590	27,245.70	22,048.95
F. W. Fontenot, Broussard and Hebert, Anahuac.....	7,626	37,469.94	37,469.94	Louie Mollnar, El Campo.....	6,282	27,236.16	27,236.16
J. W. and John Isaacs, Alvin.....	8,308	37,381.67	37,381.67	A. E. Elliott, Bay City.....	5,606	27,020.92	27,020.92
J. H. Sandlin, Anahuac.....	6,994	37,340.55	37,340.55	B. E. Wilber and D. L. Heckaman, Hamshire.....	5,079	26,545.85	26,545.85
Schiurring Bros., Garwood.....	7,793	37,331.65	37,331.65	Frank Smaistria, Martha Losack, and Wm. Lee Frederickson, East Bern- ard.....	5,671	26,479.07	20,762.46
W. W. McBride, Winnie.....	7,131	37,133.10	37,133.10	Lynn and Donald Herbert, Waller.....	5,586	26,421.78	26,421.78
L. L. Fontenot, Winnie.....	7,413	37,079.20	37,079.20	Johnnie Garrett, Garrett Bros., and Walter L. Roome, Louise.....	5,714	26,421.49	26,421.49
Jack C. and Eloise McBride, Winnie.....	7,043	36,812.75	36,812.75	Rudolph Skalicky, Ganado.....	5,598	26,311.41	26,311.41
E. J. and Euell Dugan and E. C. Devillier, Winnie.....	7,352	36,647.02	36,647.02	W. C. Jenkins, Hankamer.....	5,385	26,132.42	26,132.42
Bert Harbour and Mrs. Lucille Har- bour, Hankamer.....	7,835	36,416.87	36,416.87	Lester R. Wisegerber and Seaberg Farms, Inc., Dayton.....	5,701	25,882.54	25,882.54
J. T. Herin, Edna.....	8,712	36,329.46	36,329.46	Wanda S. and Wayne Bunton, Edna.....	5,217	25,877.81	25,877.81
Louis Watson, Angleton.....	7,193	35,836.82	35,836.82	J. Harland Bell, Rock Island.....	4,925	25,823.41	4,771.20
N. S. and Jesse Wittman, Hamshire.....	6,928	35,709.26	35,679.63	Buren J. Kallina, Garwood.....	5,260	25,601.90	25,601.90
Jay and Dexter Anderson, Lissie.....	6,936	35,457.46	35,287.43	George W. Stansbury, Raywood.....	4,864	25,536.00	25,536.00
B. D. Hart and Frank Galloway, Devers.....	7,581	35,428.55	35,428.55	Harvey E. Johnson, Port Lavaca.....	5,888	25,495.86	25,495.86
William Zboril, Garwood.....	7,232	34,203.88	34,203.88	R. L. Poskey and Roy Dawson, Anahuac.....	4,871	25,475.33	25,475.33
M. A. Ellis & Son and Mitchell D. Ellis, Collegeport.....	6,008	34,020.84	25,767.38	Johnnie Garrett, Guy Stovall, Jr., and S. C. Cappell, Louise.....	5,265	25,444.90	21,466.90
H. A. Norris & Son, Bay City.....	7,040	34,013.44	34,013.44	James L. Adkins, Lissie.....	4,729	25,442.02	25,442.02
Guy Myrick and Otto Truksa, Alvin.....	7,040	34,013.44	34,013.44	W. H. Huseman and Mrs. Annie Carmichael Estate, Louise.....	5,420	25,394.49	25,394.49
Lowell, George, and Norris Raun, El Campo.....	6,420	33,962.59	33,962.59	R. B. Christ, Sr., R. B. Christ, Jr., Ed Lohmann, and Elvan Bourque, Hamshire.....	5,480	25,373.28	25,373.28
				W. H. Oetken, Anahuac.....	6,003	25,140.50	17,581.24
				J. W. Murrell, Winnie.....	4,710	25,072.90	25,072.90

TABLE B.—1964 crop price-support loans made of \$25,000 or more and amount repaid, by producer—Continued

State, producer, and address	Quantity pledged	Amount loaned	Amount repaid	State, producer, and address	Quantity pledged	Amount loaned	Amount repaid
RICE—continued				WHEAT—continued			
Texas—Continued				Kansas—Continued			
M. I. Jones and Remie Fontenot, Beaumont	Bushels 5,310	\$25,010.10	\$25,010.10	S. Everett Dennis, Scottsbluff, Nebr.	Bushels 31,495	\$43,153.57	
SOYBEANS				Harold N. Hobart, Sr., Harold N. Hobart, Jr., and Gano H. Tschudy, Hutchinson	28,244	40,510.93	
Arkansas:				C. Wilber White, Goodland	27,702	36,008.19	\$1,931.67
Arkansas Grain Corp., Stuttgart	7,103,230	16,353,580.93	10,454,477.76	Herman Bott, Palmer	24,984	34,129.44	
McAlister Seed Service Co., Walnut Ridge	42,120	94,888.80	32,316.30	R. T. McCreight, Ness City	23,220	33,156.00	
Hugh E. Richardson, H. B. Richardson and Richland Plantation, Inc., Hughes	34,344	77,960.88	77,960.88	Adrian Schweitzer, Osborne	22,626	32,019.58	
Ralph Wimpy, Harrisburg	15,585	35,997.26	35,997.26	Vestring Bros., Burns	22,807	31,124.21	6,172.20
J. W. Prescott, Hughes	15,390	34,935.30	34,935.30	W. T. Rooney, Jr., Garden City	23,580	30,720.60	
Pirani Bros., Marion	15,000	34,050.00	34,050.00	John Kriss Farms, Colby	23,850	30,289.50	
James E. McDaniel, Jonesboro	13,500	30,645.00	30,645.00	Benton Jones, Glasco	21,173	29,819.66	6,010.29
David N. Ford, Sherrill	13,500	30,510.00	30,510.00	Ferguson Bros., Kensington	20,250	29,767.50	
James D. Ford, Pine Bluff	12,375	27,225.00	27,225.00	E. A. Baalman & Sons, Menlo	20,754	26,504.82	3,682.80
J. B. Davis, Ogden	11,713	26,998.47	26,998.47	Hattendorf Bros., Scott City	21,884	26,466.62	19,795.87
W. B. Bynum, Dermott	11,700	26,559.00	26,559.00	John D. DeForest, Peabody	20,608	25,739.63	
Phinn Reynolds & Son, Harrisburg	11,070	25,571.70	25,571.70	Richard L. and Jack Spiegel, Formoso	18,900	25,515.00	
Illinois: A. E. Deal, Morrisonville	13,500	30,375.00	30,375.00	C. H. Moore Trust Estate, Dodge City	20,453	25,300.49	
Indiana:				Minnesota:			
Donald Kolb, Evansville	11,115	25,119.90	25,119.90	Keith Driscoll, East Grand Forks	30,780	46,146.60	16,310.25
Donald E. Stewart, Robert Revell, and Harold Revell, Lebanon	12,690	28,171.80		John Bogestad, Karlstad	22,500	31,050.00	
Iowa:				Vernon Hagen, East Grand Forks	18,879	26,767.36	
Herbert P. Turin, Odebolt	18,784	40,484.04	40,484.04	Montana:			
Kenneth Johnson, Callender	12,690	28,171.80		Campbell Farming Corp., Hardin	200,212	206,218.36	73,233.00
Louisiana:				Nash Bros., Redstone	49,320	57,704.40	
W. P. Tomlinson, Lake Providence	15,840	35,640.00	35,640.00	Onstad Grain Co., Carter	51,480	56,113.20	
Orville A. Coady, Lake Providence	11,681	26,581.36	12,406.36	Kraft & Martin, Havre	44,460	55,859.40	
Mississippi:				J. G. Robertson, Inc., Great Falls	49,905	54,396.45	54,396.45
Joe Priddy & Sons, Rolling Fork	32,168	72,802.88	72,802.88	Juedeman Grain Co., Geraldine	48,285	52,630.65	
Greer Bros. & Son, Hollandale	29,250	66,397.50	66,397.50	Warren Swenson, Cut Bank	46,660	50,859.40	6,714.40
J. R. Flautt & Sons, Swan Lake	27,180	61,426.80	61,426.80	Otis Waters, Richey	37,170	47,949.30	1,161.00
Eyanna Plantation, Inc., Cary	23,130	52,273.80	52,273.80	Pryor Land Co., Billings	43,625	47,551.25	47,551.25
F. B. Swarengen, Philipp	18,289	40,510.66		Floyd Warren, Inc., Hardin	44,100	45,423.00	45,423.00
W. P. Skelton, Rosedale	16,392	37,209.84	37,209.84	Oscar A. Kalgaard, Big Sandy	40,526	43,746.68	43,746.68
Dominic P. Rizzo, Cleveland	15,961	36,231.47	36,231.47	Westernmark Bros., Levon	38,610	42,084.90	42,084.90
Annapex, Inc., Minter City	13,265	29,382.41		Francis Maurer, Dutton	37,800	41,202.00	
L. L. Walker, Minter City	13,050	28,904.22	28,904.22	Bill McCarter, Galata	34,570	36,591.30	36,591.30
Ray Roberson Farms, Inc., Philipp	13,009	28,815.44	28,815.44	Roy Killenbeck, Scobey	32,040	36,525.60	
Missouri:				Birkeland & Son, Inc., Fort Benton	32,850	35,806.50	
A. C. Riley, New Madrid	22,500	51,075.00		Gaylen Vernon, Ray Stoner, and Richard McCarty, Outlook	28,440	35,661.60	
W. V. Riley, New Madrid	22,500	51,075.00		Larry K. T. Ranch, Billings	32,193	35,090.37	35,090.37
The Albert Painton Co., Inc., Painton	17,280	39,052.80	39,052.80	Clair Schilling and Schilling Farms, Inc., Wolf Point	29,430	35,021.70	1,392.30
Wallace Farms, Gideon	17,100	38,304.00	38,304.00	Kenneth Schilling, Vida	26,091	34,566.57	
North Carolina:				Adolph Fix, Ekalaka	25,324	34,148.88	1,206.00
A. D. Swindell, Pantego	41,580	93,325.50	63,220.50	Royce Applegate, Square Butte	30,240	32,961.60	
McNair Investment Co., Laurinberg	19,814	44,185.22	44,185.22	Sikorski & Sons, Inc., Willard	24,641	31,749.21	5,945.04
South Carolina:				John H. Leuthold, Molt	28,800	31,392.00	
W. R. Mayes, Mayesville	41,043	91,525.89		D. K. Hereford Ranch, Ballantine	27,810	30,312.90	
J. A. Harvin, Sumter	26,774	59,623.65	6,021.00	F. E. Davison & Sons, Highwood	27,812	30,181.23	2,713.23
J. T. Duncan, Martin	11,430	25,488.90	25,488.90	John Keil & Sons, Ledger	27,000	29,430.00	
Wisconsin: Charles H. Kuiper, Union Grove	15,030	34,268.40	34,268.40	Kenneth G. Axvig, Kremlin	22,500	28,632.60	
WHEAT				A. C. Kammerzell, Chester	25,920	28,252.80	28,252.80
Arkansas: Lake Plantation, Hughes	19,244	27,807.00		Donald Norman and Arnold Dees, Kremlin	24,660	28,225.80	
California:				Allan and Leo Schilling, Vida	21,240	28,170.00	
E. L. Wallace, Woodland	59,345	83,858.11		Roland and Burton Wright, Moore	25,200	27,468.00	27,468.00
Jackson & Reinert, Paso Robles	50,806	69,096.16	69,096.16	Leo M. Kraft, Havre	22,320	27,342.00	
Colorado:				Ralph Lee, Buffalo	24,930	27,173.70	27,173.70
Sprague Bros., Holyoke	31,915	34,302.11	34,302.11	Conover Ranch Co., Broadview	24,500	26,705.00	
Harold Kuckartz, Arriba	27,000	31,860.00	15,525.00	Ivan Dahlman, Forsyth	23,220	26,470.80	26,470.80
Kalcevic Farms, Inc., Aurora	27,000	31,050.00		Herbert G. Blitz and Selma McClintock, Box Elder	21,150	26,464.50	
Ralph and Jack Bowman, Wray	24,300	29,889.00		Ole Jensen, Chester	24,102	26,271.18	
Idaho:				Swank & Son, Poplar	21,960	25,912.80	
Wagner Bros., Lewiston	81,892	101,546.08	101,546.08	Elmer and Mary F. Dostal, Geraldine	23,400	25,506.00	
Ira McIntosh & Sons, Lewiston	63,102	78,246.48	78,246.48	Frank Kukla, Blue Creek	23,130	25,211.70	
Meacham Land & Cattle Co., Lapwai	59,997	73,738.23	18,411.00	Nebraska:			
Heglar Ranch, Inc., Burley	46,882	51,335.65	51,335.65	Grace Land & Cattle Co., Lewellen	52,200	64,728.00	
Drechsel Bros., Worley	34,162	49,187.57	19,298.57	Raymond, Ronald, Pamela, Michael, Leo, Morris, and Ise Jensen, Lodgepole	39,600	48,312.00	
Herdon Farms, Inc., Coldspring	34,615	41,197.22	31,248.00	Knipp Land Co., Big Springs	33,300	41,958.00	
Gaffney & Howe, Plummer	34,839	40,111.90		Ruth Hunt, Hastings	31,178	40,227.67	10,067.40
Wittman Farms, Inc., Lapwai	31,497	38,111.37		A. L. Rosener & Sons, Daykin	26,809	37,179.88	
Sam Alm & Sons, Inc., Grangeville	33,828	37,979.34	37,979.34	Bailey Partnership, Big Springs	29,700	36,828.00	
W. W. Riggers & Sons, Craigmont	31,587	36,049.07	36,049.07	Glen F. Burns, Chappell	28,342	34,317.52	10,918.72
Stanton Becker, Genesee	24,266	35,598.47		Svoboda & Hannah, Ogallala	26,100	32,886.00	
Harold Heaton & Son, Tekoa, Wash.	27,900	34,596.00	34,596.00	Eugene Schefeleck, Alliance	25,038	32,048.64	32,048.64
Pfaff Bros., Inc., Garfield, Wash.	30,084	34,192.19	28,699.68	Leo Jensen, Oshkosh	23,400	29,250.00	
Arthur P. Meier, Peck	29,700	33,264.00	33,264.00	Robert R. Elliott, Solvang, Calif.	22,410	28,012.50	
Matsuura Bros., Blackfoot	27,610	31,496.63	31,496.63	Ed and Beulah Jelinek, Alliance	20,002	26,807.64	
Herb Millhorn, Worley	27,000	30,510.00	30,510.00	Nevada: Rio King Land & Investment Co., San Francisco, Calif.			
Alvin Barker & Sons, Soda Springs	27,200	29,376.00		20,327	25,205.48	25,205.48	
Shayne Linderman, Newdale	23,220	28,792.80	28,792.80	New Mexico:			
George and Otto Brammer, Lewiston	27,000	28,755.40	28,755.40	Archie Baker, Clovis	24,337	31,227.94	31,227.94
Leland Woodbury, Burley	22,214	26,529.21	26,529.21	W. L. Lockmiller, Clovis	25,360	31,065.58	
John Campbell, Idaho Falls	22,604	25,881.69	25,881.69	Virgie Harrison, Texico	22,918	28,954.11	220.19
J. J. Driscoll & Son, Troy	22,248	25,814.76	25,814.76	Albert and Monte Matlock, Clovis	20,510	26,765.55	26,765.55
Hilding, Erick, Plummer	22,145	25,305.11	21,396.35	North Dakota:			
Anderson Bros., Troy	22,377	25,174.82	25,174.82	Arvel Glinz, Eldridge	38,904	57,073.29	2,260.59
McLeod Bros., Nezperce	21,032	26,057.06	26,057.06	Ballantyne Bros., Westhope	36,000	50,760.00	
Iowa: Payne Valley Farms, Inc., Hamburg				Benjamin Schaible, Mott	34,650	49,999.50	
Kansas:				The Wittman Co., Mohall	36,900	46,125.00	
Earl, Elsie S., and Frank Weisenberger, Scott City	45,608	62,482.96		L. J. Johnson, Plaza	34,200	42,408.00	
Albert Frahm et al., Colby	38,844	49,331.88		Polies Bros., Sykeston	28,512	40,487.04	
B. A. Hutton, Brewster	37,260	47,320.20		Roscoe W. Kelly, Niagara	27,900	39,078.00	
Robert W. Thierolf, Beloit	34,574	45,211.48	45,211.48	August C. Kirschmann, Mott	25,200	35,932.50	
Neli Fuller & Sons, Beloit	31,673	44,885.63		John D. Kirschmann, Bismarck	28,440	35,550.00	4,725.00
				Henry Grain & Stock Farm, Westhope			

TABLE B.—1964 crop price-support loans made of \$25,000 or more and amount repaid, by producer—Continued

State, producer, and address	Quantity pledged	Amount loaned	Amount repaid	State, producer, and address	Quantity pledged	Amount loaned	Amount repaid
WHEAT—continued				WHEAT—continued			
North Dakota—Continued	Bushels			Oregon—Continued	Bushels		
T. A. Dilse, Scranton	27,720	\$35,481.60		Earl Mecker, The Dalles	18,900	\$25,704.00	
Norman Glinz, Bottineau	26,370	35,406.00		Stirrup Ranch, North Powder	21,664	25,248.44	
Alvin Kenner, Leeds	25,200	35,280.00		G. L. Pratt, Visalia, Calif.	21,664	25,248.48	
Edwin Netzer, Regent				Harry Proudfoot, Echo	20,854	25,069.17	\$7,177.17
Dan Netzer, Bismarck	35,525	34,197.08		South Dakota:			
W. J. Thoreson, York	25,000	34,125.00		William J. Stanley and William D.			
Ernest P. Jensen, Williston	24,300	33,777.00		Asmussen, Agar	117,387	168,397.20	1,297.80
Stair Bros., Newburg	24,930	33,655.50		J. E. Check Estate, Pierre	50,797	70,326.89	
Willis Glinz, Newburg	25,429	33,496.25		Elkhorn Farm, Martin	42,570	54,242.10	
Carl M. Hadenfeld & Sons, Ray	27,000	33,210.00	\$1,451.40	Alfred and Johanna Ehlers, Preshe	36,000	52,560.09	
Helen, Wayne, Cecil, and Dennis				Dennis L. Anderson, Rapid City	37,291	51,625.11	8,109.76
Zahnaw, Roseglen	25,650	32,832.00	32,832.00	Leo J. Terca, Preshe	31,500	46,076.40	
Alfred Johnson, Plaza	26,100	32,364.00		John Hippen, Martin			
Jack Follman, York	23,808	31,546.49		Raymond Jensen, Lodge Pole, Nebr.	32,769	41,767.20	
Reginald and Kenneth Henry, West-				Louie E. Bartels, Gerysburg	25,110	37,776.60	
hope	24,300	30,375.00		Bartley Mills, Winner	28,800	37,440.00	
August and Ronald Wagner, Englevale	20,367	29,403.00	2,268.00	Kenneth Kinkler, Blunt			
Earl Schwartz Co., Kenmare	23,400	29,250.00		Hugo Kinkler, Littlefield, Tex.	24,840	35,272.80	
Walter E. Johnson, Courtenay	18,990	27,830.70		Krier Bros., Preshe	23,580	33,069.60	
Roger Redel, Fressenden	18,211	25,859.62		James S. Brown, Chamberlain	23,130	31,784.40	31,784.40
Leo and Anthony Muggli, Vincent				Arvid Ambur, Preshe	24,030	31,719.60	
Muggli, Jr., and Vincent Muggli, Sr.,				Bruno Wiczorek, Chamberlain	23,580	31,131.60	31,131.60
Carson				G. K. Hutchison, Preshe	21,600	29,331.00	
Rose Weinhandl, Shields	17,280	25,423.20		Robert E. Duncan, Pierre	20,430	29,316.60	
Carlton Larson, Sykeston	18,203	25,309.46		Roy Norman, Hayes	21,852	29,063.16	
Harold Hosstrand, Leeds	18,251	25,198.74	1,192.00	Earl E. Kinder, Onida	21,600	28,728.00	1,915.20
Raymond Forster, Conway	16,420	25,048.20		Verdun Stanley, Preshe	21,600	28,512.00	19,483.20
Ohio:				Orville Schwarling, Gordon Nebr.	22,950	28,458.00	
Ward Walton & Associates, Inc., Upper				K. R. Shiley Creighton	22,500	28,350.00	24,080.60
Sandusky	25,576	33,375.96	33,375.96	Myron D. and Mildred A. Johnson,			
Orieton Farms, Inc., London	21,039	26,825.27	26,825.27	Rapid City	21,780	27,052.20	
Oklahoma:				H. G. Ehlers Sons, Preshe	20,890	27,943.80	6,878.10
John A. Francis, Kingfisher	20,250	27,315.00		Jerry Geeringer, Castle Rock	21,330	26,875.80	26,828.10
Joe Steichen, Ponca City	22,000	27,170.00		Leonel M. Jensen, Wall	21,150	26,818.20	21,319.20
James W. Sharrock, Ponca City	20,483	26,934.71		Robert Bartels, Fort Pierre	19,440	25,660.80	25,660.80
Oregon:				Jetter Bros., Milesville	19,880	25,542.00	
McCormack Bros., Pendleton	69,570	83,622.36	83,622.36	Wm. G. and Lyle Schoulte, Preshe	19,000	25,080.00	
Glenn Thorne, Pendleton	54,265	65,308.85	65,308.85	Texas:			
John Proudfoot and Leo Gorgier, Ione	47,025	61,602.75	61,602.75	Hill Farms, Hart	38,760	68,379.05	
Raymond & Son, Inc., Helix	50,138	60,903.45		Taft McGee, Hereford	43,528	55,933.48	55,933.48
Ralph S. Crum, Ione	43,647	57,177.57		Homer Hill, Hart	32,520	55,303.86	
R. & T. Ranches, Athena	42,301	51,270.80	51,270.80	Buddy Hill, Hart	35,342	55,231.81	
King Ranches, Pendleton	38,365	49,874.50		Gerald L. Lasley, Dalhart	40,582	53,419.06	53,291.86
Robert Kilkenny, Heppner	39,344	49,476.72	40,044.72	Frank Robinson, Panhandle	35,204	51,573.38	
Les King, Inc., Helix	38,846	46,809.44	46,809.44	Berkley Stringer, Dumas	38,561	50,520.24	50,520.24
F. L. Watkins, Wasco	34,816	45,791.02	42,713.66	D. G. Cluck, Gruver	36,797	48,755.59	48,755.59
4 R Ranches, Wasco	38,840	45,254.20	45,254.20	Sam R. Cluck, Gruver	36,297	47,730.99	47,730.99
Mud Springs Ranches, Pendleton				Harold H. Hogue, Dalhart	30,011	46,274.56	46,274.56
Ranches, Cunningham Sheep Co.,				A & O Farms, Dumas	34,496	46,028.39	46,028.39
and Hoke Ranches, Pendleton	34,650	45,045.00	45,045.00	Mrs. M. W. McCloy & Sons, Morse	34,349	43,451.70	
Adolph, Jr., or Georgia Shaffer, Condon	36,309	44,722.66	44,722.66	Monroe Bros., Sunray	31,825	40,895.13	
Key Bros., Inc., Milton, Freewater	33,705	43,816.50		Gordon Taylor, Sunray	29,697	40,536.18	
Richard W. Hampton, Pendleton	33,735	42,774.35	13,758.34	Dale Coleman, Dumas	29,944	39,076.47	8,173.64
V. R. Ranch, Helix	35,059	42,246.48	42,246.48	Rose C. or R. C. Porter, Spearman	28,661	37,033.20	22,386.42
Weber, Inc., and Vernita Adams,				Merrill Dryden, Sunray	30,000	36,450.00	36,450.00
Athena	30,360	39,354.24	37,908.00	Lyons Bros., Hereford	23,242	35,844.65	35,844.65
R. A. Brogotti, LaGrande	31,444	39,305.00	39,305.00	Glen Scribner, Sunray	25,860	35,225.77	14,572.87
Foster, Wernsing & Coffman, Athena	32,548	39,090.96	7,969.77	Weatherford Bros., Sunray	25,405	34,169.05	
Charles Carlson, Ione	29,160	38,199.60		Marshall Cator, Sunray	23,871	32,455.26	
M. Smith, Condon	26,608	36,950.64	36,950.64	Don Williams, Farwell	24,630	32,388.45	
H. H. McIntyre, Pendleton	30,348	36,633.42	36,633.42	A. R. Bort, Gruver	24,377	32,164.26	32,164.26
Alvin Bunch, Heppner	29,577	36,372.70	36,372.70	Gene Cluck, Gruver	23,471	30,394.52	
Holdman Ranches, Pendleton	30,078	36,352.84	36,352.84	Joe Schuman, Dumas	22,260	28,826.96	
Hill Ranches, Inc., Helix	30,000	36,150.00		Everett Bros., Stratford	21,064	28,541.76	210.64
Larry E. Kaseberg, Wasco	26,100	34,713.00	34,713.00	Fred W. Mercer, Silverton			
Marion T. Weatherford, Arlington	27,756	34,567.92	4,835.75	Velma W. McGraw Estate, Fort Worth	19,068	26,849.14	26,849.14
W. D. Hardie & Sons, Condon	25,043	34,259.79	9,180.52	John Cole, Waka	19,235	26,832.83	
Merton S. Wade, Lostine	28,088	33,520.74	33,517.83	Claude Higley, Stinnett	19,379	26,453.01	26,453.01
E. Earl or S. Bernice Pryor, Condon	27,148	33,517.83	33,517.83	George Farms, Charlene and G.			
Storle Ranches, Pendleton	27,384	33,271.86	33,271.86	George, Perryton	18,000	25,740.00	25,740.00
Coppinger & Son Ranches, Echo				J. H. Burkett, Sunray	20,268	25,638.38	
A. C. and R. C. Moll, Pendleton	24,750	32,175.00	32,175.00	Claude Johnson & Son, Dalhart	18,909	25,621.70	
H. T. Rea, Inc., Walla Walla, Wash.	26,211	31,444.60		John A. and Raymond Smith, Here-	14,447	25,302.90	
F. N. Johns, Athena	24,075	31,298.79	31,298.79	Washington:			
McElligott Bros., Ione	32,827	31,213.37	31,213.37	Glen Miller & Sons, Amber	133,542	166,927.50	41,927.50
H. M. Zell, Wasco	24,260	30,806.42	30,806.42	D. Everett Phillips, Lind	110,500	139,482.99	
Johns Smith and Beamer, Athena	23,418	30,443.52	30,443.52	Leonard and Henry Franz, Lind	86,038	106,541.33	101,626.13
C. O. Burnet or Althea Burnet, Moro	24,496	30,378.38		Kenneth Smith, Walsburg	83,653	79,249.74	79,249.74
Tad O. McCoy, The Dalles	23,524	30,236.64	30,236.64	George D. Brown & Sons, Pomeroy	58,563	73,360.03	13,352.53
W. L. Hulse, Dufur	22,050	29,988.00		Staley & Boyd, Pullman	58,500	73,125.00	73,125.00
R. M. and Delta Johnson, Wasco	23,926	29,844.28	29,844.28	Robert V. Phillips, Lind	49,995	63,204.86	
A. C. Warren, Ione	22,063	28,902.53		Lehn Bros., Farmington	45,180	60,475.00	
Bill Wolfe, Wallawa	24,183	28,740.44	10,184.24	Curtis Cattle Co., Garfield	41,427	50,694.20	50,694.20
G. W. Temple, Pendleton				Roy Peringer, Pullman	43,753	50,683.36	50,683.36
Albert L. McCormack, Walla Walla,	22,060	28,679.04	28,679.04	W. M. Boyd & Sons, Moscow, Idaho	39,195	48,993.76	48,993.76
Wash.				Osborne Belsby, Amber	39,150	48,540.00	48,540.00
T. M. Campbell, Helix	23,444	28,303.49	28,303.49	Baumman Farm, Washtucna	37,710	48,268.80	48,268.80
Sieg & Sieg, Baker	23,484	27,486.05		DeZellen & Son, Bridgeport	37,548	47,871.96	1,517.45
David Horne, Pendleton	22,732	27,392.27	27,392.27	Richard E. DeSpain, Winona	41,081	47,773.02	47,773.02
Glen Brogotti, Helix	22,597	27,229.18		Urgel Bell, Lacrosse	41,578	47,708.87	47,708.87
Powell Goodin Farms, Moro	21,841	27,192.41	16,741.76	Robert J. and Lewis Patton, Wals-			
R. & H. Farms and Archie Harris,				burg	36,073	46,534.17	46,534.17
Milton-Freewater	20,821	27,067.30	27,067.30	O. H. Woodward, Inc., Dayton	38,535	46,492.58	7,099.85
Sandhollow Ranches, Helix	22,163	26,928.54	12,005.71	Donovan Farms, Prescott	34,747	45,171.10	45,171.10
C. N. Jones & Sons, Heppner	21,857	26,714.38	26,714.38	Ford Gumm & Sons, Tekoa	38,309	44,130.16	
J. Smith, Inc., Condon	19,270	26,689.41	26,689.41	Thomas J. Byers & Sons, Pomeroy	34,756	44,568.61	19,580.68
Verne W. Dale, Helix	22,025	26,540.51	26,540.51	J. R. Damon, Lind	35,693	44,071.22	23,140.00
Robert Rothrock, Adams	20,798	26,457.27	20,475.00	Pearl Gwinn, Pomeroy	31,626	43,275.89	2,674.62
Rosco E. Moore, Moro	21,226	26,365.03		S. T. S. Farms, Inc., Prescott	33,273	43,264.90	6,049.90
Campbell Ranch, Inc., Echo	20,984	26,349.95	26,349.95	Ferrell & Luvaas, Pomeroy	35,902	42,902.29	42,902.29
Walker Whitacre Ranch, Athena	21,500	26,122.96					
Harvey Smith, Ione	19,593	25,862.76	25,862.76				

TABLE B.—1964 crop price-support loans made of \$25,000 or more and amount repaid, by producer—Continued

State, producer, and address	Quantity pledged	Amount loaned	Amount repaid	State, producer, and address	Quantity pledged	Amount loaned	Amount repaid
WHEAT—continued				WHEAT—continued			
Washington—Continued				Washington—Continued			
Joe McCown and Charles E. Neace	Bushels			Matthew Lyons, Waitsburg	24,875	\$29,974.38	
Estate, Waitsburg	34,433	\$41,146.96	\$41,146.96	Klicker Bros. & Sons, Walla Walla	23,006	29,907.80	\$29,907.80
J. L. Williams, Lind	32,040	41,011.20	39,168.00	Blacklaw Bros., Eureka	24,408	29,771.91	
Fred and Cecil Rommel, Pomeroy	32,832	40,453.25	40,453.25	C. B. Stonecipher, Waitsburg	24,706	29,675.43	
Godfrey Meike, Lind	33,747	40,267.60	40,267.60	J. I. Kupers, Harrington	24,995	29,618.72	29,618.72
Higginbotham Bros., Hartline	33,163	39,629.45	39,629.45	Neihenke & Pavlik, Colfax	25,360	29,543.81	29,543.81
C. C. Wolf & Sons, Pomeroy	32,671	38,214.08		Erwin Bros., Prescott	24,384	29,306.83	29,306.83
Laura C. Gilliland Estates, Lafayette, Ind.	32,211	38,170.21	18,206.13	Mary Hanger, Dayton	24,258	29,058.29	29,058.29
Casey Farms, Inc., Eureka	31,297	37,970.98		Felgenhauer Bros., Fairfield	23,400	29,016.00	
Lester Camp, Lacrosse	32,793	37,876.03	37,876.03	Hofer Bros., Waitsburg	23,998	28,917.10	28,917.10
Nelson Bros., Waterville	28,530	36,518.40		John Stephenson, Elda Stephenson, and Ella Stephenson Estate, Benga	22,500	28,800.00	
Lasater Farms, Inc., Walla Walla	30,004	36,455.06	36,455.06	Willard C. Hennings, Ritzville	22,500	28,800.00	28,800.00
Dippel Bros., Garfield	29,070	36,337.50		Dave Repp & Son, St. John	24,850	28,796.07	28,796.07
Wayne Beale, Pomeroy	29,013	35,787.62	35,787.62	Walter A. Zellmer, Davenport	24,061	28,765.28	
John E. Hair, Walla Walla	27,276	35,458.80	35,458.80	Carl Boyd, Pullman	22,950	28,687.50	28,687.50
Allen Struthers, Eureka	28,460	35,307.53		Gale O. Geller, Lind	22,410	28,684.80	
Ralph Cooley, Connell	27,000	35,100.00	4,680.00	Frank J. or Frank Wolf, Pomeroy	20,866	28,199.21	4,875.52
The Sheffels Co., Govan	27,627	35,086.66	19,108.67	Herbert Sackmann, Odessa	23,702	28,087.18	28,087.18
John W. Smith, Lancaster	28,264	34,543.40	10,018.40	Robison Land & Livestock Co., Walla Walla	21,600	28,080.00	
Marvin Carstens, Espanola	29,518	34,403.11	19,298.47	Chester Powers & Son, Starbuck	23,202	27,726.64	27,726.64
Franklin D. Rockwell, Endicott	29,596	34,382.45	34,382.45	C. L. Nelson & Sons, Thornton	23,496	27,372.75	27,372.75
Jack Clodius, Waitsburg	28,408	34,343.43	34,343.43	Byron G. Dague, Walla Walla	21,052	27,367.60	27,367.60
Rockdale Farms, Edwall	28,997	34,338.89		David V. Adams, Coulee City	22,071	27,323.10	27,323.10
Harp Bros., Farmington	29,437	34,122.45	21,227.66	Roy M. Anvil, Farmington	23,601	27,259.05	
Heglar Bros., St. John	28,837	33,594.84	33,594.84	Earl T. Sherry, Prescott	22,513	27,127.89	14,451.77
Wilbur Morgan, Pomeroy	26,400	33,528.00	33,528.00	C. C. King and J. C. Kinzer, Pullman	21,600	27,000.00	27,000.00
Calvin Raugust, Farmington	26,640	33,300.00	33,300.00	Weishaar Farms, Marlin	21,175	26,892.25	
Ed Faure, Jr., Ritzville	27,500	33,109.64	33,109.64	Ray L. Small, Jr., Lowden	22,238	26,757.66	
Ellsworth Conover, Waitsburg	27,447	33,073.78	33,073.78	A. S. Miller & Son, Colfax	21,330	26,662.48	26,662.48
Howard Jorgensen, Coulee City	25,695	32,889.60	32,889.60	James F. Ferrel, Walla Walla	21,998	26,288.09	
R. F. Young, Starbuck	27,486	32,845.89	32,845.89	Clarence Strohmaier, Lind	20,520	26,265.60	
Earl M. Pierson, Colfax	26,100	32,624.98		Paul Webb, Jr., Walla Walla	21,833	26,212.74	26,212.74
Phillips Farms, Inc., and Merlin				I. A. Zakarison Estate, Pullman	20,855	26,068.50	26,068.50
Phillips, Walla Walla	25,020	32,526.00		Clyde Davis, Pullman	22,488	26,043.19	26,043.19
E. E. Watkins, Spokane	27,356	32,416.33	32,416.33	Lowell Baker, Pomeroy	22,312	26,033.78	26,033.78
Bennett Land Co., Farmington	25,830	32,287.50	32,287.50	Paul E. and Glenn D. Hofer, Prescott			
Dick Edwards, Hartline	26,359	32,097.64	32,097.64	Paul S. Hofer, Waitsburg	20,025	26,032.50	
Virgil Fezell, Mabton	23,985	31,900.05		Wanetta Hellman, Los Angeles, Calif.			
Ferrell & Luvass, Pomeroy	27,095	31,836.12	31,836.12	Harris Bros., Dayton	21,690	25,823.19	25,823.19
Eugene Valser, Walla Walla	24,300	31,590.00		Edgar L. Smith, St. John	20,610	25,762.50	25,762.50
Morris Ganguet, Waitsburg	25,829	31,254.73	31,254.73	Myklebust Bros., Lacrosse	22,271	25,709.73	25,709.73
Yoshino Bros., Quincy	23,116	31,109.07	31,109.07	Fred Mader, Palouse	22,237	25,636.88	25,636.88
Nick Seivers, Jr., Lind	24,300	31,104.00	31,104.00	Pioneer Stock & Grain Farm, Inc., Colfax	22,043	25,443.46	25,443.46
Orval Painter, Waterville	24,120	30,873.60		Virgil Stevens, Wilson Creek	21,044	25,366.72	12,115.52
George H. Ellis, Reardan	25,912	30,657.22		Norman Hansen, Tekoa	21,990	25,365.38	23,123.78
Lawrence Timm, Harrington	25,760	30,525.37		R. C. Walker, Hartline	21,028	25,339.19	25,339.19
Kenny Foulkes, Lind	24,281	30,296.37	30,296.37	Raymond B. Williams, Almira	21,423	25,110.00	25,110.00
Dwelle Jones, Walla Walla	25,164	30,159.39		Scheele Bros. and Theodore F. Scheele, Fairfield	20,250	25,110.00	25,110.00
Elmer Schoesler & Sons, Ritzville	25,354	30,159.34					
Heitstuman Bros., Clarkston	25,413	30,028.50	16,171.20				
Robert Heitstuman, Pomeroy							
Cornwall Farms, Fairfield	24,347	30,018.39	11,604.39				

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. I want to preface my remarks by saying that for a long, long time I have been very much interested and concerned with the whole price support program, in many instances I have taken a position contrary to the recommendations made by several previous administrations—and with the present administration, which is Democratic.

I should like to propound this question to my distinguished colleague: Will this affect the one-price cotton system which we have today and which we hammered out after years and years of frustration?

Mr. BREWSTER. My answer to my distinguished colleague from Rhode Island is that, in my judgment, this amendment will have no effect on the present cotton price structure.

Mr. PASTORE. Why does the Senator say that? It is my understanding this amendment excludes everyone who would get over \$50,000. As I understand the situation—and I will ask for time from the opposition to the amendment, because I do not want to take the time of the Senator from Maryland, unless he will indulge me; but, if he does not wish to yield me time, I wish to ask time from the opposition—

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am glad to yield such time to the Senator from Rhode Island as he may need.

Mr. PASTORE. I will take only 5 minutes.

I would like the Senate of the United States to understand that in order for this Government to unload its surpluses in cotton, we have been selling and exporting cotton to foreign manufacturers at 8 cents a pound cheaper than the American manufacturers must pay for it. There is not a Senator in the Chamber who does not understand that there is a differential in the standard of living between our country and countries like Japan, Italy, France, Great Britain, Hong Kong, and many others in the world, that are manufacturing cotton cloth, making shirts, and sending them back to be sold on the American market.

I realize that to a certain extent America must use her ingenuity, her marketing ability, her styling skills, to make up the differential. This is because the American millworker makes from \$1.80 to \$2 an hour, while the Japanese worker may make 35 cents an hour.

In order to unload the cotton on the world marketplace, we sell to Japan our raw cotton at 8 cents cheaper than the man manufacturing a shirt in Rhode Island must pay for it.

The argument is made that unless we do it, we cannot sell the raw cotton. If we cannot sell the raw cotton, we cannot dispose of it. In the process we are closing down mills in the United States of America.

In the last 10 years we have experienced an astronomical increase in our gross national product. As a matter of fact, last year it was \$675 billion. This year it will be \$750 billion. In the last 10 years it has increased 100 percent.

In this prosperous period we have shut down 1,000 mills in the United States of America, and have thrown 350,000 millworkers out of jobs. Why? Because we cannot compete with countries that are buying American raw cotton 8 cents cheaper than the American people are able to buy it in America. To me that represents not only an inequity, but an iniquity.

In order to arrive at a solution of the problem, I suggested to the late President Kennedy that we ought to sell cotton at 8 cents a pound cheaper to Japan, for example, in order to unload our surplus cotton, but we ought to add 8 cents a pound when it comes back at the port of entry. The administration said we could not do that. I asked why. We were told that the minute we did that, Japan would cut back on her imports of our raw cotton. We wrestled

with that problem day in and day out, month in and month out.

The only solution considered feasible was to pay the mill 8 cents a pound, which was criticized because it was alleged to be a payoff, or pay it to the cotton producer. We inaugurated that program.

I should like to know if the amendment of the Senator from Maryland is intended to take away the benefit of 8 cents a pound to the American cotton producer so we can maintain and preserve American jobs.

I wish to have a clear, definite answer, because I have been told by people who are knowledgeable in this field that the amendment will destroy the one price cotton system.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, in answer to my distinguished colleague, this amendment is to pay for yesterday's laundry. In other words, the \$3.5 billion that goes for commodity support prices in this bill of \$7 billion does not appropriate one single cent for tomorrow of the \$3.5 billion. What it does is replace past expenditures of the Commodity Credit Corporation, money that has already been spent, and it does not in any way, in my judgment, affect the issue the Senator from Rhode Island addresses himself to.

I know he, like myself, time and again in the past has supported the consumer position in the argument over agricultural support prices.

Mr. PASTORE. Indeed, I have, and I am interested in American jobs. One cannot buy anything unless he has money to buy it with. That is the reason why we are running around in circles.

Mr. BREWSTER. There comes a time to reevaluate our position on our agricultural policy. I have already placed in the RECORD a list of the many hundreds of people that have accumulated in excess of \$25,000 per year per crop from the U.S. Government.

Let me give some examples.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that we may get an answer to the question of the Senator from Rhode Island? The question involves what the farmer shall get for his product.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am willing to yield, but on the Senator's time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I do not want to get the time period confused. I yielded 5 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island; has he concluded?

Mr. PASTORE. I think I used four and a half minutes. Did I not, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island used 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to yield more time to the Senator from Rhode Island, if he desires it.

Mr. PASTORE. No.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield such time as he may need to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland has the floor.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I said I was happy to yield, but on the Senator's time.

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

Mr. BREWSTER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I ask the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], how much money is appropriated in this bill to finance the program described by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] a moment ago, that is, the recompensing of the cotton processors? How much is involved?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on whose time are we operating now?

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is Senator BREWSTER's time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland yielded to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. HOLLAND. There is no specific sum appropriated for that purpose. The sum appropriated is to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for losses incurred in 1964 and 1965, in carrying out the various commodity programs financed by the Corporation revolving fund.

Mr. LAUSCHE. No, my question is, what is the estimated cost of the subsidy to the processors of cotton goods?

Mr. HOLLAND. I cannot state that. I can state that the loans made in calendar 1965 to all cotton producers were \$886,697,959. The Senator will find that on page 59 of our report.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That does not answer my question.

Mr. HOLLAND. I cannot answer the question, if I may say, Mr. President, because this question was not involved in the hearings of the committee and is not involved in this particular bill. Therefore, I am unable to answer the Senator's question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In previous discussions on this subject, statements have been made in the Senate that the subsidization of the processors of cotton amounted to about \$350 million to \$400 million a year. How close is that to being correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. We do not deal with that particular subject under this bill. As I have tried to explain to my distinguished friend, this bill has no relation at all to the provisions of the farm legislation enacted last year. This bill reimburses the Commodity Credit Corporation for previous years' losses under the previous legislation, and restores it to a sound fiscal condition to continue its operations. But we do not compute for each commodity, in preparing this bill, what the Commodity Credit Corporation is limited to spending for that particular commodity in the next year. It is not done that way.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Where is the provision dealing with the subsidies to the processors of cotton?

Mr. HOLLAND. That was in the previous legislation and was amended by the legislative act passed in 1965.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In the authorization act?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes, the legislative act.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How much are we expending to subsidize the processors? Can no one connected with this subject give an answer?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am unable to answer it. Maybe someone else is able to tell us.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. On page 58 of the committee report, there is a table showing all of these payments. On cotton for calendar 1965, the estimated number of payments was 509,000 totaling \$69,551,000.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That still does not answer the question. It tells the cost of the cotton program, but it does not tell the cost of subsidizing the processors of cotton goods.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. No, Mr. President, I should like to continue my presentation. I am somewhat surprised, though, that the proponents of this appropriation measure are not quite sure where all this \$7 billion is going.

My proposition is very simple: No one person should get more than \$50,000. That seems to me to be eminently fair.

Let me give some examples. I put in the RECORD, the record for 1964. I have pulled out of that some seven or eight people who really got a windfall at the expense of the taxpayers.

Jack Robison & Sons, Arizona, a sorghum producer, received a loan of \$98,000 which he never repaid.

Perry, Texas, sorghum, \$135,000.

Kehi Plantation, Arkansas, rice, \$81,000, never repaid.

Tulana Farms, Oregon, oats, \$140,000. Straight out of the taxpayers' pockets.

Mills Bros., Mississippi, rice, \$85,000.

Now listen to this one: Arkansas Grain Corp., soybeans, \$6 million.

Wallace, California, wheat, \$83,000.

Stanley, South Dakota, wheat, \$167,000.

Phillips, Washington, wheat, \$139,000.

In fact, some of the loans advanced were in amounts such as this: \$3.7 million to Producers Rice Mill, Inc., in Arkansas. And the Arkansas Grain Corp. was loaned a staggering \$16.4 million in 1964, of which they repaid a portion, but the taxpayers paid \$6 million.

I ask the Senate, what sense does this make? What sense does it make to the housewife, to subsidize large corporate operations to this extent?

I argue that it results in higher prices for the consumer, higher taxes for the taxpayers of the country, and serves no useful purpose.

The original purpose of the farm program was to save the family farmer. I am fully prepared to do that. But I am not prepared to subsidize, at great cost, the big producer. I do not see that this

is in accordance with the original philosophy of the measure that was passed.

I now yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I support this amendment, but I think we should clear up some of the points that have been raised here.

First, the Senator from Ohio asked the question as to what effect this would have on the subsidy that is being paid to the textile mills today.

The subsidy is not being paid to the textile mills now. A subsidy was paid under a previous law, but it is not affected by this amendment as of today. In previous years the subsidy was paid direct to the mills and amounted to, I think it was about 8 or 9 cents per pound. Then later the law was amended to provide that we sell to the American mills at the world price, and in order to do that the subsidy is now paid to the farmer. That subsidy amounts roughly to about 9 cents per pound, which means about \$45 a bale, and if Senators wish to get what the cost of that is to the taxpayers they can multiply that figure by the number of pounds used domestically.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. While the Senator is figuring up the amount, I wonder if there is not an error in the calculations made by the distinguished Senator from Maryland, and whether, when he talks about the astronomical losses, he is not somewhat inaccurate, inasmuch as, when a large producer or a small producer gets a loan from the Government, the Government, in turn, receives either the grain or commodity or the money; so there would not be a loss as large as the one speculatively suggested by the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. There is a loss, but the Senator from Maryland was pointing out in his report the amount of loans made to these individual units under the price-support program.

Mr. MUNDT. Precisely. And the Government then gets either the grain or the money.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct, and the loss sustained is on the sale of this commodity in the open market.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland has yielded to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But there is a loss sustained if the Government, after obtaining the grain, has to sell it at a loss; and it is that loss we are reimbursing in the Commodity Credit Corporation appropriations here this year, which amounts to \$2 or \$3 billion a year. Technically, that is the way we approach it.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It would be appropriate, however, that this amendment be adopted. It has been close to adoption before, and I am very much in favor of it.

There is no reason in my mind why they should use taxpayers' money to sup-

port these multimillion-dollar operations of the corporate type of farms. It involves less than 2 percent of our farmers. I have nothing against bigness in America if it is not done with Government money. From the standpoint of protecting the taxpayers, consumers, or farmers, I do not think it should be the policy of our Government to promote a farm program for crops and subsidize it for the large corporate farmers to the extent that they can take over and gobble up the small farmers with taxpayers' money.

That is exactly what is happening in America. I do not think this should be done with Government money. That is the reason that I am strongly in support of the amendment of the Senator from Maryland which would put a limit of \$50,000 upon the amount which any one individual could get from the Federal Government.

The Senator from Rhode Island raised the question concerning whether the amendment of the Senator would affect or nullify the two-price system; in my opinion, it would not. In all fairness, however, I should say that if we are successful in having this amendment agreed to, I am reasonably confident that it would have an effect on the program as administered. Those supporting the present program would see a revision. No doubt they would try to go back to the two-price system. That is the reason the textile mills are fearful. The amendment in itself, if agreed to, would not bring back the two-price system. I think we should look at this realistically.

I realize the concern of the Senator from Rhode Island. However, at the same time I think the Senator from Maryland is correct in his analysis. We would not automatically go over to the two-price system. It might lead to it, but this in itself would not.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, if there is any justice in what I have said, and if there is any justice in the program itself, rather than laboring under promises to be made here and possibly never kept in the future, why would it not be better to modify the amendment now and obviate any injustice that might be done? Why should we repose our faith in assurances given on the floor, assurances which are so uncertain?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not say that.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator said it might not lead to it or it might. We cannot keep jobs in existence with terms such as "might" or "might not."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I was trying to get the question straight. I was trying to be fair with the Senator from Rhode Island. Let it be clear that if an effort were made to go back to subsidizing the mills I would oppose it. I do not think we should be subsidizing the textile mills either directly or indirectly as is now being done.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is correct. The mills do not want it. They were absolutely against it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. They do not want the subsidy in their own name, but let us be realistic. They are getting a subsidy today, only it is being paid in the name of the farmer. It is the same amount.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is correct. However, if we stop selling it abroad cheaper than it is sold for in America, the American mills would have no complaint.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If they would stop paying artificial support prices to produce more in America we would not have this problem.

Mr. PASTORE. Provided, they do not sell it cheaper abroad.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland has 2 minutes remaining.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, who has charge of the time on the bill?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have charge of the time for those who support the committee bill. I cannot yield to the Senator in view of the position he is taking.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, who has charge of the time for the opposition?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The acting minority leader has charge of the time for the opposition.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I want to get clear one statement that the Senator made. I am one of those who look with great concern on the growing tendency to have corporate farming in this country. I do not think it is wholesome. I do not think it is good. I do not think it is in the public interest to have our little family farms constantly merged into corporate farming operations.

I want to get it clear in the RECORD. In the opinion of the Senator from Delaware, who has studied this issue very carefully, would the continuation of these large payments beyond the \$50,000 amount incorporated in the bill go to the level of encouraging new corporation operations as against family operated farms?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In my opinion, it would not only encourage it, but would subsidize such expansion at the expense of the American taxpayers. That is the reason why I think the time is long overdue when we should put a limit on the amount that can be paid to any one operator.

I have no objection to a man having all the acreage that he can afford to buy and pay for. There is nothing in here to control that, and I would object to any legislation which would restrict the amount of land that any one farmer could plant

or control provided he uses his own money.

I do think there should be a limit as to the amount that he could expect to receive under the price-support program from the Federal Government and a limit to his subsidy payments.

When the amount exceeds the \$50,000 limitation he should certainly use his own money and take his own loss or gain. If he cannot do that he should get out of the business, and the small farmers can take over.

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

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 2 minutes for a clarification of the Senator's amendment? Sugar was exempted last year, and I would like to propose a clarification to the amendment.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Maryland last year accepted an amendment which exempted the sugar compliance payment. I ask if the Senator will accept this modification to his amendment:

On next to the last line I would strike out the words "under title 3 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended," and insert in lieu thereof "of sugar, as defined in section 101(k) of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, under title 3 of such Act."

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I modify my amendment accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

Who yields time?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President the time is long overdue for a study and reappraisal of the various subsidy payment programs. Perhaps the most lush of all subsidy payments is that made to the merchant marine, with which the Senator from Maryland is so familiar.

Under the Public Law 480 program appropriations contained in the pending bill, there are large amounts for subsidies to pay freight rates to the American merchant marine over and above the cost for which we could ship grain to foreign countries under foreign flags. This is all right, but the Senator should recognize that over the years, under the Public Law 480 program, the merchant marine has been subsidized to the extent of \$1,187 million. This amount was paid them for handling Public Law 480 commodities to needy foreign nations.

I suggest that this should be a subject of concern by the Senator from Maryland.

The Senator has also indicated a loss of some \$6 million on a single loan on soybeans. This is not correct. Soybean prices have been constantly above the price-support level. There has been a shortage of supply.

Mr. President, if this provision were to provide only for payments to farmers and not loans, I would support it. However, loans to farmers to make possible

more orderly marketing are just as much in the interest of the small farmers as they are in the interest of the big farmers.

A high percentage of these loans, particularly on wheat and many other crops are repaid. Why should we want to disrupt orderly marketing by placing a limit on the amount of loans that could be made to any one farmer?

Mr. President, I am amazed that the Senator from Maryland would state that the cost of these subsidies to farmers is about \$7 billion. Under the bill that is being considered today, about \$1.6 billion is to repay the Commodity Credit Corporation for the Public Law 480 program, the best foreign aid program we have. Yet, this is charged to the farmer.

The special milk program, from which the dairy farmers of Maryland derive great benefit, is under this bill, too. Also included are all the loans made through REA and RTA and the Farmers Home Administration which have a repayment record of almost 100 percent yet the Senator from Maryland considers these as subsidies to farmers.

We should have a better understanding of what this bill is about.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to myself.

Mr. President, the proposed amendment strikes at the heart of the price support and the cropland diversion programs now underway under existing law. The bitter truth about this matter is that the proposed amendment has a much broader objective. Before proceeding further Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I wish to reply to the Senator from North Dakota.

The Senator from North Dakota pointed out that under this agriculture bill many items are charged to the American farmer which in reality should be charged to other departments. As one who has criticized our present farm program and as a strong supporter of the proposed amendment I wish to say that the Senator from North Dakota is correct in his analysis. As he has just said and as I have said many times, many items here need clarification as to what this farm program is costing from the standpoint of the farmers. I say that as one of the critics of the program and as one of the supporters of the proposed amendment.

As the Senator from North Dakota has pointed out, Public Law 480 should be charged to the foreign aid program. The school lunch program should certainly not be charged to the American farmers. In many instances such as these I believe it would be better for the country and the Senate if the bills were broken down so that when we criticize one of these programs—and I say this as one of the critics of this program—we would at least be specific on what the program itself is costing in each instance.

I believe it is too expensive a program, and I would like to see the amendment adopted and a limitation placed on payments; but we want our arguments to be fair.

I appreciate the generosity of the Senator from Florida in yielding to me in order that I might concur in what the Senator from North Dakota has said. The Senator from North Dakota and I have discussed this point many times. In fact, we have spoken of getting together and attempting to get a true analysis of what the farm program, the maritime program, and many of these subsidy programs are actually costing the American taxpayers. Unfortunately they are included in different appropriation bills, and the different categories are mixed together so that very few people know what each program is costing.

I thank the Senator from North Dakota for pointing that out; in all fairness to the American farmers that should have been pointed out.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I would like to add that the Senator from Delaware has, for a long while, been seeking to accomplish this and to obtain a better system of budgeting.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the proposed amendment, while it is well intended and is made by honest men who want to impose reasonable limitations on the price support program, would be a very serious and vital blow to the whole price support structure, the whole program loan structure, and the whole cropland diversion structure under existing law.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] called attention to the fact that not all of the facts that he desired were available in the report of this committee and in the record. That is the truth, Mr. President, because this committee was endeavoring to do its duty, to bring out a bill to supply the cost of operation of the Agriculture Department and its related agencies under existing law for fiscal 1967. This bill is not rewriting the law that is on the books. This bill is not a legislative bill, but is an appropriation bill, and provides for the restoration of the Commodity Credit Corporation's capital losses incurred for fiscal year 1964 and 1965.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I cannot yield at this time. I have limited time. I shall yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Ohio later.

Mr. President, this bill is an appropriations bill. It has been carefully drawn. More than 2,000 pages of hearings are on the desk of every Senator. In the report are 69 pages showing every conceivable item that might have been desired, but not showing some of the things requested by the Senator from Ohio, because they do not pertain to the subject matter of this particular bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Well, it is in the report.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the proposed amendment would very seriously hurt the operation of the cotton program, which was mentioned by the Senator from Rhode Island, the wheat program, which is of great importance to the wheat producing industry—particularly the States of North Dakota and Kansas—and to the feed

grain producing industry. The proposed amendment would be of very great and devastating importance to all of them, because it covers not just payments but also loans, even though many of those loans are repaid—every cent—with interest. Nevertheless, loans are also limited by the terms of the proposed amendment.

Mr. President, nobody can tell how many producers will be affected by that, because that was not one of the pertinent facts before the committee. We can tell, however, from looking at the report of this committee, how big this subject matter is.

For instance, on page 58 of the committee report is a listing of the num-

ber and amount of payments for calendar year 1965. I ask unanimous consent that that tabulation be included in the RECORD at this time as part of my remarks.

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

Number and amount of payments, calendar year 1965

Program	All payments		Payments below \$5,000		Payments \$5,000 to \$24,999		Payments \$25,000 to \$49,999		Payments \$50,000 and over	
	Estimated number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Emergency conservation measures.....	30,700	\$11,968,000	30,696	\$11,945,774	4	\$22,226				
Conservation reserve.....	163,000	152,932,000	162,664	151,251,200	336	1,680,800				
Cropland conversion.....	5,800	7,512,000	5,575	5,846,913	225	1,665,087				
Feed grain diversion.....	1,893,800	956,340,000	1,885,145	882,410,712	8,509	66,854,504	113	\$3,734,749	33	\$3,340,005
Feed grain price support.....	1,387,000	434,866,000	1,385,445	422,304,877	1,538	11,402,966	10	343,671	7	814,486
Wheat diversion.....	1,047,500	37,823,000	1,047,361	36,772,818	139	1,050,182				
Wheat certificates.....	942,000	487,234,000	934,259	423,859,871	7,652	60,211,153	80	2,456,421	9	706,555
Cotton price support.....	509,000	69,551,000	508,485	64,165,765	487	4,329,286	23	734,260	5	321,689
Sugar.....	75,000	77,195,000	72,370	32,729,445	2,438	23,099,588	114	3,731,162	78	17,634,805
Wool-mohair.....	263,000	17,926,000	262,747	15,886,181	250	1,963,781	3	76,038		
Total, all program payments.....	6,316,800	2,253,347,000	6,294,747	2,047,173,556	21,578	172,279,573	343	11,076,331	132	22,817,540

Mr. HOLLAND. From that report alone, it appears that in the feed grain diversion program the amount of all payments for that year was \$956,340,000. Those diversion payments were made because Congress had determined, in its judgment, that this was the best way to approach the problems which were facing agriculture. The amount of feed grain price support paid in that year was \$434,866,000.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. Under the item of wheat diversion, \$37,823,000 was paid for the year 1965, and \$487,234,000 was expended for wheat certificates during the same year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator yield additional time?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 additional minutes at this time.

Under the item of cotton price sup-

port, the figure shown is \$69,551,000, in that particular compilation.

If we go to the next page in the report of the committee, on page 59, we see a tabulation of the number and amount of loans for calendar year 1965. I ask unanimous consent that that tabulation appear in the RECORD at this time, as part of my remarks.

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

Number and amount of loans, calendar year 1965

Commodity	All loans		Loans below \$5,000		Loans \$5,000 to \$24,999		Loans \$25,000 to \$49,999		Loans \$50,000 and over	
	Estimated number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Corn.....	73,685	\$217,972,425	65,183	\$139,020,206	8,274	\$70,245,352	194	\$6,230,723	34	\$2,476,144
Grain sorghums.....	22,869	93,416,117	17,781	24,081,393	4,533	47,616,405	462	15,310,668	93	6,407,621
Wheat.....	78,830	223,585,023	68,425	118,905,259	9,991	88,926,659	361	11,774,308	53	3,978,797
Barley.....	6,436	12,876,952	6,079	8,521,245	344	2,892,910	7	244,824	6	1,217,973
Oats.....	16,025	22,938,520	15,522	17,965,469	494	3,992,460	6	176,435	3	774,156
Rye.....	5,554	6,365,210	5,478	5,799,157	76	566,053				
Flaxseed.....	15,922	24,738,137	15,170	19,261,663	750	5,483,656	2	52,818		
Cotton, form A and G loans.....	(1)	886,697,959		229,784,421		349,615,237		138,345,523		168,952,778
Soybeans.....	62,152	172,101,062	56,991	86,115,109	4,979	39,863,738	133	4,584,588	49	41,537,617
Peanuts.....	226	55,873,948		27,746,539		23,193,761		3,861,408		1,072,240
Rice.....	1,109	48,630,141	410	985,421	395	5,475,823	204	7,167,131	100	35,001,766
Honey.....	530	2,095,960	419	590,421	99	1,047,427	10	322,024	2	136,088
Tung oil.....	883	5,506,482	814	3,659,751	51	545,501	11	349,484	7	951,746
Beans, dry edible.....	1,385	4,583,377	1,139	2,402,623	242	2,023,449	3	103,531	1	53,774
Naval stores.....	21	9,193,051		3,186,564		2,900,269		1,178,821		1,927,397
Tobacco.....	215	101,018,714		98,586,236		2,335,611		30,199		66,668
Dryer equipment.....	1,406	2,508,019	1,405	2,502,591	1	5,428				
Total, commodity loans.....		1,890,161,087		789,144,068		646,729,739		189,732,515		264,554,765

¹ Comparable number data not available because CCC makes loans to cooperative associations (form G) as well as loans to individual producers (form A) and the data on advances by cooperatives to individual producers is not available. Amounts shown

represent total form G loans to cooperatives and form A loans to individual producers classified by size.

² Represents number of loans to cooperative associations, not individual producers.

Mr. HOLLAND. Without attempting to quote all of the loan figures—and they apply to all the commodities separately—I shall mention some figures briefly.

As to wheat, the total loan figure was \$223,585,023. As to cotton, the total loan figure was \$886,697,959.

Mr. President, we are asked to take a blind approach—the case of the blind leading the blind—in which it is proposed to ban loans of over \$50,000, regardless of whether they were repaid. Many of them, of course, were repaid. We are asked to ban them in all three of these commodity fields which I have

mentioned, and in other fields which I will not mention because they do not happen to be that important.

The fact is that we are asked to take this leap into the dark, to outlaw the making of loans and the making of payments over \$50,000 to every individual or corporation throughout the country.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. As a member of the Senate Agriculture Committee, the Senator from Florida knows

well that under the present cotton program as well as the wheat program, the wheat certificate payments and the payments to the cotton farmers are supposed to be a part of the price the farmer gets for his wheat or cotton. The loan price was greatly reduced so as to better compete with foreign countries and to provide cheaper materials here at home.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is so right, they are not only supposed to be, but they are a very important part of the price the producer gets for his labor and the use of his land.

Mr. President, since the law changed, effective in 1965, I call attention to the tabulation on page 293 of the record of hearings for two purposes: First, to show that the cotton equalization payments of fiscal year 1965 under the previous legislation were \$409,604,844.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this time?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio as soon as I finish this statement.

I call attention to that because those equalization payments were made separately to the processors in that year. They were made as a part of the price support system in effect under that legislation, and for which the costs are reimbursed in this bill.

I yield to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to point out that the information which I sought earlier and could not get is now clearly provided by a reading of what is contained on page 293 of the hearings. That is, the cotton program helping producers, or whoever it was said it helps, the cotton grower, cost \$409 million in 1965. We are seeking to reimburse Commodity Credit Corporation for that cost.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct in one part and incorrect in another part.

In fiscal 1965 that was the amount paid to the cotton processors; but that amount would not necessarily be paid to them in fiscal 1966, or 1967. The situation is entirely different under existing law enacted last year. This change in payments procedures is not due to the action of the committee, but rather to the action of the Congress in passing legislation which deals with this subject matter differently.

I plead with my learned friend that he not tamper with existing law in an appropriations bill without knowing what the outcome will be, and no man here can determine what the result would be by the application of this \$50,000 limitation on all loans and payments.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield a half minute to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield one-half minute to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] knows that I was vigorously opposed to subsidizing processors of cotton. I am glad to know that the Senator from Florida opposed that initial measure.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct, and that points up the fact that the Senator from Florida is not trying to write legislation on an appropriations measure, as this amendment proposes to do. The Senator from Florida is trying to carry out his duty as a member of the committee to help carry out the laws which are on the books, because we put them there, even though the Senator from Florida did not vote for it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 10 minutes of the Senator have expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

From this tabulation on page 293 there appears another figure which I mention because it appears in the total payments for fiscal 1965, although it was in a dif-

ferent category last year. The payment on wheat certificates was \$106,652,864. I call attention to that fact because the Congress, in its wisdom, placed this in a different category last year in the legislation approved for the 1965 crop year.

I say again, and without reflection on my learned friends, that this is a case of the blind leading the blind, in asking that we apply a limitation of \$50,000 on all loans, whether repaid or not, and all payments made under the laws which we have passed. It is the farmer who risks his land, and his own toil, and investments in the production of a crop, and the Congress should not attempt to change a law just passed last year in this manner, and with no knowledge of its impact.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] placed his finger on the specific point involved when he said that we are not now considering legislation or the amendment of legislation. We should be considering the problem of financing of the Department of Agriculture to carry out laws that we have placed on the books.

I know something about the matter, and I wish to point out what was done. This committee acted over a long period of time to gather the facts and report them to the Senate. This bill was reported out of the full committee of members by unanimous vote.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for 2 minutes?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] on the bill for 2 minutes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As one who voted for the Brewster amendment last year, I must oppose it this year if it is to be added on to the agriculture appropriation bill, because of the ruling by the General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture on how such a limitation would affect the cotton program.

Last year Congress provided a one-price system for cotton. I strongly supported this program because our domestic cotton textile industry needs to be able to buy cotton at a competitive price with foreign manufacturers. We now find, however, that under the so-called snapback provision in the farm bill, if the Secretary of Agriculture is not able to make available to all cotton producers cooperating in the cotton program the amounts of loans and payments they would be entitled to under the cotton provisions, cotton would again go back on a two-price system.

Mr. John Bagwell, General Counsel of the Agriculture Department, in a letter to Chairman COOLEY, of the House Agriculture Committee, dated June 2, 1966, advised that a payment limitation to any one producer cooperating in the cotton program would trigger the snapback provision for the whole program. This opinion was rendered in connection with a payment limitation which the Senate included in the natural disaster planting legislation last month, but it is my understanding that it would apply also to the Brewster limitation in this bill.

Whether this ruling is right or wrong, Mr. President, this is the interpretation of the Department of Agriculture which

must administer the cotton program. It is vital that we continue cotton on a one-price system. If we are forced back onto a two-price system, New England textile mills, for example, will be required to pay 29 cents a pound for their cotton, while their foreign competitors could get our U.S. cotton for about 22 cents. Congress clearly declared their intent that this not happen in the cotton provisions of last year's bill. In addition, just a few weeks ago, we passed legislation to encourage cotton research and promotion. I believe we must maintain these efforts to stimulate our domestic cotton industry, both for producers and manufacturers, and therefore I must oppose this measure which threatens to place our cotton program back on the two-price system.

I thank the Senator from Florida for yielding to me in order that I might make my statement.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad that the Senator from Massachusetts mentioned one fact of three I will mention at this time to show what other steps are being taken to try to bring the market into some degree of order.

The fact that he mentioned was that the bill we passed and which is now being set in operation by the Department of Agriculture, imposed a \$1 per bale tax upon all cotton produced to step up improving the cotton situation. That does not look like the cotton producers are trying to evade their responsibility.

Another fact is that the cotton producers supported the bill last year, not just under the proposals of last year, but also proposals to favor the small producer because everybody knew the strain was on them, by giving them 4 or 5 cents more a pound. This was an attempt to enable them to stay in business.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point? I would like to make a statement.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator, but I wish to make two more points in connection with wheat.

Everybody who knows anything about the situation knows that the Secretary is trying to carry out the wishes of the administration, and I think that they are in most cases the wishes of the Congress; trying to increase the production of wheat because the greatest need of the world is for more food. The Secretary, because of his desire to help in that situation, gave a 15-percent additional allotment to step up the production of wheat.

Now, are we going to say that we are going to bring under this bill not only those who made \$50,000 to finance the crop last year, but those who yield to the request of the President and the Congress and the Secretary of Agriculture to produce more wheat this year to meet our international needs?

Mr. President, I shall not labor the point further. I am glad now to yield such time on the bill as the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] may need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized for such time as he desires.

Mr. HOLLAND. I hope that the Senator from Arizona will take not more than 5 minutes, as I have so many other requests from Senators to speak.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I should like to support the points which have been made so capably by the Senator from Florida as to the advantages which will accrue as a result of the provisions of this bill and the damaging effect the pending amendment would have on it.

The whole country stands to benefit if the cost of producing cotton can be reduced and if cotton products can be further improved. Scientists say these things can be done.

The question is whether the necessary investments will be made in research, promotion, machinery, land improvement, et cetera, and whether modern management and engineering skills can be attracted to cotton farming.

Efficiency is the key word in cotton's future. The drive for greater efficiency will be killed off if the Government deliberately discriminates against the larger cotton farmers. In most areas of business, the advantages of large-scale operation are clearly recognized. Only if firms become monopolistic are they considered to run counter to public policy. But the largest cotton growers in the country are not 1 percent as large as the biggest manmade fiber producer.

In manmade fiber manufacture, new discoveries are normally patented or carefully guarded as business secrets. Among the larger cotton farmers, the situation is exactly opposite to this. The larger farmers are usually best set up to try out new techniques of operation. They are usually the only growers with the financing, the management, and the scale of operation to put new scientific discoveries promptly into trial use. Their successes or failures are immediately known to all other farmers in surrounding areas and are communicated to all parts of the cotton belt. The larger farmers are thus the spearhead of progress in a great deal of cotton's struggle to compete with synthetics.

Cotton can be a great source of strength to this country if public policy does not cripple its drive toward efficiency. Right now the requirements of military procurement are forcing textile mills to shift back to cotton from synthetic fiber. New scientific discoveries are bringing all-cotton fabrics back into strong competition for manufacture of the new "durable press" garments. Research aimed at complete elimination of the boll weevil and other insects is now well advanced. Scientists predict that the cost of cotton production can be lowered 11 cents per pound through weed and insect control, mechanization, and so forth.

Farmers will soon vote in a referendum on whether they should be assessed \$1 per bale to finance the kind of research and promotion that can help solve cotton's basic problems—and the distinguished Senator from Florida covered that very capably. It would be tragic for the Government to step in and penalize the larger producers, who are counted upon to bear a substantial part of this burden.

The payments being made to cotton-growers under the Agricultural Act of 1965—excepting only the payments to "small farms"—are designed to do no more than maintain farm income at tolerable levels in the face of sharp acreage reductions combined with an 8-cent reduction in support levels. This is not largess but a sound investment in the future of cotton. The investment and the leadership which has to come from larger farmers in cotton's drive for efficiency will surely turn to other fields if the Government adopts a policy of discrimination against them.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida for yielding to me to make this statement.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator in charge of the bill, who is in opposition to it—if there is any such opposition—grant me 5 minutes?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as acting minority leader, I am glad to yield 5 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I recognize fully the argument made by the Senator from Florida that this is an appropriation bill to finance the ordinary problems incurred in the past under laws of authorization. However, I would feel delinquent if I did not use all available time in my possession to express my vigorous opposition to a U.S. Government program which, under the guise of helping the little farmer to survive, would proceed to make payments of over \$50,000 in subsidies and loans aggregating \$264 million.

Now what I have just stated may not sound completely understandable, but \$22,817,540, according to the report, has been paid out to farmers in the way of subsidies in amounts of over \$50,000.

Therefore, how could it be said that a farmer who receives \$50,000 in subsidies comes within the category and the principle of the farmer who has to be helped to survive?

Such an argument cannot be maintained.

The second point is, I did not know that this was a fact, but page 59 of the report shows that loans of \$50,000 and more, as distinguished from payments, have been made aggregating \$264 million.

Again, I put the question: How can it be claimed that the farmer who is able to borrow \$50,000 and more from the Government is in the category of needing Federal help in order to survive?

Mr. President, such an argument cannot be maintained.

I have just discussed \$264 million loaned to farmers in amounts of \$50,000 and more, and now we come to another one, in the amounts of \$25,000 to \$49,000 where the loans have totaled \$189 million.

I cannot support the pending bill as it is written. I can support the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER].

I concur fully with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and other Senators who allege that large charges

in the agricultural program have been made against farmers that should not be charged against them.

I repeat most emphatically that every time I get the opportunity, I shall rise on the floor of the Senate to argue against this misnomer of a farm program contemplated to help the little farmer stay on the land.

The amendment of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], if it is adopted, will not disturb at all the little farmer. In my opinion, it will not disturb the farm industry.

In conclusion, I come to the subject of subsidizing the processor. It has been argued in this Chamber today that there is no subsidy of the processor of cotton—and let me bring this point to the attention of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. When we initially passed the bill, the subsidy went to the processor.

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

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

But the argument was made in this Chamber, since that time, that we have now initiated a new program of subsidization of the processor. Thus, that was removed and instead of paying the processor we are now supposedly paying the farm grower.

By whatever name one calls it, it is the same thing.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to go into the many arguments that could be advanced against the pending amendment. For the past 15 or 20 years we have been dealing with this problem.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be placed in the RECORD at this point a letter from the National Grange addressed to me, dated July 14, 1966, which covers the subject very well.

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

NATIONAL GRANGE,

Washington, D.C., July 14, 1966.

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The National Grange would like to reiterate its position on Limitation of Payments for you and your distinguished colleagues in the Senate.

Support payments are made to assure farmers, who have expanded their productive capacity and increased their capital investment in times of national need, relief from hardship during times of a decline in market demand. Support payments on all commodities have been substantially reduced since the end of World War II. In some cases, these payments are not sufficient for the producer to receive a return even equal to his cost production. Although these payments have not contributed to a prosperous agriculture, they have prevented the economic distress in agriculture such as resulted after World War I.

Diversion payments are not a gift, but a legitimate return for a desirable action in the national interest. In the late 1950's, the United States was faced with the vast accumulation of agricultural stocks with enormous storage costs to the government. The use of diversion payments, coupled with voluntary programs, have dramatically re-

duced the stocks of wheat and feed grains; the low support prices in milk have continually reduced surplus milk production; and the planting of cotton during the present year indicates the smallest cotton acreage in many decades. This program is working to reduce the price depressing and tax consuming effects of surplus stocks.

The payments for limiting production are proportionately higher for the larger farmer, and so, also, is his contribution to reduced production. It seems only just that the producers with the greatest capital investment should earn the largest payments since they are making the largest reductions. In addition, there seems to be some doubt about the constitutionality of an action limiting payments in such a manner to discriminate against large producers.

Since most of the reduction programs are on a voluntary basis, the effectiveness of these programs would be reduced seriously by a limitation of payments to the larger producers. This action would force them to replant acreage for unneeded agricultural commodities. Consequently, the ultimate effect would be borne equally by the small farmers, through a decrease in farm prices, or by the Government, through an increase in surplus stocks.

With the present program, we have transferred our surplus of stocks to a surplus of capacity, and, at the same time, our capacity for production remains the highest in the world. Yet, our surplus capacity does not depress farm prices as surplus stocks have done in the past. A much smaller percentage of production goes into Government storage now, and a smaller percentage yet is unredeemed after the loan period.

In our judgment, the public has received a proper return on its investment, including—

A reduction in surplus stocks;
The steady supply of an adequate amount of basic stocks at reasonable prices;
The availability of agricultural products for export, making our agricultural exports the largest earner of dollars of all our exportable commodities; and
The strategic value of our productive capacity kept intact.

Not the least of all the results has been a stabilized and improved farm income. Although it is still far too low, this program has fostered an increased equality for farmers in the domestic economic system.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, we would appreciate your conveying to the Senate the opposition of the National Grange to acreage limitation payments on any part of our agricultural program.

Respectfully yours,

HARRY L. GRAHAM.

Cc: Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I agreed to yield next to the Senator from Mississippi, to whom I yield 4 minutes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I take a small part of this time to highly commend the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] for the laborious work they have done on this bill. I commend them for the fairness of their presentation with respect to this amendment.

The question reduces itself into the simplest terms. Congress passed a basic agricultural act. The President signed it. Among other things, in effect, it sets the world market price of cotton as being the price of cotton in the United States. In other words, both thought it was necessary, in order to grow cotton, to provide some profit by the farmers receiving a subsidy.

Now, at the first chance in an appropriation bill, there is an attempt to repudiate the principles adopted in basic legislation—not as to everyone. It is not intended to repudiate it as to all, but only as to a few.

The basic unfairness of that proposal is so apparent that I do not think we need any further argument. But if there is to be a change in that basic principle, then let us adopt basic legislation, measuring the merits of all groups, rather than go out with a meat ax and chop down one group, and say we are going to apply this proposition to one group, but not the others.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield briefly.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it not true that the Mississippi State Penitentiary received over \$175,000?

Mr. STENNIS. That is incidental. It has a cotton farm, is one of the best managed penitentiaries in the United States, and provides its inmates with fresh air, and so on. It has no relation to the basic argument.

We talk about the little farmer. I represent the little farmer. I come from the area of the State where there are little farmers. I know their problems.

That is not the issue at all. There is a basic issue involved here, of a promise being made, and now there is an attempt to repudiate that promise in an appropriation bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as the acting minority leader in charge of the time on this side, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the distinguished acting minority leader for his graciousness.

Mr. President, under the bill as presently presented there would be no limitation whatsoever on the amount of loans and subsidies paid to any one farmer.

The Senator from Maryland is quite correct in saying that 20 percent of the total \$2.5 billion will go to the approximately 20,000 farmers with gross incomes of over \$100,000 a year.

The Senator from Maryland has limited loans and subsidies to \$50,000 for any one farm. The average net income per farm is approximately \$5,000. What the Senator from Maryland is proposing is that no one should receive from the taxpayers more than 10 times the average net farm income. Who can object to that?

The minimum income established under the poverty classification is \$3,000. The Senator from Maryland has proposed that no one should receive more than 17 times the poverty scale. That is certainly most moderate.

It seems to that it is a fundamentally sound argument that the farm subsidy program has become a program for many farmers who do not need help, and that it gives only a small proportion of its aid to the small farmer.

Many Senators would like to make cuts in the poverty program, but want to give 20,000 landlord farmers over \$50,000 each in loans and subsidies. They would take it out of the poor while

pouring wealth into the pockets of the few.

The Brewster proposal will save tens of millions of dollars and possibly even more. It is my belief that we should support it.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield such time to the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] as he may desire.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I desire to express my appreciation to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture. I have the privilege of being the most junior member of that subcommittee, with some 13 Senators on it. On no subcommittee or committee on which I have served have I seen a chairman sit there and go through each individual item, whether there was opposition to it or not, with more care than does the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. He examines every item carefully, whether there is opposition to it or not. Many times the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] helps him.

I have a communication from the Texas Farmers Union. Nearly every one of its members is a small farmer. They tell me, first of all, that these limitations cannot be made effective when participation in various farm programs is voluntary. What will happen is that the big corporate farms, at which payment limitations are aimed, will simply pull out of the programs. Without them you have no program. Large corporate farms will pull out and still survive, but the little farmer will not survive, because the program will be wrecked.

In the second place, in the case of cotton specifically, if the limitation is adopted, there is a "snapback" provision in the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 that will automatically put cotton back under the 1958 act, which all backers of the 1965 act opposed.

I ask unanimous consent that the section from the act to which I have referred, subparagraph (12), which appears on page 10 of Public Law 89-321, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

(12) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, if, as a result of limitations hereafter enacted with respect to price support under this subsection, the Secretary is unable to make available to all cooperators the full amount of price support to which they would otherwise be entitled under paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection for any crop of upland cotton, (A) price support to cooperators shall be made available for such crop (if marketing quotas have not been disapproved) through loans or purchases at such level not less than 65 per centum nor more than 90 per centum of the parity price therefor as the Secretary determines appropriate; (B) in order to keep upland cotton to the maximum extent practicable in the normal channels of trade, such price support may be carried out through the simultaneous purchase of cotton at the support price therefor and resale at a lower price or through loans under which the cotton would be redeemable by payment of a price therefor lower than the amount of the

loan thereon; and (C) such resale or redemption price shall be such as the Secretary determines will provide orderly marketing of cotton during the harvest season and will retain an adequate share of the world market for cotton produced in the United States.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I would point out that the figure the distinguished Senator has earlier referred to, of \$264 million for all characters of loans, for grain, for sorghums, for everything, represented only 14 percent of all loans. That represented 14 percent of the total of over \$1,890 million.

Although the amount is large, when one considers the overall agricultural program, it is the tail wagging the dog.

Out of 3.5 million farmers in the United States, we have learned in the Education and Labor Committee in the hearings on the minimum wage bills, over 2 million of those farmers do not hire one single hired hand on their farms.

These are voluntary programs. Are we going to weaken the program for those more than 2 million family farmers on small farms?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, one of the main purposes of the price-support program is to protect the small farmer. We have always recognized the important role of these small farmers in American life.

But in the past we have given the most money to the largest farms—to the men who need the money least. Seven barley producers receive in price support loans more than the 1,753 small barley farmers. One-ninth of the rice producers get two-thirds of the Federal money for this crop. The Government loaned one company—the Arkansas Grain Corp.—over \$16 million.

Because of the world's needs and the changing picture of U.S. agriculture, we can no longer rely on our surpluses. American agriculture should produce enough food to provide for domestic needs, consumer exports, and food aid to certain developing countries.

President Johnson has said that we must have "a major effort to find new approaches to reduce the heavy cost of our farm programs and to direct more of our effort to the small farmer who needs help most."

Without this amendment, 2 percent of the farmers—those grossing over \$100,000 a year—will take in about one-fifth of the subsidy money. With this amendment, we will spend less money, and a proportionally larger amount on small farmers. I feel this amendment may best lead to an efficient and rational approach to the problems of agriculture.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 2 minutes.

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Maryland for his leadership in this field. After all, the purpose of his amendment is to help the small farmer. The second purpose of his amendment is to help the consumer.

I certainly do not know why, under any theory of any thinking person, we should not be interested in helping the small farmer and the consumer to a better way of life. Certainly, if the Senator's amendment is adopted, we will save about \$25 million. That will help in cutting down the expenses of the Government, to say nothing of the other items.

I might point out again, as President Johnson stated in his state of the Union message last year:

Our economy owes much to the efficiency of our farmers. We must continue to assure them the opportunity to earn a fair reward. I have instructed the Secretary of Agriculture to lead a major effort to find new approaches to reduce the heavy cost of our farm programs and to direct more of our effort to the small farmer who needs the help the most.

That is exactly what the Senator's amendment would do. I hope the Senate will approve this amendment, and I hope that we will consider this as a first step—and a serious step—toward economy in Government, and the realization that we are going to have to help the people who need it most.

I might point out that \$50,000 a year is certainly a little bit more than the average farmer makes—I was about to say during his entire life, but certainly 10 times what he makes in any one year.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, on this proposition I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I understand I have 1 minute remaining, so therefore, I say in summation: This is just one step in calling a halt to a program which has gone far beyond what was originally intended. This program was set up to help the family farmer, the small operator with small acreage, without much machinery.

That we support. We think it is important to American society. What we do not think is right is for one corporation, in Arkansas, to get loans of \$16 million a year, and repay \$10 million.

The distinguished Senator from Florida, the proponent of the appropriation measure, said most of the loans had been repaid. Then why are we asking the taxpayers to put up \$3,500 million to make loans to millionaires? That is the question. My amendment would be one way of stopping it.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as the acting minority leader in charge of the opposition, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Delaware.

Do I understand, Mr. President, we have 16 minutes left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifteen minutes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I support this amendment and wish to say that I am as much interested in the welfare of the small farmers as has anyone else. In fact, there has been so much interest expressed for the small farmer that I sometimes wonder if it were possible to save all the tears that

have been shed in the name of the small farmer it would not go a long way toward eliminating the drought with which we are now confronted in many areas of the country.

Let us get down to the facts of the matter. The adoption of this amendment would not in one single degree or by one penny affect the small farmer in America. It would not affect any farmer in America who is receiving total payments of less than \$50,000 from the Federal Government. So let us keep that point clearly in mind.

Much has been said about the cotton farmers. Based on the report by the committee, on page 58, there are exactly five cotton farmers in the United States who would be affected by the adoption of this amendment as respects the amount of subsidy payments received only five.

As we use the statistics for 1965 I think I should be fair and say there would be more affected by the adoption of this amendment than the number reported by the committee, because in 1966 we shall be making the subsidy payments to the farmers rather than the textile mills; but, nevertheless, there are very few farmers who would be affected. As to wheat farmers, there are 14 farmers whose subsidy would be affected by the adoption of this amendment. Based on the reports, 132 wheat farmers in the entire United States received payments in 1965 in excess of \$50,000. So let us get straight what we are talking about. This does not affect the small farmers.

Now, as to price support loans there were about 300-and-some-odd—the figures are not totaled, but roughly 300 farmers that would be affected, not including cotton. This is based on the committee report. Cotton payments under price support loans are not included in the report. We are dealing with a relatively small number of large operators, and even those are not affected except to this extent: They could still receive up to \$50,000 from the Federal Government in subsidies or price supports. After that they would be on their own. And why should they not be on their own?

Much of American agriculture as we know it today has grown and flourished without any support prices whatsoever, without any subsidy payments. I am proud to say that the poultry industry of my State is one of them, and they have made out better by not being under Government operations and Government controls.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The Senator mentioned a moment ago that only 14 wheat farmers in the United States would be affected. This would be true if a farmer raised only wheat. But I do not know of a single farmer in my State or the surrounding States who raises wheat alone. Most of the farmers are involved in raising of several commodities, including wheat, corn, oats, rye, soybeans, and perhaps wool or sugarbeets.

For the life of me, I cannot understand why it is proposed we exempt sugar under this amendment and include wool payments. These programs are almost exactly the same.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. It has been called to my attention that under the present law there are instances where there is an overlapping, and some are drawing \$50,000 under two or three different crops. In other words, it could well be they get over \$50,000 from two or more crops.

But the point is, why should we not limit to \$50,000 the amount to be paid under any one price-support program? I ask that question from the taxpayers' standpoint and for the benefit of the small farmer. Because if we stop subsidizing corporate type operations, the small farmer can better compete, and he can stay in business and keep and maintain his small farm.

There is a second point. A few years ago, we administered the cotton program by subsidizing the textile mills to the amount of about \$300 to \$400 million a year. We are still subsidizing them today; the only difference is we are doing it by making the payments to the farmer. But indirectly the subsidy goes to the mills because they can buy the cotton about 8 to 9 cents per pound below the prevailing domestic price; therefore it is a subsidy, even though it is paid in the name of the American farmer.

During the hearings the textile industry and the various departments—the Department of Commerce, the Department of Agriculture, all others that offered testimony in behalf of that subsidy—said, "If you would reduce the price of cotton to the textile mills you would reduce the price of cotton cloth to the consumers and it would average out that the consumers as taxpayers would save the money."

Statistics put out by the Department of Commerce show that cotton cloth is selling at a higher price today than it was selling before we started subsidizing the price of cotton for the textile mills, before we started giving them cotton at world prices. So the consumers did not receive the benefit of the subsidy, but the American taxpayers are paying this \$300 to \$400 million a year.

Certainly there is merit to the Senator's amendment that we should confine the agricultural program to the American farmer and not give it to big business, and the best argument that I know of in behalf of the Brewster amendment is made by those who tried to argue against it when they called attention to what it would do to the textile mills.

That is the secret to the whole problem. The textile mills are more interested in this program than the American cotton farmer because it is the mills that are getting the subsidies, not the American farmer. I think it is time that we confine our agricultural program to the farmers and not try to take care of the textile mills. If we are to subsidize the textile mills and other industries let us do it as a subsidy to the industries and not charge it up to the American farmers.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have two more brief requests, and I am glad to grant them.

First, I yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to make my position clear that I do not think this would benefit the consumer. It certainly would not benefit the small farmer, as the evidence already put into the RECORD by my colleague indicates. However, with regard to the argument of my friend, the Senator from Delaware, who is an expert on taxes, he knows very well that, even though large payments are made to individuals, the income tax—of which he is a great master—does much to bring the situation back into relationship, one with the other. Most of the payment will be recaptured in any case, and that is one of the functions of that tax.

I am sure that the principle that is sought to be applied here would not be applicable or acceptable by the Senator from Delaware or the other sponsors for many of the companies in their own States, which companies benefit to a great extent from Government contracts. I am sure that the Senator from Delaware would not want to apply a \$50,000 limitation on the DuPont Co. I am not suggesting it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I have opposed subsidies being paid to companies in any State in any amount. I only wish I had more support.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The principle that it is being sought to establish here arose last year. It has a saving factor. Its main objective is that if we take away this benefit for the larger companies, we negate the whole program. We might as well get started on a program to make it impossible for the big producers to comply.

I wanted to ask a question of the Senator from Maryland. He mentioned two companies in Arkansas.

Is it not a fact that the Arkansas Grain Corp., which the Senator mentioned, is a large cooperative with several thousand members, and that this money does not accrue to some big individual producers, but on the contrary accrues to several thousand small producers?

Mr. BREWSTER. I am sure that the Senator from Arkansas knows more about the situation in his State than I do. All I know is that \$16 million was advanced as a loan to a corporation in Arkansas and only \$10 million was repaid. The taxpayers lost \$6 million.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is probably the largest co-op in the State, and it has been very successful on the whole. I do not know about that loss. I had no notice of the loss aspect. However, the corporations which the Senator mentioned are two of the largest co-ops in the State. They have been quite successful in rice and soybeans, and I am sure that the full amount of the loan will be repaid when the crop has been fully marketed.

To leave the impression that some big corporate enterprise, such as DuPont Co., is taking a vast sum of money, I think is a misrepresentation of the facts.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, 1 minute will be sufficient.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I merely wanted a minute to say to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Delaware, that ordinarily I would be able to support the amendment.

The Senator from New Hampshire is not happy about the subsidy method that we had to resort to after a long, hard, and desperate fight in order to allow American textile mills to buy their cotton at the same price that their competitors abroad buy it.

It was the only way in which this could be done, and it was imperative that it should be done. However, after a long, hard fight, we have at last placed the American textile industry in a competitive position as far as buying cotton is concerned.

I could not vote for an amendment which might undo all we have accomplished and might possibly place our American textile mills back in a position of paying more for their raw materials.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Maryland raises an issue which has been raised over and over again. I have listened carefully to the arguments pro and con. I have obtained an analysis of the issue from the Department of Agriculture which I find persuasive. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

LIMITATION ON PAYMENTS

Salient points

Payments are an integral part of farm programs carefully tailored to specific commodity situations. For diversion they are partial compensation for adjustments made in the national interest. For price support they are economy, because in their absence expenditures would be higher. Payments are not "something for nothing," they are not welfare, and they do not represent hand-outs. They are a "quid pro quo" adopted as the least costly method of achieving program objectives. Their limitation could well be the beginning of the end of farm programs as we know them.

Discussion

A limitation on Government payments to producers of agricultural commodities would strike at the heart of our farm policy and probably result in the breakdown or death of the entire structure of farm programs in their present form. This conclusion inevitably evolves from consideration of a payments limitation in relation to our basic

agricultural policy, and the nature and purpose of our farm programs, and the role of payments in those programs.

Our basic agricultural policy is designed to provide a continuously adequate supply—but not a burdensome excess—of food and fiber products at stable prices which are fair to both producers and consumers without undue costs to the Government. This policy deals with agriculture as a whole, and the demand for farm products as a whole. Our agricultural policy is not a relief policy. It is not aimed at the plight of individuals or groups of individuals although it helps them by strengthening the economy of which they are individual parts.

FARM PROGRAMS

Farm programs are designed to achieve a reasonable balance between what farmers produce and what can be used—either domestically or through export channels. Present technology is so advanced and resources are so great that it is essential for these farm programs to be tailored to the prevailing commodity situation. Commodity programs are designed to affect the total economy of a commodity—the entire supply and the price for that entire supply.

Payments, like commodity programs, are geared to the circumstances of particular commodity situation. Payments under ASCS programs can be grouped in two categories: (1) diversion and price support, and (2) conservation.

1. *Diversion payments* are used to achieve a balance between production quantities that can be utilized, or, more literally, to induce a producer to hold down his acreage and production. (Such payments are made under acreage diversion programs for cotton, feed grains, and wheat, as well as cropland adjustment, cropland conversion, and conservation reserve programs. Other provisions of the commodity diversion programs—such as price support payments and certificates—also play a major role in reducing production to desirable levels.) Underlying diversion payments is the assumption that it is in the national interest to adjust production and supply. Such adjustments in the interest of the total economy or society should be apportioned. But a reduction in acreage is contrary to the individual farmer's interest—it reduces his income. Thus, there is a choice between two approaches: (1) give the farmer a *quid pro quo*—a diversion payment, or (2) maintain a mandatory program. The job is to adjust supply. The size of the payment only reflects the degree of participation or contribution to the total adjustment. Excluding large acreages from participation would be contrary to the purpose of the payment and the objective of the program. If large operators could not participate, total production would increase.

Loan operations, by their nature, would embrace the quantity that could not be marketed at the loan level. Denying or limiting the loan program to large operators would mean only that their production would be marketed largely through regular commercial channels, putting pressure on prices. Small operators would suffer from lower prices.

Thus, in the absence of higher payments to smaller farmers to withhold much more acreage, the production of smaller farmers would go under loan and total price support operations would increase. Either way, costs to the Government would go up.

Price support or equivalent payments are made to eligible producers of cotton, feed grains, wheat, wool, mohair, and sugar. The payments in the case of cotton and grains are offsets to reductions which have been made in returns which farmers heretofore could get for their crops by placing them under loan and turning them over to the Government in settlement of the loans. Payments on wool and mohair were described in the authorizing legislation as being intended to provide an incentive to increased produc-

tion. In the case of sugar, the economy of which is more highly and rigidly structured, payments are generally referred to as "conditional" because of the various requirements imposed requisite to their issuance. Further, sugar payments are more than offset by taxes imposed on sugar processed, both domestic and imported.

2. *Conservation payments* are made under various programs. A common characteristic of all such payments is that they share the costs incurred by owners in carrying out needed and approved conservation practices. Such payments have been appropriately described as reflecting the benefits to the total economy, or people collectively, from needed soil and water conservation.

PAYMENTS—SUBSIDY OR SACRIFICE?

There is substantial misunderstanding that Government payments to farmers are "something for nothing"—and nothing could be more incorrect. Moreover, in neither of the categories cited can payments be appropriately described as subsidies or net profit. In each case there is a consideration—a *quid pro quo* on the part of the producer.

Payments are *not* welfare. They are part of a stabilizing mechanism in the interest of the national economy. They have been adopted as the least costly method of achieving an objective. To limit the size of the payment would jeopardize the achievement of the objective. And, clearly, the supply adjustment is just as effective whether 10 producers divert 100 acres each or 100 farmers divert 10 acres each—so long as the unit rate of inducement is the same.

Payments are *not* handouts. Payments are made, for example, to farmers to take land out of production. It is their land; they have the capital, equipment, know how and the right to produce a commodity on it; and they forego the return from this output.

Payments are *not* net profit or subsidy. Payments are in lieu of income the producer would have received from raising crops on acreage held out of production, or to prevent losses which would occur to our endowment of soil and water resources for future generations in the absence of needed conservation measures.

In all cases, payments are in direct proportion to the farmer's contribution. Clearly, a payments limitation would prevent participation in programs by the larger producers. No useful purpose would be served and supply adjustment could not be accomplished by forcing such producers out of our programs. Their nonparticipation would, instead, result in increased costs to the Government, less effective programs, and perhaps a complete collapse of our present programs in a few years.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the prepared remarks of the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], who is necessarily absent, concerning the amendment offered today by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] be printed in the RECORD.

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

NATIONAL POLICY AGAINST BIGNESS?

(Statement by Senator TALMADGE)

If we proposed to place limitations upon government payments to farmers because of the size of the individual operation, we should clearly recognize the nature of the issue. It is not whether subsidies are good or bad. It is whether subsidies should be used as a means of discrimination against the larger individual farmers, who produce the bulk of our crops.

This would be an extremely dangerous move, not simply for agriculture but for the nation. It is not in keeping with American

tradition to oppose bigness as such, in business, industry and agriculture. We oppose bigness only where it restrains progress or otherwise harms public interest. But there is no contention that the large farms do any such thing. Much of our progress in agriculture, as in any other field, has been the result of bigness and the efficiency that normally goes with it.

In awarding Defense contracts—which necessarily contain various forms of subsidy—does our government avoid our giant corporations? Of course not. We are delighted to award billions in contracts to such outstanding firms as General Dynamics, General Electric, Boeing, North American Aviation, Lockheed, General Motors and Westinghouse. We are grateful that we have these big corporations with their enormous potential for equipping our defense establishments.

In this country we have a long history of subsidization in the national interest. It began with the very first Congress, in 1789, when subsidies were established to encourage American shipping. Today the subsidies for American shipping are heavier than ever. For example, subsidies on ship operations averaged almost \$180 million a year from 1960 through 1964. Subsidies on ship construction average almost \$100 million a year in the same period.

And is there any discrimination, based on size, in the subsidy the various shipping companies may receive? Of course not. There is no discrimination because of the size of the contract or the size of the company with whom the contract is made.

And what about the billions that have been spent on mail subsidies? Have we had limitations here based on size? Of course not. A big magazine like *Life*—which is constantly taking aim at the "farm subsidies"—gets the same benefits of the mail subsidies as the small publications. On the basis of a post office estimate made a number of years ago, the mail subsidy for *Life* (in 1956) was about \$9½ million, compared with only about \$800 thousand for *Coronet*.

What I am saying is that the question of price support limitation for farmers goes far beyond agriculture itself. If we should arbitrarily set a limitation on a farmer's size and opportunity, we should be opening the door to the same kind of penalty on bigness and efficiency throughout the rest of our economy.

Today the government has massive powers to influence our economy for better or for worse. There are so many different subsidies that it takes eight pages simply to list them in a recent Joint Economic Committee report entitled "Subsidy and Subsidy-Effect Program of the U.S. Government."

There is no way to set up a total amount of the subsidies paid. The Federal Government estimates its current subsidy expenditure at something over \$7 billion a year but this does not even begin to take into account the many hidden subsidy benefits that are associated with such things as tariffs, depletion allowances, accelerated amortization of facilities, investment credit, etc.

The Federal Government, of course, has virtually unlimited powers over every form of economic activity. And if we now decide to use this power to penalize bigness and efficiency in a basic industry such as agriculture, how long will it be before this same principle is applied in the rest of our economy?

Price support limitation based on size of a farm is unsound and dangerous. It flies in the teeth of our American tradition. It should be defeated.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have no further requests for time. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, of the Senator from Maryland. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Georgia would vote "nay," and the Senator from Washington would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS and Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Michigan would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 53, as follows:

[No. 139 Leg.]

YEAS—28

Allott	Bennett	Boggs
Bayh	Bible	Brewster

Burdick
Cannon
Case
Church
Dominick
Douglas
Hartke
Hickenlooper

Aiken
Bartlett
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Cotton
Dirksen
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Harris
Hart
Hayden
Hill
Holland

Anderson
Bass
Clark
Cooper
Curtis
Dodd
Gore

Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Lausche
McIntyre
Morton
Nelson
Prouty

NAYS—53

Inouye
Jordan, N.C.
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGovern
Metcalfe
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Moss
Mundt
Murphy

NOT VOTING—19

Griffin
Gruening
Hruska
Jackson
Javits
Magnuson
McGee

Proxmire
Ribicoff
Robertson
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Young, Ohio

Muskie
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Randolph
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smith
Stennis
Symington
Thurmond
Tydings
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

Scott
Smathers
Sparkman
Talmadge
Tower

So Mr. BREWSTER's amendment, as modified, was rejected.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PASTORE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I wish to call up my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

AMENDMENT NO. 644

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 18, line 7, strike out "\$100,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$125,000,000".

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

Mr. MONTOYA. I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. President, the amendment which I have offered seeks to increase the appropriation for the food stamp plan, or program, by \$25 million.

The Committee on Appropriations has recommended a total appropriation of \$125 million to operate the food stamp program in fiscal year 1967.

Participation at the beginning of fiscal year 1967 totaled between 1.2 and 1.3 million people—325 project areas are now in operation, and 14 areas are scheduled to open shortly. It is now estimated that \$120 million would be required to finance the program in these areas for the full fiscal year. The \$125 million approved by the Appropriations Committee would obviously permit only a minimal expansion.

In enacting the Food Stamp Act in 1964, Congress contemplated a gradual, orderly expansion until the program reached all States and all communities that wanted the program. In line with this approach, the program was expanded during fiscal year 1966 from an initial total of 110 areas, at the beginning of the fiscal year, to the present 325.

The number of people participating almost doubled—from just over 600,000 to more than 1.2 million.

The States are geared to this gradual expansion. They have filed requests on behalf of more than 400 areas. The low-income families in these areas need food assistance. Although our general level of prosperity is high, many families are not participating fully. Even the \$150 million requested will mean that some counties will remain on the waiting list at the end of this fiscal year.

The \$150 million I am requesting is within the budget request recommended by the President.

We have an odd situation here today in this appropriation bill. I thoroughly approve the committee's action with reference to the school lunch and special milk programs but I cannot agree with their action in reducing the recommended level of funding for the food stamp program. My amendment restores the full \$150 million requested for this program. I will support a move to provide the full \$150 million requested for this program.

I said we have an odd situation and it is. There has not been a single question raised as to the effectiveness and the efficiency with which this program is operated. I have heard no one question its purpose or doubt its results in improving diets for low-income families.

I have heard no one say that we should slow down its momentum because there are indications of sloppy administration in the Department of Agriculture or in the States or in the communities that have the program. We have heard this type of charge against programs administered by other agencies.

We passed the Food Stamp Act in 1964. That act contained an authorization of \$200 million for this fiscal year. The Department of Agriculture has not asked us to go that far. They are fulfilling the intent of Congress by providing an orderly, equitable expansion of the program to areas of the country that want and need the program. The \$125 million proposed by the committee cut things too fine. It will require \$120 million to operate the program in just those 325 areas now participating and the 14 areas scheduled to begin shortly. We are going to be in the position of disappointing a number of counties that, on the basis of the action taken in the other body with respect to this appropriation, had good reason to expect extension of the program to their people this year.

Many States have geared their finances in anticipation of the passage of the full budgeted amount which the President recommended of \$150 million, the amount I propose in my amendment.

The country is prosperous, no doubt of that. There is also no doubt that thousands of families need food assistance despite the general prosperity. The food stamp program is a sound, accepted dignified way of getting food assistance to these families. We are not dealing here with an overnight nationwide expansion of the program. We are proposing a moderate expansion to maintain the momentum that has developed and to assure the States and communities that

we meant what we said when we passed the act—the program will be made available in an orderly manner to every State and community that wants and needs the program.

I wish to say without reservation that I have a very high regard for the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], with whom I serve on the Committee on Agriculture. I know that he is sincere in the recommendations that have been made by his committee to the Senate.

But, Mr. President, food for hungry people should be the most important item on the agenda of the Senate. If we go through without increasing this appropriation to the level recommended by the President and the Department of Agriculture we are going to foreclose 300 additional areas throughout the country who are waiting for this bill to pass in order to program themselves into a food program which will feed hungry families throughout the vast expanse of the United States. That is what is at stake today and that is why I appeal to every Member of the Senate, because many Members have counties in their respective areas where hungry families are living and eking out an existence from day to day and going to bed hungry at night.

That is why it is of vast importance that we enact this program. The original intention of the program was to increase it gradually and that is what we are requesting by this amendment: to attempt to bring it up to the level recommended by the Department of Agriculture and the level that has been worked out by the States in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture.

Unless we do this many communities will be disappointed. But more importantly, many families who are going hungry will be deprived of this opportunity to feed their families and nourish their families properly so they can compete in American society with dignity and respect.

That is what is at stake. That is why I urge the adoption of the amendment today.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for 2 minutes?

Mr. MONTOYA. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I have tremendous sympathy for the amendment. It is meritorious, so far as I am concerned, in every respect.

However, I wish to say this: In my 16 years in the Senate I have never met a man who is more considerate, more compassionate or understanding, than the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. He, least of all men, would want any man, woman or child to go hungry. I know whatever he does, he does conscientiously, seriously, sincerely and he feels that what the committee has done is adequate in every respect.

But there are two sides to the story. I have been told that there are some communities in my own beloved State of Rhode Island that will have to go without this help, unless the amount is increased.

I have every confidence, after informal discussions with the proponent of the amendment and the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], that before the time expires on this amendment a proper adjustment will be made which will be satisfactory to carry out the intent and the desire of the Senate where human needs are involved.

I am told that there are several communities in my State that will face hardship if this help is not increased. That information comes from the Department of Agriculture.

It predicates a measure of suffering that need not be—and must not be.

I compliment the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA] for offering the amendment, and I express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] who has listened today with compassion. I know he will act with justice and equity on the amendment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for 5 minutes?

Mr. MONTOYA. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] for 5 minutes.

INCREASED APPROPRIATIONS NEEDED FOR FEDERAL FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to express my wholehearted support for the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA] to increase the appropriations in fiscal year 1967 for the Federal food stamp program. The fiscal year 1967 appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture provides \$100 million for the program with another \$25 to \$30 million expected in carryover funds from fiscal year 1966. I am reliably informed that the Department of Agriculture has contributed toward the operation of this program in 324 counties in the country. Another 300 counties have requested approval in the program in fiscal year 1967. I am told that it has been estimated that \$150 million is needed to operate the program in the 624 counties for fiscal year 1967, so it appears that the funds approved will not equal the needs in the counties already approved.

Mr. President, the State of West Virginia has long realized the benefits of this highly worthwhile program. It was begun as a pilot operation in May 1961, in McDowell County of West Virginia and has since been extended to 17 other counties in my State.

Although West Virginia has seen some improvement in its unemployment situation—due to the Appalachian regional development program—we are still faced with the unsolved problem of assisting our people with severe needs of survival in the small rural communities which have not benefited from the major developmental projects.

For this reason, we have requested that the food stamp program be extended to another 14 counties—many of which are the so-called pockets of unemployment. These counties all have small out-

of-the-way communities where elderly persons reside by themselves and where men who have the skills of coal miners, have not been able to find other jobs in other areas.

It is estimated that some 7,000 households and 25,000 persons in these counties could benefit from the program.

However, if the appropriations for fiscal year 1967 are not sufficient to maintain the program in the counties already approved, it is difficult to see how it may be extended to still more counties, not yet approved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McIntyre in the chair). The time of the Senator from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from West Virginia.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in those counties where food stamps have been offered, there has been ample testimony of the program's value. School officials readily testify that children are more alert when they are properly fed; employment offices note that men, as the heads of households, are more ambitious and physically fit to accept employment when it becomes available; doctors report less chronic illnesses among the elderly citizens of the communities.

May I also state here, that employment in West Virginia has not yet seen the same improvement as it has elsewhere. The latest figures for the State, available from the U.S. Department of Labor, indicate that unemployment is still in the 6-percent category.

May I quote one passage from the President's Appalachian Regional Commission which made its report in 1964. It said:

The nutritional problems of the region persist despite the dedicated efforts of State and Federal officials who administer the Federal school lunch and commodity distribution programs. Increased funds will be needed to permit the extension of the school lunch program to those schools not now participating. The commodity distribution program cannot, however, be corrected by simply adding additional funds. The very nature of the program restricts the variety of the foods distributed; as a result many suffer from a lack of certain essential nutrients. The food stamp program—which has operated in selected pilot counties in Appalachia—has demonstrated its basic merit in overcoming these deficiencies and should be expanded.

The report is still correct today as it applies to the rural areas of West Virginia. They need the program.

Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from New Mexico on his vision in offering this amendment and thank him for the time he has yielded to me to make these remarks.

I hope that the Senate will adopt the pending amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a list of those counties in West Virginia which would participate in the food

stamp program during fiscal year 1967, if the pending amendment is adopted.

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

Counties in West Virginia which would participate in the food stamp program during fiscal year 1967 if the amendment is adopted:

OTHER AREAS THAT HAVE REQUESTED THE PROGRAM

Cabell County, Mr. HECHLER.
Calhoun County, Mr. MOORE.
Gilmer County, Mr. MOORE.
Jackson County, Mr. HECHLER.
Lewis County, Mr. MOORE.
Pendleton County, Mr. STAGGERS.
Pocahontas County, Mr. STAGGERS.
Putnam County, Mr. HECHLER.
Randolph County, Mr. STAGGERS.
Roane County, Mr. HECHLER.
Upshur County, Mr. STAGGERS.
Wirt County, Mr. HECHLER.
Wood County, Mr. HECHLER.
Mason County, Mr. HECHLER.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. MONTTOYA. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have heard reference made to some 324 areas now receiving benefits from this program. By areas, does the Senator mean counties within the United States?

Mr. MONTTOYA. Yes. Governmental units, either municipalities or counties.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I see. Then, according to the information I have, there are some 20 counties in Arkansas which have made application for participation in the program. Do I correctly understand that if only \$125 million is appropriated, which is the amount in the Senate bill, that possibly none of these counties would be able to participate because there would not be ample funds to include them in the program?

Mr. MONTTOYA. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Do I further correctly understand that if the amount of the budget is appropriated, as I understand it, the Senator seeks to go no further in the budget recommended to the President and the Department of Agriculture up to \$150 million?

Mr. MONTTOYA. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is the budget. My understanding is that if that amount is appropriated, then some 5 or 6, possibly, of the 20 counties in Arkansas which have applied would be able to participate, but if we do not go to the budget, then there could be no new counties added in my State; is that substantially correct?

Mr. MONTTOYA. The Senator is correct. I stated in my remarks that there would be only minimal expansion. That is hardly any expansion at all.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Under the \$125 million appropriation?

Mr. MONTTOYA. That is correct. But if we get the full funding, then most of the counties in the Senator's State which have applied would be programed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not know whether most of those 20 counties have applied.

Mr. MONTTOYA. I do not know how many have been certified pending this appropriation. The Senator has that information.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In my State, it may be five or six which possibly would be included in the program. Unless this is granted, they would not be included.

I heard something said on the floor a moment ago, possibly in the course of debate on the Senator's amendment, that some effort is being made to work out something which will be agreeable and satisfactory.

Mr. MONTTOYA. I am hopeful that such an agreement can be made.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am not in the confidence of those who are undertaking to bring about an agreement on this question, but I hope that such an agreement can be made and worked out satisfactorily so that a number of counties which are anxious to participate, and are eligible to participate, counties in which families reside that the Senator has described, should be receiving benefits the same as other families in a comparable position. I hope that such an arrangement will be worked out. If not, I shall enthusiastically support the Senator's amendment because I believe that the program, where it can be extended, should be extended at least up to the budget recommendations.

If we are going to bring about some reduction in the budget and try to hold down expenditures, I believe I would rather reduce it in some other area where a program is just getting underway, where there is not much experience, and we are not certain they are operating on behalf of those for whom the benefits are intended.

We know that those who are in need of assistance are being reached. As the Senator knows, there has been no criticism of the administration of the program up to now. We can have full confidence and assurance that whatever we appropriate will go toward providing the benefits we seek to bring about.

Mr. MONTTOYA. I thank the Senator for his valuable contribution.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. MONTTOYA. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MONDALE. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Mexico and commend him for his leadership on this important issue.

I am proud to serve with him on the Agriculture and Forestry Committee. His leadership on this issue is typical of his creativity, the dedication he gives to American agriculture, and to the proper application of the abundance of American agriculture in the American society, and in shipping food overseas.

At present, in Minnesota, as I understand it, there are 12 counties which are in operation. Since June 1 of this year, three more counties have been added to the list. Hennepin County will be added on August 1, making a total of 16 counties presently or which will be in operation during the current year.

In addition, there are 16 additional counties—Renville, Lyon, Dakota, Benton, Clearwater, Otter Tail, Washington, Pipestone, Wright, Polk, Roseau, Chisago, Aitkin, Pine, Chippewa—which have requested participation in the program but which, under present circumstances, must be denied when the last full funding requested by the President is appropriated by Congress.

Is that the understanding of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. MONTTOYA. Yes. I am so informed by the Department of Agriculture. In fact, I supplied the list to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MONDALE. I am most pleased to join with the Senator from New Mexico in what is a needed improvement in the program.

Mr. MONTTOYA. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

I now yield to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON].

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I associate myself with the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico. I do not think the problem is whether or not we feed the hungry—we are going to do it—but how we feed them. I think this is the best way to do it, rather than have somebody drive up to a warehouse and take a big basket of groceries, which is obviously against our economic system and our distribution of food, wholesale and retail. This certainly is the best plan to throw out of balance, to a lesser extent, the American economic system. I think it is so much better than providing gratuities at the warehouse, because the retailer and wholesaler are taxpayers and they furnish some of the funds that go into this program.

Mr. MONTTOYA. May I interject to say that, according to a study made by the Department of Agriculture, in the small communities where the Department has started to have the same program, grocery stores have noticed and experienced an 8-percent increase of intake at the retail level.

Mr. MORTON. Yes; and that means a tax paid at the local, statewide, and Federal level.

I merely say to the Senator that we obviously are not going to shirk our duty to feed the hungry. The best way to do it is through the plan the Senator has offered.

Mr. MONTTOYA. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for the valuable contribution he has made.

I yield now to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is a privilege to associate myself with the amendment sponsored by the able Senator from New Mexico. I think it is well for us to realize that, in reality, this is not a handout; it is a helping hand. There is a very real difference between the two.

As the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] so well said, this is a program for aiding needy families to which the Senate and the American people will subscribe.

The food stamp program benefits those families who are receiving some type of

welfare assistance—including the unemployed, the aged, blind persons, the handicapped, and mothers with dependent children. There is also food stamp authorization to assist other families with incomes as low as or lower than those of families receiving welfare assistance, but who, for a variety of reasons, are not eligible for welfare grants. These may include persons living on small pensions, the unemployed, the underemployed, and those whose training limits them to unskilled low-paying employment.

Mr. MONTROYA. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, may I inquire how much time I have left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). The Senator from New Mexico has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. MONTROYA. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, under the program, families must invest the money they would normally spend for food in the purchase of food stamps. In return, they receive additional stamps without charge. The normal food budget continues to be spent for food. But, as we know, the normal food budget for low-income families cannot meet financially the nutritional requirements for a sound diet. Thus, one of the principal objectives of the food stamp program which has been very successful in West Virginia is to stimulate the use of more nutritious food for low-income families.

I am told that during fiscal 1966 the food stamp program was expanded to about 1.3 million eligible persons in approved areas throughout the country. The budget request of \$150 million—the figure in the House bill which our Appropriations Committee would reduce to \$125 million—would permit further expansion to thousands of needy people located in approximately 300 more areas. With the continuing improvement in employment in larger and more industrialized areas, States have placed a priority on making the program operative in smaller and more rural areas. This is indicated and vital in West Virginia.

Hence, enlargement of the food stamp program is important to our State. There are 18 counties in West Virginia currently participating in the program, embracing approximately 72,000 eligible persons. But, Mr. President, there are 14 priority counties with pending applications certified by the State welfare agency. The number of counties across the Nation awaiting approval is approximately 400. It is my understanding that to enable participation by any substantial number of these additional counties it is necessary that the budget request of \$150 million be approved. The pending applications may affect as many as 28,000 needy persons.

Mr. President, Gov. Hulett C. Smith, of West Virginia, has telephoned to express his concern that the food stamp program funding recommended by the Senate Appropriations Committee is inadequate. Governor Smith, through the responsible State agencies, has directed successful and effective food stamp proj-

ects. He indicated the pressing need for programs in the 14 additional priority counties in West Virginia.

I support the amendment of the capable and distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTROYA]. He is to be commended for his alertness in moving forward with this worthy effort. I am hopeful that the Members of the Senate will restore the food stamp appropriation to the \$150 million budget level, thus providing the means through which food stamps may be extended to thousands of needy citizens on a realistic basis—not by a handout but by a helping hand from Government.

I support the amendment. I trust that the Senate will not so much override the Committee on Appropriations on this matter, but will realize the validity of the proposal which is advanced.

Mr. MONTROYA. I thank my good friend from West Virginia for his contribution.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am not without sympathy for the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico and supported by other Senators. The RECORD should clearly show what has happened in this matter.

First, the Senator from Florida was a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the legislative committee which studied, reported, and supported to passage the Food Stamp Act. The Senator from Florida has been and is in sympathy with the purpose of that bill.

Second, last year the agency asked us for \$100 million. We provided the full amount. We were assured that it would be spent in fiscal year 1966. To the contrary, only \$70 million of that amount was spent; \$30 million remains unexpended.

When the agency requested \$150 million this year, they later told us that they would have a carryover of \$25 million, meaning that they were asking for twice the amount they had expended in fiscal 1966.

The committee thought that that was a little big for a step-up, so we suggested an appropriation in the amount which is provided in the bill, in addition we provided for the reappropriation of the unexpended \$25 million.

Now we find that the agency has made a larger mistake and has a \$30 million carryover.

I have told the distinguished Senator from New Mexico that it seems to me we are being very generous toward this objective if we double the appropriation that was actually spent last year, from \$70 to \$140 million. So far as I am concerned, I am not disposed to be ungenerous with this program but the subject was heard by the full committee.

I am disposed to step up the amount to \$140 million, which is \$70 million more than was spent last year, in spite of the fact that we are at the highest period of employment we have had. This would be accomplished by a step-up of the direct appropriation from \$100 to \$110 million, and by stepping up the reappropriated amount, as is found in

the bill, from \$25 to \$30 million. It seems to me that that is about as generous as our distinguished friends could expect us to be. That will still leave in conference with the House the difference between \$140 and \$150 million.

Mr. MONTROYA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MONTROYA. Mr. President, I should like to modify my amendment accordingly, and I ask unanimous consent that I may do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). The yeas and nays have not been ordered on the amendment, so the Senator has a right to modify his amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. That would mean that the Senator would step up the first amount from \$100 million to \$110 million, and the second from \$25 million to \$30 million?

Mr. MONTROYA. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I would have no objection to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

Mr. MONTROYA. I sincerely thank the Senator from Florida for making this concession. I want it clearly understood that my remarks were not intended to cast any reflection upon the Senator's integrity or his feeling for hungry people. He is doing the job as he sees it in the Committee on Appropriations. I know that in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry he has always exhibited a compassionate heart for the hungry, poor people of the country. I thank him for accepting this compromise on the floor of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it the understanding of the Chair that the Senator from New Mexico has modified his amendment as indicated by the Senator from Florida?

Mr. MONTROYA. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, may I read for the RECORD the modified amendment—at least as I understand it?

On page 18, line 7, strike out "\$100 million" and insert "\$110 million"; and on page 18, line 8, strike out "\$25 million" and insert "\$30 million."

That is the latest estimate on the amount of the carryover.

Is that the Senator's understanding?

Mr. MONTROYA. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. MONTROYA. Yes; except I wish to say this, to conclude my remarks: I commend the two Senators from West Virginia, who have manifested great interest in this amendment, and have lent me considerable advice. In fact, West Virginia was the first food stamp area certified by the late President Kennedy in 1961.

Because of their interest, and because of the interest manifested by other distinguished Senators here, I have offered the amendment, and I am deeply grateful to the Senator from Florida, as well as to the Senator from Rhode Island,

who has been greatly interested and has contributed to the solution of this problem.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to have been able to work the matter out with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

I now yield such time on the bill as he wishes to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all time yielded back on the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MONTROYA. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico, as modified.

The amendment of the Senator from New Mexico, as modified was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] for his dedicated efforts in bringing the Agriculture Appropriations bill to the Senate floor.

He has been sympathetically understanding and cooperative. I know of his knowledgeability and interest in the problems of Appalachia. I know him to be a dedicated Senator with an abiding concern for people.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. I now yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the courtesy of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations, the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] in yielding to me.

I wish to discuss with him briefly the amounts of money involved and the language written into the bill regarding one of the appropriations in which I am greatly interested—the watershed projects.

A very excellent article by John B. Reubens, managing editor, was recently carried in the Central States Construction magazine, from which I quote as follows:

Watershed projects are initiated by local groups and directed by a local board. Under Public Law 566, the Hope-Alken Act of 1956, federal funds are available to pay for costs of construction but the local people must provide right-of-way, water rights, land rights and maintain the completed project. If structures cost less than \$250,000, they can be approved at the state level; otherwise, the watershed plan must go to the appropriate committee of the U.S. Senate and House for approval.

Congress itself makes a yearly identified appropriation to finance Soil Conservation Service work on watershed protection. After salaries, in fiscal 1966, there was \$54 million available for construction and another \$5.9 million marked for watershed planning. According to experts, this was adequate because the SCS engineering staff cannot handle much more work than these funds will

permit. For fiscal 1967, about \$55 million was available for construction and \$6.1 million set aside for planning.

At this point, executive interference with Congressional decision intervened. The Bureau of the Budget managed to get a directive written into the appropriation act, reducing the long-standing annual allowance of 100 projects planned and 80 under construction to 50 under planning and 35 under construction. This, for the entire United States.

When we consider that there are 469 watershed districts, completed or under construction in the United States, and that there were 2400 applications for districts on file as of January 1966, this limitation is unbelievable. At the rate fixed by the Budget boys, it would take 48 years to dispose of the planning backlog alone. Worse yet, since a large watershed may require as much as 8 years to complete its structures, time to construct even projects already approved would extend infinitely. This is not what the Congress wanted or wrote into the law.

As I understand it, from reading the report, there has been a reduction in the number of projects that can be completed under the President's proposal, and also certain limitations on the fund. I would appreciate any comments the chairman of the committee could make on that matter.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the request, and also the interest the distinguished Senator from Kansas has shown in this matter. It is a matter which has caused a great deal of concern to the committee.

The committee is in favor of the small watershed program. We have found through the years, however, that we have been making disproportionate appropriations for planning of new projects, in comparison with the money we have made available to carry out the advanced plans and perform the construction work. We have complained of this in earlier years. This year, we decided the best way was to take this dilemma by the horns and step up the appropriation for construction, which we did by \$2 million, we also reduced the number of new projects which can be worked on this year to 60, because the backlog of planned projects has grown steadily year by year until we are several years behind.

That obviously is not an unreasonable way to approach the program, and I hope the distinguished Senator will feel that our giving \$2 million more for construction is proof positive of our interest in the program and of our desire to see it go ahead more rapidly than heretofore.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the statement of the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], because I know of no one who has had greater interest in this field than he. Therefore, I fully accept his response, and appreciate it greatly.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I may say that several members of our committee were greatly interested in this subject, some of whom I see on the floor. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Colorado, who was one of those so interested.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator very much. I was one of those who were very much interested in this matter. On firsthand, cursory examination, it did appear that the committee was doing an injustice. The explanation the Senator from Florida has given here is the one that was given in the committee.

There is one other thing which he mentioned in the committee, which I think should be brought out for the record here. Is it not a fact that in some instances the planning had proceeded so rapidly ahead of the construction that they had actually had to do some replanning on projects which had already been completely planned at one time?

Mr. HOLLAND. That statement was made by my distinguished friend, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the ranking minority member, who has several times told me that was the case. I am very sure that it is the case, and it would logically have to be. When you have plans developed years in advance, by the time you reach the construction stage, there are different developments in the area on the local lands and farms, and it naturally requires certain replanning.

I am sure that the Senator from North Dakota will recall having made that statement.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes; the Senator is correct. Our planning of these projects is ahead of the construction program.

If you are planning 4 or 5 years ahead of the time that construction of a project is undertaken, much of the planning is out of date and has to be done again. I agree with the Senator from Florida, the chairman of the subcommittee, that we should step up the funds for construction, and ease up a bit on the planning.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator from Florida. I think it is a fact that when you plan 4 or 5 years ahead, it is almost a certainty that you will have to replan before you can construct.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. In the meantime, that involves additional money, and it disappoints many people, who think that when you have the plans drawn, that means construction is imminent. In many instances, that has not been the case.

I now yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask the Senator to yield at this time so that I may ask for the yeas and nays on final passage of the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have no objection to yielding for that purpose.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, each year I have served in the Senate, I have supported the agriculture appropriations bill, without which there would be no

farm programs. I intend to continue this policy with respect to the bill now before the Senate.

Even though I have disagreed with some of these programs and have voted against them, I nevertheless recognize that a failure to appropriate the money to continue farm programs would be disastrous to the agriculture sector of our economy.

I might point out that a good many farmers have recently become acutely aware of the seriousness of the defects contained in some of these programs—defects in the form of undue authority in the Secretary of Agriculture to exercise powers which depress market prices of agricultural products. These powers should be far more carefully regulated by laws passed by the Congress than has heretofore been the case.

The action by the Senate Appropriations Committee has, in good measure, restored some short-sighted reductions proposed by the President and his Budget Bureau.

The cooperative research service program for the State experimental stations would have been seriously impaired in Iowa and in other States by the proposed reduction of over \$7 million, which reduction has been restored along with \$5 million needed for maintenance of personnel at increased salary levels needed to meet the cost-of-living increase caused by inflation and also needed to strengthen the program.

The proposed reduction of \$9,600,000 for distribution to the States under the extension service program has been rejected; a reduction of \$20,200 for agricultural engineering research at Iowa State University has been restored; elimination of \$10,000 for cooperative beef cattle breeding research at Iowa State University was rejected, as was a proposed elimination of \$10,900 for research in corn genetics and breeding.

Perhaps the most significant action taken by the bill is the complete rejection of the administration's proposed cut from \$103 to \$21 million for the special school milk program; and not only is the administration's proposed reduction in the school lunch program from \$157 to \$138 million rejected, but the program will receive an additional \$10 million to meet the normal growth requirements. I might point out that I cosponsored a bill to maintain our school milk program at current levels, and this was covered by the recently passed Child Nutrition Act which I also supported. Action by the Senate in these matters indicates a consensus that the administration proposals to cut these programs while at the same time expanding less essential programs were not well founded.

I might note that the committee report at pages 47 and 48 contains language designed to avoid unnecessary and time-consuming action by REA-financed cooperatives, and this should make more acceptable the guidelines spelled out in the fiscal 1964 committee report.

I believe the Appropriations Committee has done a commendable job, Mr.

President, and I wish to commend it for placing before us a money bill which is as reasonable as one could expect, taking into consideration the programs that need to be funded.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I know of one further amendment, of which I have received notice that it might be presented, by the distinguished Senator from Michigan. I do not see him in the Chamber. Therefore, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Florida indulge the Chair for an inquiry? Is the time to be charged against his side?

Mr. HOLLAND. I suggest that the time be charged to neither side, Mr. President, unless there is objection.

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan has an amendment to offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 646

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 646 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Page 17, line 16, strike out "\$167,000,000" and insert "\$171,500,000".

Page 17, lines 16-17, strike "\$2,000,000" and insert "\$6,500,000".

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I modify my amendment at this time to make it read:

Page 17, line 16, strike out "\$167,000,000" and insert "\$169,500,000".

Page 17, lines 16-17, strike \$2,000,000" and insert "\$4,500,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, this amendment would provide additional Federal funds to implement section 11 of the National School Lunch Act.

The committee recommended \$2 million, the same amount provided for fiscal year 1966. Last year \$2 million resulted from action taken on an amendment which I offered on the floor and which the able Senator from Florida graciously accepted. This year the Department of Agriculture requested, and the budget proposed, an increase to \$6.5 million for fiscal year 1967. My amendment, prior to modification, would have increased spending under section 11 of the National School Lunch Act to that recommended figure.

It was in 1962 that the Congress added section 11 to the National School Lunch

Act. This section, carrying its own provisions for the apportionment of funds among the States, is intended to provide an extra level of support for a lunch program in schools drawing attendance from particularly needy areas.

We have had 20 years of highly successful experience with the national school lunch program. It is available to three-fourths of the children enrolled in public and nonprofit private elementary and secondary schools. Eighteen million children participated in the program during the last fiscal year—about half of all children enrolled in schools that are in the national school lunch program.

One of the requirements made of schools under the National School Lunch Act is that children who cannot afford to pay the full price of the meal must be served a lunch at reduced price or free. For most of the schools in the program, fulfilling this requirement is not an undue burden. But many schools either did not come into the program at all because they knew they could not finance the lunch service or, if they were in the program, could underwrite the cost of the lunch for only their very neediest students. In both instances, the children suffer—they are the ones deprived of a program intended to help them. Section 11 was aimed at helping schools in this situation.

The \$2 million we appropriated for this purpose last year was used to develop a series of demonstration projects—at least one in every State and the District of Columbia—to show what could be done with a higher rate of Federal cash reimbursement per lunch and a great deal of effort and initiative on the part of the State educational agencies and the local communities.

The level of Federal support including surplus foods provided for each lunch was still less than half the cost of putting that lunch on the table. The balance had to come from State and local sources and whatever the child could pay.

The States had very little time to get the demonstration projects rolling and they did a commendable job. Since the Federal cash assistance can be used only for food, local school officials and civic groups had to meet other program costs as best they could.

A total of 831 schools participated in the demonstration projects. The enrollment in these schools was 325,000 children. Nearly 137,000 children, or more than 60 percent of the total enrollment, participated on a daily basis. A total of 82 schools operated lunch programs for the first time. The average daily participation was approximately two-thirds of the total enrollment in these 82 schools. I ask unanimous consent that a tabulation showing the number of projects by State and the number of children participating be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Special school lunch demonstration projects under sec. 11 of the National School Lunch Act—Increases in participation resulting from special assistance payments¹

Projects	Average daily participation				Lunch price		Projects	Average daily participation				Lunch price	
	Before sec. 11	After sec. 11	Additional children		Before sec. 11	After sec. 11		Before sec. 11	After sec. 11	Additional children		Before sec. 11	After sec. 11
Number	Number	Number	Number	Cents	Cents		Number	Number	Number	Number	Cents	Cents	
Alabama.....	16	720	2,546	1,826	2 23	2 23	Missouri.....	2	1,017	1,151	134	22	10
Arizona.....	4	676	1,723	847	27	15	New Jersey.....	3	311	362	51	30	20
Arkansas.....	10	561	1,876	1,315	20	15	New Mexico.....	18	1,974	2,163	189	19	19
California.....	20	3,604	5,971	2,367	31	21	New York.....	106	25,809	29,017	3,208	25	22
Colorado.....	3	276	453	177	30	15	North Carolina.....	6	2,060	4,991	2,931	23	12
Connecticut.....	1	311	491	180	35	25	Ohio.....	5	2,336	2,766	430	27	17
Delaware.....	1	58	113	55	25	15	Oklahoma.....	3	1,009	1,394	385	23	18
District of Columbia.....	1	295	547	252	30	20	Oregon.....	1	222	314	92	25	15
Florida.....	12	3,800	5,500	1,700	31	15	Pennsylvania.....	25	3,995	5,169	1,174	32	15
Georgia.....	20	5,560	7,356	1,796	25	19	Rhode Island.....	1	225	776	551	30	10
Hawaii.....	2	224	247	23	25	17	South Carolina.....	14	2,365	3,663	1,298	17	15
Illinois.....	7	1,200	1,800	600	24	16	South Dakota.....	11	744	874	130	26	20
Indiana.....	5	353	697	344	33	19	Tennessee.....	7	7,088	8,106	1,018	24	16
Kentucky.....	61	11,401	13,800	2,399	26	8	Texas.....	31	4,401	8,072	3,671	(?)	(?)
Louisiana.....	13	6,384	8,912	2,528	17	18	Utah.....	2	369	584	215	20	10
Maine.....	4	120	250	130	27	15	Virginia.....	13	1,459	2,761	1,302	26	13
Maryland.....	5	413	686	273	26	19	Washington.....	2	362	469	107	28	15
Massachusetts.....	15	1,382	2,517	1,135	20	15	West Virginia.....	23	2,776	3,195	419	24	21
Michigan.....	19	3,407	4,147	740	22	14	Wisconsin.....	5	865	1,000	135	23	13
Minnesota.....	5	2,203	2,404	201	21	16							
Mississippi.....	8	1,834	3,448	1,614	19	14	Total.....	581	104,169	142,111	37,942		

¹ Data not shown for several States because incomplete.

² Lunch prices not reduced. Special payments used to finance additional free meals.

³ Not available.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, while complete data are not available on the level of participation in each of the projects prior to the pilot program, it is estimated that more than 50,000 needy children received lunches for the first time at school.

I would like to give a few examples as to how the program worked and what some of the people most deeply involved with the education of these children feel:

In Michigan, typical of immediate results achieved was the record in the Pelham School in Detroit which supplied lunches for the first time to 437 of its 959 attending children. In Les Cheneaux School in Mackinac County with 526 attending children participation rose from 256 to 308, a 20-percent increase. Similar participation increases were noted in other Michigan schools selected for the project.

In North Carolina, six schools participated in the demonstration project. Prior to the new program, less than one-third of the total enrollment of 6,400 children were participating in the lunch program. As a result of the additional assistance provided the student participation increased from 2,060 to nearly 5,000.

In California, 20 schools were approved for special assistance with an average daily attendance of 13,840 children. Here, the increase in participation as a result of reducing the lunch price from 30 cents to 20 cents, was 65 percent. In addition, there was a decrease in the number of lunches previously served free because more children could afford to pay the lower price for the lunch.

In Pennsylvania, 25 urban and rural schools with an enrollment of 9,000 children were approved as demonstration projects. Lunch prices were reduced from an average of 31.7 cents to 15.7 cents in these schools. As a result, the level of program participation increased

by one-third and the number of free lunches provided more than doubled.

Here is what a few teachers and principals had to say as to the effects of the program:

Joseph C. Carroll, Principal, Washington Elementary School, Kenner, Louisiana: "I have seen a tremendous result since participation in the lunchroom has been increased due to lowering the lunch price from 20 cents to 12 cents per child. This improvement has been physically and scholastically noticed."

Sister M. Florence, OSB, teacher, Our Lady of Guadalupe School, La Junta, Colorado: "... there has been a definite increase in alertness and attention in school. Several children who habitually fell asleep during lessons no longer do so. One child used to faint periodically from lack of food. This also has stopped."

L. S. Mosely, Principal, Cumbeary High School, Cumbeary, North Carolina: "Since the initiation of the new program on December 1, 1965, the ADP (average daily participation) has more than doubled. Teachers have reported better attendance and improvement in the academic work of the students. The morale of the whole school is much higher."

Mrs. Wise—School Nurse, Shaw Jr. High School, Washington, D.C. Said she was "very pleased with the program" and stated "there was a remarkable change in the students now eating in the cafeteria for the first time." She "reported a decreasing number of students complaining of stomach cramps (from lack of food) and the children seemed to be happier."

R. P. Martin, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Herford County, North Carolina, Re: Robert L. Vann School, Abeskie, North Carolina: "The Special Assistance Program has enabled the school to feed in excess of 1,200 students daily since December 1, 1965, and the effect has been gratifying. Pupil morale is up. They take more pride in their lunchroom and in their school. Large numbers eating in organized groups in assigned areas of the room with the lunch period being used as a teaching and learning period in good eating habits, proper use of eating utensils, and good health practices is having a noticeable effect on the children. Teachers report that children who were formerly inattentive in class due to lack of proper nourishment have shown improvement in

their class work and seem more interested in achieving the educational goals set for them. Many of the children who formerly were absent much of the time have improved attendance records resulting in better school work."

In the light of these results and these endorsements, I believe this program has demonstrated its effectiveness and has justified the congressional action in adopting this special approach in 1962.

I believe we can now do no less than continue this effort at the present level for the coming school year by providing \$4.5 million.

There is uniform agreement that the program has been exceptionally wisely undertaken. The experience with the program, as indeed is reflected in the report filed a few days ago by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on the child nutrition law, makes clear that the program deserves the fullest support based on this very satisfactory experience.

I would hope that 1 year's additional experience at the present level will persuade us substantially to increase it in the years ahead.

The distinguished and able manager of the bill and chairman, the senior Senator from Florida, and the ranking minority member, Mr. Young of North Dakota, and I have reviewed the objective that is sought to be attained by the amendment. I believe they concur in the \$4.5 million figure. The amendment, I hope, will be supported.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the purpose of the committee in including the \$2 million was to fulfill the effort that had been started last year. We thought and had been given reason to believe that this amount would permit carrying the program on through the next year, as started.

It now appears that is not true. The amendment of the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan has been modified to cover the inclusion of \$4.5 million

rather than \$2 million as provided by the committee. This will finance expenses for the full year on the trial program.

Mr. HART. That is my understanding.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, with that understanding, the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from Florida, without endeavoring to speak for all members of the committee—because we have not had a chance to confer with them—are willing to accept the amendment and take it to conference.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I am very grateful, as I was a year ago, to the Senator from Florida and to the Senator from North Dakota for their recognition of the value of the program and for their willingness to attempt to maintain it.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan is a very good salesman and has done an excellent job of presenting his case. This program is a very fine one.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART]. During the course of the last year, I had an opportunity to visit with Father Charles Woodrich of the Annunciation Grade School in Denver, Colo. This parish is in the center of the city of Denver and is made up largely of low income, Spanish and Negro families. Father Woodrich's school was invited to participate by USDA under the pilot program which was funded by the \$2 million implement to section 11, offered by Senator HART last year. The parish inaugurated a special assistance lunch program. It produced remarkable effects.

Father Woodrich has summarized the results of the program in the attached statement. I ask unanimous consent that his statement entitled "Special Assistance Lunch Programs for Elementary and Secondary Poor Schools" be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

SPECIAL ASSISTANCE LUNCH PROGRAMS FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY POOR SCHOOLS

When the War on Poverty of this administration started, we were invited to take part in what USDA called a Special Assistance Lunch Program.

There had been no food program in poor schools because the schools would have to charge 30 or 35¢ for a lunch and the administrators knew the children could not afford it. Consequently the whole program would be a failure. So we began 10¢ hot lunch for grade school kids and 15¢ for high school students.

How does the Special Assistance Lunch Program work?

USDA gives double allotments of surplus foods and every month pays each school in cash for all the food they buy to give a balanced diet. (This cannot exceed 15¢ per day per child.) This gives a child milk, meat, vegetables, freshly baked rolls, fruit and

dessert. The child comes back for seconds, or thirds, free of cost. Also extra milk is free. The children are so hungry that it is necessary to cook twice as many meals as there are children in order to satisfy their hunger. For most of them it is the only balanced meal they get all day.

The 10 and 15¢ pays the cooks and other incidentals in running the kitchen. Now this is possible because there is volume, all the kids are eating. Not a few children, as in 30 or 35¢ lunch programs in the poor schools at the present time.

Results from the Program: 1 and ½ years as pilot study in Denver, Colorado

(1) All the kids eat every day.
(2) Absenteeism is down 36%.
(3) Their marks have gone up, because they have energy to study.

(4) Stealing and other Juvenile crimes dropped. There are one out of 300 children per year compared to 1 out of twenty in the other schools where they do not eat.

(5) The kids take part in extra curricular activities, sports, etc. Before they did not have enough energy to do this. Their interest is up. And they stop hanging around with those that are out of school after school hours.

(6) Health and knowledge of new foods and eating habits is much better. They cannot be measured by yardstick you have to see it and then you just know this to be true.

(7) This program positively stopped drop outs in many cases. I know because I have seen the cases.

A poor child cannot pay 30 or 35¢ for a Hot Lunch, so he goes hungry. (This is all the National School Lunch Program provides now).

SUMMARY

USDA needs about \$24,000,000 to be allocated to the Section 11 of the National School Lunch Program of 1963 and the poor children in all the poor schools of this great country can be fed a decent meal.

\$2,000,000 was allocated by Congress last year to study this, but we don't need to study on empty stomachs to find out it needs food. We need the program now.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I call the Senate's attention to Father Woodrich's summary in which he states that USDA needs \$24 million under section 11 of the national school lunch program in order to take care of all poor children in all poor schools. In view of this great need, let me say that the amendment of the senior Senator from Michigan in the amount of \$4.5 million is a modest one indeed. Permit me to urge the Senate to adopt his amendment and to instruct the conferees on the part of the Senate to insist on this amendment being sustained in conference.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time on the amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, of the senior Senator from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, there may be some Senator who has an amendment to offer, but I have no knowledge of it.

Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Texas.

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

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I again express my thanks, admiration, and appreciation to the chairman of the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. He has put in a tremendous amount of work on this bill. His great knowledge of agriculture has been gained from many years of work on both the Agriculture Committee and on the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee. While no one is ever completely satisfied with an appropriations bill, we must recognize that the job of a chairman is a demanding one. The Senator from Florida shows unflinching patience and courtesy.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. President, the committee report contains language which should enable the rural electrification program to go forward in a prudent, sound manner to meet the increased needs of the future.

The directions of the committee report accompanying the fiscal year 1964 Agriculture Department appropriations bill require that, before approving loans for generation and major transmission, the REA Administrator take certain steps to evaluate existing or proposed contracts by which private companies supply or offer to supply wholesale service to REA-financed cooperatives.

I ask unanimous consent that those directions of the 1964 report be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

TITLE II—CREDIT AGENCIES

**Rural Electrification Administration
Electrification Loan Program**

The success of the rural electrification program in bringing electricity to the farms and rural areas has been an outstanding development in the past quarter century. It has benefited both the rural and urban segments of the national economy. The electrification of rural areas brought to rural residents the advantages of modern living which city people had long enjoyed. Power-type equipment operated on farms has opened a vast market in manufacturing and commerce. Nonfarm employment opportunities have expanded. The rapid growth in the economy has in large part developed from the contribution that REA-financed electrification loans has brought to the rural areas.

During the course of the hearings this year, the committee has presented to it, as it has in the past, widely divergent views with respect to REA loans for generation and transmission facilities.

As previously stated, this committee believes that both the rural electric cooperatives and the private power companies who furnish most of the supply of energy needed to serve the electric cooperatives are here to stay and they should make every effort to enter into earnest negotiations in reaching power supply contracts because it is to the mutual advantage of the cooperatives and the private companies to enter into satisfactory power supply arrangements.

The committee recognizes that the House recommended a new procedure for REA after hearing the differing points of view surrounding the loans made by the Rural Electrification Administration for generation and transmission purposes.

This committee concurs with the recommendations set forth in the House committee report, to wit:

Before public funds are loaned for power generation or transmission, the Rural Electrification Administrator, in connection with any such loan, should:

(1) Make a survey and determine wherein the existing contract for power or the proposed contract is unreasonable;

(2) Advise the supplier wherein such contract is unreasonable; and

(3) Attempt to get such contract modified to make it reasonable.

Loans should be made only when reasonable contracts cannot be obtained.

With regard to any further generation and major transmission loan approved in excess of \$2 million, the Administrator shall certify to the Secretary of Agriculture, the Comptroller General, and the Congress, that each of these steps has been taken and that the private supplier had been given an opportunity to make the contract reasonable, specifying the details, and had refused or failed to do so.

The Administrator also shall furnish the Comptroller General and the Congress on the date of approval of each such loan application, the following information:

(1) The name and address of the applicant borrower and the date of the application.

(2) Description and estimated cost of the proposed generation facilities. Indicate if the proposed facilities are the initial or additional unit or units of a plant comprised of one or more units.

(3) Description and estimated cost of proposed transmission facilities, including any immediate or future plans to interconnect with other transmission systems.

(4) Description of any long-range plans the applicant may have for construction of additional generation and transmission facilities and the estimated cost of the planned facilities.

(5) Comparison of the estimated costs of generation by the applicant borrower with the cost of power available from existing suppliers, including the final offer by the private supplier including terms and conditions he offered to meet applicant's long-term energy needs.

(6) Summary of the efforts made by the applicant and by REA to obtain the applicant's power and energy requirements from existing power suppliers and the reasons why such efforts have not been successful.

(7) Explanation of the applicant's reasons for seeking an REA loan.

(8) The amount of electric energy which the applicant will cease to purchase from present power suppliers upon construction of the generating plant for which REA financing is being sought.

(9) Explanation of the extent to which the feasibility of the requested loan for generation and transmission facilities depends upon the use of a portion of the facilities by others (including Federal power marketing agencies).

(10) Details of the applicant's plans to sell or otherwise make available any of the power and energy from the proposed generation facilities to others (including Federal power marketing agencies).

(11) Names of State agencies and commissions having jurisdiction over the applicant borrowers.

With respect to each generation and transmission loan application, processed by REA in accordance with the foregoing procedures, the Administrator should, in order to avoid dilatory tactics or protracted delays on the part of either party in such negotiations, establish a publicly announced period of time during which the survey, determinations, and negotiations will be carried on prior to a definite cutoff date set by the Administrator.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, due to a report by the General Accounting Office on a loan to the Brazos Electric Cooperative in Waco, Tex., some controversy has arisen over what types of loans Congress intended should be covered by the instructions. I consider the GAO report to be thoroughly inaccurate in its interpretation of congressional intent. The GAO report gave an unreasonable interpretation to the language of the directions.

In an effort to make clear the intent of Congress, the committee has included language in this year's report to clarify the situation.

I ask unanimous consent that the language of the agriculture appropriation report filed with the Senate July 12, 1966, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The directions of the Committee Report accompanying the Fiscal Year 1964 Agriculture Department Appropriations Bill (No. 497) require that, before approving loans for generation and major transmission, the REA Administrator take certain steps to evaluate existing or proposed contracts by which private companies supply or offer to supply wholesale service to REA-financed cooperatives.

The directions were intended to apply only to applications for initial loans for generation and major transmission to cooperatives where the facilities to be constructed would displace existing contractual arrangements with private power companies. The Committee did not intend the directions to require solicitation of offers from private power companies in the case of subsequent loans to federated G & T cooperatives.

Further, the directions were not intended to apply to any loan application which had been approved by the Administrator prior to the adoption of the directions, or to any reasonable addition to such loan. The Committee affirms this position and directs the Administrator to proceed without considering the directions as applicable as to any such loan and reasonable additions thereto.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, this bill reported from the Senate Appropriations Committee is a great improvement over the administration request and a further improvement over the House bill, which restored many of the cuts in the budget request.

The budget called for cutting many of the most worthwhile programs of the Agriculture Department. All have been either partially or fully restored.

The special milk program has been restored to \$105 million, an increase of \$84 million over the budget request, and an increase of \$2 million over the House-passed bill. I would have preferred \$108 million, to allow for growth in the number of children being served under the program, but I am happy that we were able to get as close to that figure as we did.

The school lunch program has been restored to \$167 million, \$29 million over the budget request and \$10 million over the House.

The committee recommends \$2,500,000 for the Rural Community Development Service, which will offer new hope to rural areas. The House had recommended only \$637,000.

The budget called for cutting the appropriation for the Agricultural Research Service to \$204,728,000 a cut of over \$20 million from the 1966 figure. The House restored this to \$227,437,000 and the Senate has provided further restorations to bring this figure to \$238,342,800.

The committee has recommended additional amounts above the budget request for construction and modernization of research facilities which were authorized by Congress last year. I am happy that among these is an appropriation of \$325,000 for a much needed soil and water research facility at Bushland, Tex.

The committee also recommended, very wisely, I feel, that certain research which the Department had slated for extinction, be continued. Among these is a facility for research on sandy soils at Big Springs, Tex. The work being done there is very important for the Great Plains. I strongly urge its continuation. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a letter from Jack Buchanan, chairman of the board of supervisors, Martin-Howard Soil Conservation District, dated March 14, 1966, telling of the need for more research on sandy soils.

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

MARTIN-HOWARD SOIL
CONSERVATION DISTRICT,
Stanton, Tex., March 14, 1966.

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: I am writing you concerning a very important problem. As you know, there is a proposal to close the USDA Big Spring Experiment Station on July 1, 1966. We feel this should not be done and hope you will support our efforts.

If this station is closed, within the next five years there will be a desperate need for additional research on sandy soils. Why close this station only to open another in the near future at considerable expense? We feel that the station should be continued, and should be enlarged to the status of a Regional Research Center.

The enclosed "Needs for Conservation Research for Sandylands in the Southern Plains", briefly states the problem and the estimated minimum funds required to carry out present and future research.

We are very concerned that there will not be any further research done on farming land under dryland conditions on sandy soils in the Great Plains States. This is the only USDA Station on sandy soils where they own the land in the Southern Plains States. You can get a clearer picture of the area in question from the enclosed map. This map is also located on page 3 of the brochure sent you in 1962 entitled "Conservation Research for the Edwards Plateau and the Sandy Lands of the Southern Plains" published by the Research Advisory Committee.

The water experts on the High Plains have estimated that irrigation water for that area will be depleted in about 60 years. We feel there will be a continuing need for further conservation research in this area. Why not go ahead and do the research needed now, because if we wait until research is needed, we will be behind. Wind erosion and limited rainfall are serious problems and will require a long range program.

Would you please ask the Secretary of Agriculture this question, "If we are to continue the research at the Big Spring Experiment Station, at what level should this research

be funded for an adequate program to meet the needs of this area"? We would like to know why research on moisture conservation is being closed out at Big Spring when this is the only hope we have of improving the stability of agriculture in this area? Other agriculture regions are receiving new research help on their problems and we need help on wind erosion and moisture conservation.

We appreciate your concern for the future of agriculture in this area and will be looking forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely yours,

JACK BUCHANAN,

Chairman, Board of Supervisors.

Enclosure.

CONSERVATION RESEARCH FOR SANDYLANDS IN THE SOUTHERN PLAINS, BIG SPRING FIELD STATION, BIG SPRING, TEX.

Sandylands represent the hard core of conservation problems in the Southern Plains. These sandy soils are subject to severe blowing and wind erosion and every now and then give rise to tremendous red dust clouds that move across the United States and "fall out" on cities of the East with resulting cries of pollution from the dust and pesticides from farms in West Texas.

The Great Plains Conservation Program and other programs that the USDA use in assisting Soil and Water Conservation Districts have direct bearing on problems of sandylands. It is believed that better technology and conservation practices are needed to make these programs more effective, and that conservation research should be strengthened on these sandylands. This research should be on three broad conservation problems: Wind erosion, moisture conservation, and grassland management.

There are approximately 40 million acres of sandy soils in the Southern Plains, representing some of the most productive land in the Great Plains. Moisture conservation and wind erosion control are major problems in managing and conserving these soils. This is the only field station in the Southern Plains that SWC-ARS-USDA has for soil and water conservation research on sandy soils. Also, it is strategically located for research on conservation problems in 4 land resource areas: Southern High Plains; Rolling Red Plains, Southern Desertic Basins, Plains and Mountains; and Edwards Plateau.

Objectives of the research are to: (1) Develop basic knowledge and understanding of physical processes involved in moisture conservation and efficient use by plants growing on sandy soils; (2) develop improved practices for minimizing soil blowing through tillage, soil amendments, and cropping systems; and (3) develop better techniques and procedures for growing grass and maintaining cover on permanent grasslands.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the committee recommends \$234,105,000 for the Soil Conservation Service, an increase of \$5,789,000 over the budget estimate. The budget called for a reduction of \$3.6 million in soil surveys. The House restored \$2 million and the Senate concurred with the House. I feel it would have been wise to restore the full amount.

Also under SCS, the House cut \$1 billion from the budget request for river basin surveys. The Senate concurred. I feel that a restoration of the House cut would have been justified.

All in all, Mr. President, in view of the budgetary restrictions under which we operate this year, this is a good bill. The onerous Budget Bureau cuts have been restored. I hope that next year we shall be in a position in which we can do a

much better job and provide more needed funds for the various activities of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which so greatly aid the American farmer in making agriculture the most efficient sector of production in all the American economy. The leadership of the Agriculture Appropriations subcommittee under the guidance of the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] has done yeomen's work in restoring unwise cuts made in very vital agricultural programs.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, agriculture has always been an important concern to Americans. From the apple orchards of New England to the wheat fields of Iowa, farmers have contributed to the American way of life.

But just because farmers always have been and always will be a vital part of America's life and economy, we do not have to have a farm program based more on tradition than on present realities and necessities. Today we need an agriculture program suited to the needs of the growing, dynamic economy of modern America.

The bill before us today is centered around an approach geared to the farm problems of the depression years—the needs of the thirties, not the sixties. Instead of anticipating the future directions and requirements of American agriculture, this bill continues the expensive dike-plugging operation which has characterized recent Federal agricultural programs.

Each year the cost of the stabilization programs has risen. Since 1955, the cost has multiplied almost 10 times. This bill asks for \$670 million more than last year's appropriation.

I recognize the problems of agriculture. But I feel that we must begin to fight our way out of the morass the Federal agricultural program has become. We must take a more rational and long-sighted approach than that embodied in the proposed bill.

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

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, in January of this year, when the 1967 fiscal year budget message was submitted to Congress, Alaskans were faced with the elimination of agricultural research in their State. The Department of Agriculture which operates the Alaska Agricultural Experiment Station at Palmer, Alaska, had cut all funds for its continuation from the budget. The Palmer Experiment Station is the only agricultural experiment station in any of the 50 States operated directly by the Department. Assumption of responsibility for the Palmer Experiment Station had originated with the Department in the late 1940's over the vigorous protests of Alaskans. Because Alaska was then a territory and not a State, Alaskans were unable to prevent this taking of administrative authority by the Department of Agriculture. And it was without warning that in January we learned that the Department of Agriculture had decided to abandon its responsibilities.

Alaska is not a great agricultural State. Alaskans make no such claims. There is, however, considerable agricultural potential which should and must be developed, and it can only be developed by an orderly and sustained research program as its foundation.

Fortunately, first the House of Representatives and now the Senate committee have agreed that research in Alaska must be continued. Funds for the Palmer Experiment Station have been restored.

I am deeply appreciative of this, as are all Alaskans concerned with the development of our State's agricultural potential. I am especially appreciative of the cooperation and understanding given us by my good friend, Senator HOLLAND. This year, as in the years past, he has shown a rare understanding of Alaska's problems and the work which must be done to overcome them.

It is our hope that this year will see the return of responsibility for operation of the Alaska Agricultural Experiment Station to Alaska, so that it can be operated in the same way as are experiment stations in all of the other States. The Alaska State Legislature during its 1966 session adopted a resolution requesting transfer of the station to the University of Alaska. I have introduced S. 3421 to accomplish this purpose and it is my hope that action can be taken on the bill this year so that an orderly transfer of authority and responsibility can be had.

In the meantime, the Alaska Agricultural Experiment Station will be able to continue its valuable work.

Alaskans are grateful and I take this opportunity to offer their thanks.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the \$7 billion agricultural appropriations bill before us has my unqualified support.

It is in the first instance a tribute to the leadership and foresight of the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the capable chairman of the Senate Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee. I consider it a special privilege to serve under his direction.

It is also a privilege to work with the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the ranking Republican member.

These two leaders work closely as a team serving the best interests of the farmer and the entire Nation. A true spirit of bipartisanship prevails at all times.

The subcommittee's printed hearings reveal the thoroughgoing manner in which it approaches its task. In some subcommittees of the Senate Appropriations Committee, testimony is confined to departmental appeals on House actions. Not so with the Agricultural Subcommittee. Program justifications are carefully examined in each instance and a solid foundation is consistently laid for subcommittee decisions.

Another outstanding feature of this subcommittee is the competence of its professional staff. The chief clerk, Raymond L. Schafer, performs his duties

with efficiency and dispatch. He has more than a decade of experience in his present position and a lifelong background in agriculture. His tenure speaks well of the confidence and trust placed in him.

The chief clerk is ably assisted by Joseph Stewart and the minority professional staff member, Mr. Edmund T. King. Again, at the staff level, there is full cooperation which is built on not only a congenial relationship but mutual confidence and respect.

Mr. President, the bill before the Senate today contains a near unanimous bipartisan effort—a victory if you will—to overturn a determined attempt by the Johnson administration and its Secre-

tary of Agriculture to make deep cuts in popular and proven farm programs so as to free funds for other activities. Many of the activities which were assigned higher priority are new and experimental innovations of the Great Society.

In his budget estimates sent to the Congress last January, the President requested a wide variety of drastic slashes in the agricultural budget. Included was an \$82 million cut for the special milk program—which the Senate has just extended and authorized to be expanded this week—a \$19 million cut for the school lunch program; a \$120 million cut for advance authorizations for the agricultural conservation program; a

\$20 million cut for agricultural research; a \$145 million cut for REA electrification loans and many others.

Some of these reductions were instigated by the Secretary of Agriculture such as the \$82 million cut for special milk; others came from the Bureau of the Budget.

The following table gives a detailed accounting of the proposed cuts and reflects the House and Senate committee action in response.

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

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

Table of major items showing comparisons between appropriations for fiscal year 1966, estimates for 1967, House action and Senate committee recommendations

Agency or item	Appropriations and loan authorizations, 1966	Johnson administration budget proposal, 1967	House bill, 1967	Amounts recommended by Senate committee
Agricultural Research Service:				
Salaries and expenses:				
Research.....	\$125,959,000	\$107,980,000	\$120,673,000	\$123,844,600
Total funds available, research.....	146,059,000	134,980,000	147,673,000	150,844,600
Plant and animal disease and pest control.....	75,547,000	69,748,000	76,764,000	81,498,200
Total funds available, Agricultural Research Service ¹	224,606,000	204,728,000	227,437,000	238,342,800
Cooperative State Research Service:				
Payments and expenses:				
Payments to agricultural experiment stations.....	48,113,000	39,613,000	48,113,000	53,113,000
Total, Cooperative State Research Service ¹	54,827,000	47,740,000	55,227,000	60,740,000
Extension Service:				
Cooperative extension work, payments and expenses:				
Payments to States and Puerto Rico.....	75,536,000	75,917,500	75,917,500	78,917,500
(NOTE.—A redirection from formula to nonformula funds of \$9,600,000 proposed in the budget was denied by the House and the Senate committee.)				
Total, Extension Service ¹	89,135,000	90,224,000	89,824,000	92,824,000
Soil Conservation Service:				
Conservation operations.....	108,802,000	109,020,000	109,235,000	109,235,000
Watershed planning.....	5,853,000	6,397,000	6,142,000	6,142,000
Watershed protection.....	66,331,000	66,559,000	67,020,000	70,000,000
Great Plains conservation program.....	16,082,000	16,112,000	16,112,000	18,500,000
Total, Soil Conservation Service ¹	226,986,000	228,316,000	228,510,000	234,105,000
Consumer and Marketing Service:				
Total available, school lunch program.....	202,000,000	183,000,000	202,000,000	212,000,000
Total available, special milk program.....	103,000,000	21,000,000	103,000,000	105,000,000
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service: Advance program authorization.....	(220,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(220,000,000)	(220,000,000)
Rural Electrification Administration:				
Electrification loans.....	(365,000,000)	(220,000,000)	(365,000,000)	(375,000,000)
Telephone loans.....	(97,000,000)	(85,000,000)	(97,000,000)	(117,000,000)
Total appropriations in bill ²	6,381,448,500	7,022,638,000	6,876,027,000	7,051,543,300

¹ Agency totals also include other items not listed.

² Total appropriations bill includes other items not listed.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, this Senator does not wish to belabor the point. It is sufficient to state—as the table fully indicates—that the administration has suffered a stinging rebuke for its ill-advised attempts to cut back on proven agricultural programs.

Mr. President, I strongly urge adoption of H.R. 14596 as reported from the committee.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, owing to a longstanding engagement in Lexington, Ky., where he is the principal speaker at the annual meeting of the Tobacco Farmers Advisory Council, my colleague from Kentucky, Senator COOPER, could not be here today. Because of the airline strike he had to leave last night to meet this commitment.

Senator COOPER, who has been a member of the Agriculture Committee for 6 years, has supported the farmer during his entire service in the Senate. He had prepared a statement in support of H.R. 14596, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR COOPER

The bill to provide appropriations for the farm programs is one which affects every farmer in the nation, as well as consumers, school children and others who benefit from the programs of the Department of Agriculture. We are grateful to Senator HOLLAND, Senator YOUNG and the members of the subcommittee for their constructive consideration of the agricultural appropriations bill every year.

First, I want to say that I am glad the Committee has recommended \$105 million for the special milk program. The Committee has also recommended \$167 million for the National School Lunch Act, a very important program which the Administration's budget greatly reduced.

Two days ago, the Senate passed S. 3467, to amend the school lunch act, which I supported. During the debate, I pointed out the importance of Section 11 of that Act, funded for the first time last year although authorization was provided in 1962. So I want to support Senator HART's amendment to appropriate \$6.5 million for special assistance.

During the hearings of the Senate Agriculture Committee on S. 3467, Secretary Freeman pointed out that a Federal appropriation of \$26 million would provide lunches to the 1½ million school children who do not now receive them. It seems to me that meeting this gap is a clear priority.

I support also the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTROIA] to

provide \$150 million for the food stamp program, which the Senate Committee has reduced by \$25 million in section 32 funds. I understand that Kentucky plans to extend the program to the remaining Appalachian counties this fiscal year with its allocation under the \$150 million budget request.

When I presented my statement to the Senate Appropriations Committee earlier this year, I urged funds for the Soil Conservation Service, particularly to restore to last year's level funds for soil surveys. Although under last year's level, I am glad to see that the Committee has concurred in restoration of at least \$2 million. The Committee has approved, as passed by the House, \$750,000 for technical assistance in Appalachia. Mr. Sam McElroy, President of the Kentucky Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, tells me that an additional \$667,000, as requested in the budget, will be needed to provide technical assistance in the land stabilization and conservation projects, and to provide additional technical assistance to soil conservation districts that do not have these projects. I am concerned also that the Committee has limited to 60 the number of watershed planning starts, which the House had increased to 100.

For the Appalachian Region Conservation Program, the Committee recommended \$3 million, with a reappropriation of \$1,375,000 in unused funds. I am glad that the Committee has recommended an increase of \$227,000 over the House amount for Resource Conservation and Development, as Kentucky is just beginning to get its Tradewater River Resource Conservation and Development Project underway.

As a member of the Senate Agriculture Committee, the principal Senate cosponsor of the REA supplemental financing bill, and one who has supported the REA during my entire service in the Senate, I am glad to note that the Committee has stricken from the bill the provision setting aside in a contingency reserve a portion of the funds approved for the rural electric and rural telephone programs. Funding the programs at last year's level is a great improvement over the drastic reduction ordered this year by the Bureau of the Budget.

I am glad that the Committee has recommended \$2.5 million for the Rural Community Development Service, noting the importance of its coordinating function. Rural community development has been the most hopeful approach to the problems of rural America for at least ten years. I remember, under the Eisenhower Administration, when the first pilot counties were designated in Kentucky as Rural Development counties, and that one of the first acts of the Kennedy Administration was to expand the concept to the entire country. It has been clear for some time that better program coordination is needed, and nearly all who are concerned about the future of rural America urge that counties and communities join in planning for the better utilization of all programs. More recently, the Department of Agriculture established the Rural Community Development Service, but it was poorly funded last year. I think it is time, after all this talk, that a reasonable amount of funds be provided to give this approach a chance to work.

I had been concerned about the budget reduction of \$8 million under the Hatch Act which would affect every land grant institution in the country, and result in a \$229,140 reduction in Kentucky, and am glad that the Senate Committee has increased these funds even above the House figure. The land-grant colleges train the scientists who solve our agricultural problems and do the research which has made the American farmer the most productive in the world. I am glad also that the Committee has increased by \$3 million over the House amount funds for the Extension Service, for I have sup-

ported the educational programs of county agents, and home demonstration agents during my entire service in the Senate.

I commend the Committee for its attention to the farm programs which are of true value to the county, and am glad to support the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS and Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS and Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from

Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 77, nays 2, as follows:

[No. 140 Leg.]

YEAS—77

Aiken	Hayden	Murphy
Allott	Hickenlooper	Muskie
Bartlett	Hill	Nelson
Bayh	Holland	Neuberger
Bennett	Inouye	Pastore
Bible	Jordan, N.C.	Pearson
Boggs	Jordan, Idaho	Pell
Burdick	Kennedy, Mass.	Prouty
Byrd, Va.	Kennedy, N.Y.	Proxmire
Byrd, W. Va.	Kuchel	Randolph
Cannon	Lausche	Robertson
Carlson	Long, Mo.	Russell, S.C.
Case	Long, La.	Russell, Ga.
Church	Mansfield	Saltonstall
Cotton	McClellan	Simpson
Dominick	McGovern	Smith
Douglas	McIntyre	Stennis
Eastland	Metcalf	Symington
Ellender	Miller	Thurmond
Ervin	Mondale	Tydings
Fannin	Monroney	Williams, N.J.
Fong	Montoya	Williams, Del.
Fulbright	Morse	Yarborough
Harris	Morton	Young, N. Dak.
Hart	Moss	Young, Ohio
Hartke	Mundt	

NAYS—2

Brewster Ribicoff

NOT VOTING—21

Anderson	Gore	McCarthy
Bass	Griffin	McGee
Clark	Gruening	Scott
Cooper	Hruska	Smathers
Curtis	Jackson	Sparkman
Dirksen	Javits	Talmadge
Dodd	Magnuson	Tower

So the bill (H.R. 14596) was passed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. MUNDT conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with his typically competent diligence and effective advocacy, the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has again led the Agriculture appropriation measure to swift and overwhelming Senate approval. We are always grateful for the highly efficient and able manner applied to all legislation which he handles.

But such an outstanding victory could not have been obtained without the equally capable cooperative leadership of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the ranking minority member of the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee. To Senator Young goes our sincere thanks for his splendid joint support.

This great success may also be attributed to the outstanding support of the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], whose articulate advocacy assured prompt Senate action. And to the

Senators from New Mexico [Mr. MONROY] and Michigan [Mr. HART] goes further commendation for joining with their characteristic highly cooperative efforts to make orderly disposition a certainty. The same may be said of the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], who urged his own strong and sincere views on this measure but who nevertheless did not seek to impede its disposition.

And to the many other Senators who joined in supporting this measure today we extend our sincere gratitude for the assistance which was so indispensable to its passage.

AMERICAN PRISONERS IN HANOI— A PLEA FOR SANITY

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I have been gravely disturbed at persistent reports that the government in Hanoi has threatened to execute, as common criminals, American airmen who are now prisoners of war.

Accordingly, I have prepared a statement, "A Plea for Sanity," in which I am joined by 18 other Members of the Senate.

This declaration has been just released to the press, and I shall, at this time, read it into the RECORD.

A PLEA FOR SANITY

We, the undersigned, have previously protested the relentless escalation of the war in Vietnam. We have deplored those decisions, taken on both sides, which have steadily extended the dimensions of the war and intensified its fury.

The struggle in Vietnam now approaches a peril point of no return. Violence begets more violence; the fever of reprisal rises, feeding upon itself; reason is in danger of falling prisoner to blind passion. Then the war becomes a raging inferno, burning away the last barriers of restraint.

We apprehend that the execution of American prisoners, as threatened by the government of North Vietnam, would provoke the gravest reprisals, and further blacken the hope for peace.

In the past, we have worked for an honorable settlement of this tragic war. We have publicly criticized the mounting involvement of our own country, and have sought to keep open the path of moderation that could lead to a negotiated peace.

So, before the last remnants of reason are irrevocably abandoned, we call upon the Hanoi government to refrain from any act of vengeance against the American airmen. They are prisoners of war, fully entitled to the protection extended to men in uniform when captured in the performance of their duty. Their execution would drastically reduce the influence of all those in the United States who have tried to curtail the fighting. It would incite a public demand for retaliation swift and sure, inflicting new levels of suffering and sorrow, and fixing more firmly still the seal of an implacable war.

FRANK CHURCH, GEORGE MCGOVERN, GAYLORD NELSON, E. L. BARTLETT, LEE METCALF, EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, MAURINE B. NEUBERGER, J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, QUENTIN N. BURDICK, FRANK E. MOSS, ERNEST GRUENING, STEPHEN M. YOUNG, VANCE HARTKE, WAYNE MORSE, WILLIAM PROXMIER, ABRAHAM RUBINOFF, JOSEPH S. CLARK, HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., EDMUND S. MUSKIE, U.S. Senators.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. As the Senator is probably aware, yesterday morning the Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees, which is conducting a series of hearings on the various refugee programs, heard testimony by the Secretary of State.

In the course of that hearing I asked the Secretary of State directly what the attitude of the U.S. Government would be if these trials scheduled for the end of next week took place. The Secretary made an extremely forthright, strong, and vigorous policy statement. He indicated, first of all, that if these trials took place, that we, as a nation, would look upon such behavior by the North Vietnamese with the greatest degree of horror and revulsion. The Secretary stated that every effort was being made by the United States, by third countries, as well as by prominent individuals, to bring our very strong position on this matter to the attention of those in responsible positions in the Hanoi government. I was very much heartened by the Secretary's statement. I am sure that he is aware that we are all relying upon the administration's activities on this problem and hopeful that they will spare no effort to assist the prisoners.

Mr. President, the war in Vietnam is perhaps one of the most impersonal of conflicts undertaken by nations. I have had serious questions in the past concerning our activities in Vietnam and its effects upon the civilian population. On the other hand I have been appalled by the incidents of terror and assassination that the Vietcong have used to achieve their ends in this struggle. The possibility that prisoners of war will now be used to satisfy the frustrations of the north or in a vain attempt to effect our future military decisions is only a further reflection of the absence of considerations for the innocent and those now removed from this conflict. But this prospect of violence against helpless men, in violation of all traditional international agreements, is uppermost in the minds of all Americans today, regardless of their views of the overall conflict. I know of two American fighting men from my own State, Comdr. James Mulligan and Lt. Edward Brudno who, having faced and met their military obligations now find themselves the victims of retaliation in the larger political and ideological struggle of our day.

So I wish to join the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] in his very strong declaration and statement of concern for the welfare and the well-being of the American servicemen who are being held as prisoners.

During the testimony by the Secretary of State we asked him about the South Vietnamese Government's observing the Geneva agreements on prisoners of war. He indicated that the names of prisoners in the hands of the South Vietnamese are now being turned over to the International Red Cross, that the Red Cross has access to all prisoners, and that the South Vietnamese Government is now in full cooperation with the International Red Cross.

I recall that on two occasions when I was in Geneva talking with the International Red Cross, they were, as of December of last year, expressing criticism of the South Vietnamese Government for their reluctance in turning over the names of the Vietcong and North Vietnamese prisoners that the South Vietnamese had taken. These lists were not available and the Red Cross indicated to me and the other members of the delegation who were at Geneva at that time their strong feeling that the United States should utilize its good offices with the South Vietnamese to have the South Vietnamese observe to the fullest extent the Geneva Convention.

The Secretary indicated on yesterday that he was firmly convinced that we are now observing these conventions in the fullest. This development, though late in coming is a source of satisfaction to those of us who have been concerned with prisoner indignities.

I also feel that the people of the free world have recognized the very strong effort recently made by the United States in attempting to insure that all in the south were respecting these Geneva agreements. On his basis, we have every right to expect the north to act in accordance with the norms of civilized men. So little of human dignity survives war that we are justified in abhorring such regressive actions as contemplated by the north and to remind them that the beginnings of peace are found in civilized behavior toward their fellow man. I therefore want to say to the Senator from Idaho that he has performed a very useful service today, one for which he deserves great commendation.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, this afternoon, in this Chamber, let me attest to my admiration for the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] for the real public service he has rendered in presenting his statement today before the country and the world.

Earlier today, I was glad to be associated with him when he and I talked over the statement he was going to make.

Surely, the heads of state of the nations of the world, including those in Hanoi, Red China, and all other Asiatic countries, whether they be somewhat neutral in this matter or extremely hostile toward the United States because of its involvement in Vietnam, must know—and they should know—that all Americans regard the lives of their airmen who are now prisoners of war as precious lives. All Americans hold to the view that these airmen are prisoners of war. As fighting men in our Armed Forces, they were flying over the areas where they were shot down in North Vietnam pursuant to orders given them. They must, therefore, be treated as prisoners of war.

If the horrible act which is being threatened by the Hanoi regime against our airmen is carried out, let the rulers of the world know that all Americans

will be united, because we regard those lives as so precious.

Let me repeat, I was glad to join with other colleagues in the statement of the Senator from Idaho. We want the rulers of the world over—friendly or unfriendly—to know our views and our determination.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator from Ohio, and fully share his sentiments. I appreciate the fact that he has joined in signing the statement which I have just read into the RECORD this afternoon.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Idaho for the initiative he has just shown, and the initiative the other Senators have shown in signing the plea for sanity.

I would say that the sentiments expressed in the statement which has just been read would apply not only to the 18 signatories but also to the 100 Members of this body.

The Senator from Idaho as once more performed a public service on the question of Vietnam. I would express the hope that this plea for sanity would be a plea for sanity on all sides.

As Senators know, the Prime Minister of India, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, is just completing an official state visit to the Soviet Union. She will be leaving shortly, but during the course of this meeting she has placed before Messrs. Kosygin and Brezhnev the possibility of a seven-point peace program which could possibly lead to the negotiation table.

Mr. President, in connection with her seven-point program. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Mrs. Gandhi May Stir Viet Peace Drive," written by David Van Praagh, and published in the Evening Star of July 14, 1966.

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

MRS. GANDHI MAY STIR VIET PEACE DRIVE
(By David Van Praagh)

NEW DELHI.—If Prime Minister Indira Gandhi stays on in Moscow for a few days after the scheduled arrival of British Prime Minister Harold Wilson on Saturday, her plan for peace in Viet Nam may be a basis for a wider peace offensive.

This is the feeling in diplomatic circles here following Mrs. Gandhi's outline of what amounted to a seven-point peace plan a few minutes before she left for the Soviet Union via the United Arab Republic and Yugoslavia July 7.

She is due to leave Moscow for home Saturday, a few hours before Wilson's arrival. But if the three-power talks on Viet Nam take place instead, it will mean that the co-chairmen of the Geneva conference—the Soviet Union and Britain—and the chairman of the International Control Commissions in Viet Nam, Laos and Cambodia—India—are putting their heads together.

SEVEN POINTS GIVEN

There is nothing particularly new about Mrs. Gandhi's almost casually expressed plan. But diplomats here reason that its timing and the order of its points—and India's reiteration after one year of its willingness to

take part in stronger peacekeeping arrangements in Indochina—give it potential in the wake of extension of U.S. bombings to the outskirts of Hanoi and Haiphong.

Mrs. Gandhi's seven points are:

1. Britain and the Soviet Union should convene the 14-power Geneva conference immediately.

2. Bombing of North Viet Nam should stop immediately.

3. "This should be closely followed by a cessation of hostilities as well as of hostile movements and actions on all sides throughout Viet Nam, in full observance of the (1954) Geneva agreement.

4. While a peaceful settlement is being hammered out in what might be "weeks of tortuous negotiations," the ICC in Viet Nam should safeguard "standstill arrangements," with India accepting added responsibility in this task if necessary.

5. Withdrawal of all foreign forces from Viet Nam and insulation of the country from foreign interference so the Vietnamese people can determine their own future.

6. Guarantee by the Geneva powers of the territorial integrity and independence of not only a neutral Viet Nam but also neighboring Laos and Cambodia.

7. The Geneva powers also should undertake a rehabilitation and development plan for all three countries.

FIRST SINCE SHASTRI

Mrs. Gandhi's statement was the first major utterance by an Indian leader on the Viet Nam war since the late Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri called for an end to U.S. bombings of North Viet Nam soon after they started in February, 1965. Shastri's reward, many believe, was the suspension of an invitation to visit the United States.

At least the first three points of Mrs. Gandhi's plan appear to observers here as acceptable to the United States, but Hanoi and Peking have insisted on the immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops, something that would come later under the Gandhi proposal.

Before withdrawal, under Mrs. Gandhi's plan, would come possibly stronger peacekeeping measures than the ICC is presently empowered to take.

This appears to be a reiteration, in a wider context, of Indian President Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan's proposal of more than a year ago for an international peacekeeping force in Viet Nam. It also appears to be an extension of talks on the same subject between Shastri and Prime Minister Lester Pearson of Canada in Ottawa in June 1965.

HINTS AT REUNIFICATION

The next two points of Mrs. Gandhi's plan appear here to be potentially unattractive to the United States.

This is partly because there is reason to believe that the Indian prime minister has in mind a reunified Viet Nam, after cessation of hostilities, under President Ho Chi Minh of North Viet Nam. She hinted at this in a recent birthday message to him. Nowhere in her peace plan does she mention South Viet Nam.

But if the Russians back this plan, it is reasoned here, there is no reason it would lead to a Chinese-dominated Viet Nam. Mrs. Gandhi specifies that the entire country would be "insulated" and "neutral" and its borders and independence "guaranteed" during and after self-determination, presumably by free elections.

Moreover, the last point, calling for coordinated economic aid to Viet Nam, Laos and Cambodia—all to be protected by the Geneva powers—accords with an earlier proposal by President Johnson.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I know that there are those who find fault with anyone who uses the word "peace," or repeats the word "negotiations." How-

ever, somehow, some way, some time, the situation in Vietnam will be settled at the conference table through negotiations. It is just not going to peter out. I would hope that in view of the proposal made by the Prime Minister of India, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, and tied in with the fact that the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Mr. Harold Wilson, will, next week, be visiting the Soviet Union, when Mr. Wilson and Messrs. Kosygin and Brezhnev meet, they will recognize their responsibilities as co-chairmen of the Geneva Conventions of 1954 and 1962, and that they will exercise their authority and assume their responsibilities, and on their own initiative reconvene the Geneva Conference for the purpose of getting the situation in Vietnam to the negotiation table.

I think it is imperative. I know that so far as the President of the United States is concerned, no man is more eager to reach that table, to sit down with whoever may be there, and to arrive at a reasonable and an honorable settlement—a settlement which will give some degree of assurance to all of southeast Asia—not just Vietnam—a settlement which will be guaranteed by all the great powers, a settlement which will allow us to get out of Vietnam, not to withdraw hastily, and a settlement which will make it very apparent that we have no desire for bases such as Cam Ranh and others by means of which we could maintain a foothold for years and decades to come.

Every word I have stated, I am sure, fits in with what the President has been trying to do over this past year or more to bring this matter to a conclusion.

Accordingly, I hope that Mr. Wilson and Messrs. Brezhnev and Kosygin will take up the proposals laid down by Mrs. Indira Gandhi, Prime Minister of India, and that out of this meeting in Moscow next week will come some small ray of hope which will bring this matter to a conclusion and bring back to the world—especially to the Far East, and most especially to southeast Asia—a degree of stability and peace which it has not had for more than two decades.

So, again, I commend the distinguished Senator from Idaho and his colleagues for taking this initiative and express the hope that his efforts, which have been persistent, and accomplished under difficulties—because he has received his share of criticism—will continue.

I am delighted that this statement has been made, and again extend my commendation and thanks to him.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the able Senator very much. I would only mention that nearly all of the Senators who have joined in the signing of this plea previously joined in a letter to the President last January, expressing the hope that the suspension of the bombing, then in effect, would be continued, and that the new round of bombing would not be renewed.

Some Senators who joined in the signing of this plea were not parties to that letter, but are nonetheless identified as Senators who have resisted the acceleration of the war, who have sought to

further the efforts for peace, and who have worked to keep open the path of moderation which might lead to negotiations.

As to the threatened execution of these American prisoners of war, we hope to make it unmistakably clear that the consequences of such an atrocity will be very grave. By adding our voices in timely warning, we seek to contribute to the saving of these lives, and to prevent further escalation of the war in southeast Asia, with all the dire results that could follow.

I yield now to the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. First, Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator for his efforts, and that of his fellow Senators.

Mr. President, regardless of one's opinion of the war, or of the bombings of North Vietnam, there is no justification and no excuse for the personal reprisals now threatened by Hanoi against individual American pilots. These men, in the oldest tradition of war, were following the orders of superior officers to attack targets which to the best of their knowledge were military involving no loss or damage to civilian life. They were doing their duty for their country—just as the soldiers of North Vietnam are acting according to their duty as defined by their leaders.

I have dissented at many points from this war and its conduct. But I am at one with all Americans in regarding any reprisals against these young men and indirectly against their families, as an intolerable act—contrary to the laws of war, contrary to all past practices in this war, a plunge into barbarism which could serve the interest of no man and no nation.

Moreover, such reprisals would do terrible damage to the possibilities of reasoned discussions between our two countries—which is the only way to a peaceful solution of this conflict. Within our own countries, in international bodies, and in the world at large, the new bitterness and meanness which such reprisals represent would inevitably stifle debate and discussion and, perhaps, place our countries on a course of even-greater escalation, a course from which there is no return.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I appreciate the eloquent statement made by the distinguished Senator from New York and the general support he has given to the effort by this group of Senators for whom I have spoken. We hope the message will be very clear that the threatened execution of American prisoners of war may well carry this cruel conflict beyond the point of no return.

As one who has constantly sought to find an honorable settlement, who can speak with some measure of independence and objectivity, as one who has frequently disagreed with our own Vietnamese policy, I hope this message will get through.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I am pleased that the majority leader pointed out that the sentiments expressed in the resolution which was referred to are shared by all 100 Members of the Senate.

In the President's address which came over television and radio last Tuesday night, these sentiments were expressed. I think the sentiments he expressed ought to be repeated here on the floor of the Senate. I am reading from an article written by the distinguished columnist, David Lawrence, which appeared in the July 14 issue of the Washington Star, and I quote from what the President said:

As long as the leaders of North Viet Nam believe they can take over the people of South Viet Nam by force, we must not let them succeed.

We must stand across their path and say: "You will not prevail. Turn from the use of force—and peace will follow." * * * We are not trying to wipe out North Viet Nam. We are not trying to change their government. We are not trying to establish permanent bases in South Viet Nam. And we are not trying to gain one inch of new territory. Then why are we there?

Because we are trying to make the Communists of North Viet Nam stop shooting at their neighbors. Because we are trying to make their aggression unprofitable. Because we are trying to demonstrate that guerrilla warfare, inspired by one nation against another, cannot succeed. Once that lesson is learned, a shadow that hangs over all of Asia will begin to recede. * * * However long it takes, I want the Communists in Hanoi to know where we stand.

First, victory for your armies is impossible. You cannot drive us from South Viet Nam by force. Do not mistake our firm stand for false optimism—as long as you persist in aggression, we will resist.

Second, the minute you realize that a military victory is out of the question, and turn from the use of force, you will find us ready to reciprocate. We want to end the fighting. We want to bring our men home. We want an honorable peace in Viet Nam. In your hands is the key to that peace. You have only to turn it.

I would suggest those sentiments are also shared by all 100 Members of the Senate.

The matter of the treatment of American prisoners of war by North Vietnam is, of course, a new matter which has been brought to our attention, but I am sure its possibility was considered by everyone in the White House, including the President, as well as many Members of the Senate.

As Mr. Lawrence pointed out in the article, the President's address was conciliatory. It was not belligerent. It was thoughtful. I hope it will be persuasive.

I ask unanimous consent that the article appear in the Record at this point.

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

PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS MEMORABLE (By David Lawrence)

A memorable address delivered by President Johnson over television and radio on Tuesday night could change the course of human history. For the first time, the head of a nation talked directly to another people in the midst of a war. He earnestly pleaded the cause of peace and emphasized that "co-operation, not hostility, is the way of the future."

Mr. Johnson's speech was neither belligerent in tone nor blustering. The President tried the art of persuasion. He pointed out that, since "humiliation can be the seed-

bed of war," America is not seeking in Viet Nam "the peace of conquest."

Stressing what could lie beyond a peace conference, Mr. Johnson spoke of the need to strengthen the economic and social development of countries in Asia with their enormous populations which suffer from poverty, hunger and disease.

The President may have been thinking of Red China's detachment from the world community as he tactfully argued that isolationism is not good for China any more than it has been for the United States. He said on this point:

"Americans entered this century believing that our security had no foundation outside our own continent. Twice we mistook our sheltered position for safety. Twice we were wrong. If we are wise now, we will not repeat our mistakes of the past. We will not retreat from the obligations of freedom and security in Asia."

The President's frank and outspoken words might have been uttered in the privacy of a "summit" meeting with the heads of other governments. But they take on added significance because of their directness and the willingness to make such statements in the open. Here are the significant passages:

"As long as the leaders of North Viet Nam believe they can take over the people of South Viet Nam by force, we must not let them succeed."

"We must stand across their path and say: 'You will not prevail. Turn from the use of force—and peace will follow.' . . . 'We are not trying to wipe out North Viet Nam. We are not trying to change their government. We are not trying to establish permanent bases in South Viet Nam. And we are not trying to gain one inch of new territory. Then why are we there?'"

"Because we are trying to make the Communists of North Viet Nam stop shooting at their neighbors. Because we are trying to make their aggression unprofitable. Because we are trying to demonstrate that guerrilla warfare, inspired by one nation against another, cannot succeed. Once that lesson is learned, a shadow that hangs over all of Asia will begin to recede. . . . 'However long it takes, I want the Communists in Hanoi to know where we stand.'"

"First, victory for your armies is impossible. You cannot drive us from South Viet Nam by force. Do not mistake our firm stand for false optimism—as long as you persist in aggression, we will resist."

"Second, the minute you realize that a military victory is out of the question, and turn from the use of force, you will find us ready to reciprocate. We want to end the fighting. We want to bring our men home. We want an honorable peace in Viet Nam. In your hands is the key to that peace. You have only to turn it."

Rarely in the relations between two adversaries during a war has such frankness been displayed, at least on the part of the nation which has the more powerful military force and weapons. The strategy behind the kind of speech that President Johnson delivered may not be apparent to the naked eye, but it doubtless was based on the advice of those experts here and abroad who know what's happening inside Red China and who recognize that this is the time to present to the people on the mainland a formula that could lead to peace. The President said:

"A hostile China must be discouraged from aggression. A misguided China must be encouraged toward understanding of the outside world and toward policies of peaceful co-operation. For lasting peace can never come to Asia as long as the 700 million people of mainland China are isolated by their rulers from the outside world."

The text of the President's address doubtless will be relayed by radio throughout the world. At least the diplomats will read it in

full text, and those who have contact with Red China's government are in a position to point out that never has there been a more sincere or constructive declaration made to an enemy during a war than that which has just been proclaimed by the President of the United States in a conscientious effort to bring peace in Viet Nam.

THE COLORADO RIVER ISSUE

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the State of California is undergoing a truly fantastic population explosion. There are 20 million people in California today and the California State Department of Health estimates that the State will have 50 million residents by the year 2000. California gains nearly 1,500 new residents each and every day.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives is now considering H.R. 4671, a bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower California River Basin project. This bill represents years of work by the water statesmen of California, Arizona, and the other Colorado River Basin States. The Lower Colorado River Basin project is crucial to the continued growth and prosperity of the semiarid portions of my State and of the entire Southwest. The 50 million people who will live in California less than 40 years from today must have water, and the Colorado River Basin project is the most important single measure contemplated to assure that water will be available for future generations.

Opposition to two dams on the Colorado River in Arizona has caused the project to be the subject of one of the largest letterwriting campaigns which I have seen in my tenure in the U.S. Senate, and I agree with the editorial published yesterday morning in the Washington Post which says:

The project unfortunately comes into collision with the passionate desire of many conservation groups to avoid any further obstruction of the picturesque Colorado. Ignoring or playing down the water problem, they cry out against the "ruin of the Grand Canyon." The Sierra Club and a number of Congressmen are asking Congress, not only to defeat the proposed Bridge and Marble Canyon Dams, but also greatly to extend the existing Grand Canyon National Park.

I am saddened that some good conservation organizations with which I have worked for years, and for which I have the highest regard, have, in this case, used misleading, erroneous, and exaggerated emotional appeals to stimulate opposition to a project which is going to be vital as we care for the millions of Californians, Arizonans, and others who will live in the semiarid Pacific Southwest in the next quarter of a century.

In the words of the Washington Post editorial:

It is plain nonsense to speak of this proposed minor change—

Minor change is what the Post calls it—

in the park as ruining the Grand Canyon. It would not alter the awesome sight that visitors in the National Park see.

Yet, unfortunately, that is the kind of nonsense emanating from some conservation groups.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Post editorial of July 14, 1966, entitled "Colorado River Issue" be printed in the RECORD, and I call upon responsible conservationists, and proponents of the Colorado River Basin project alike to heed the invitation of the Washington Post for an objective and dispassionate review of the project, with a view to achieving the greatest good for the millions of people who now live in the arid southwestern section of our country, and the many more millions who will live there 50 years from now.

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

[From the Washington Post, July 14, 1966]

COLORADO RIVER ISSUE

Debate began yesterday in the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on one of the most important bills before Congress this year—the measure to authorize the Central Arizona Project. It is vital to the 30 million people of the seven states in the Colorado River Basin. Indeed, the entire country will be affected by the outcome because of the great national interest in the Grand Canyon of the Colorado.

The Committee will have to weigh two major objectives. The Colorado Basin states are clamoring for this final step in harnessing the great river as an essential element of their continued growth. Indeed, they insist that they cannot survive without additional water. With rare unanimity, they are asking Congress to authorize a project that will divert 1.2 million acre-feet of water each year to the parched and thirsty areas around Phoenix and Tucson.

The Upper Basin states are supporting this undertaking only because the bill would also authorize five new water projects in Colorado at a cost of \$361 million and a study of 13 other Upper Basin projects. In the picture is the further hope of importing water for the semi-arid Southwest, to be financed at least in part by power revenues to be derived from the proposed dams at Bridge and Marble Canyons. Representative MORRIS K. UDALL of Arizona recently held out hope that about \$3 billion will be left in the basin fund "to help solve the larger water problems of the seven basin states."

The project unfortunately comes into collision with the passionate desire of many conservation groups to avoid any further obstruction of the picturesque Colorado. Ignoring or playing down the water problem, they cry out against the "ruin of the Grand Canyon." The Sierra Club and a number of Congressmen are asking Congress not only to defeat the proposed Bridge and Marble Canyon Dams, but also greatly to extend the existing Grand Canyon National Park.

To our way of thinking, the answer must necessarily lie somewhere between the two extremes. The inescapable fact is that harnessing of the Colorado has been essential to the burgeoning of the Southwest. It could not support its present population without the impoundments of water behind immense dams (Hoover, Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge and others). There is no doubt a compelling logic to completion of the system with due regard for scenic and recreational values as well as economic advantages.

We think that Congress will recognize this logic and pass some measure authorizing the Central Arizona Project. At the same time it is under obligation to this and future generations to minimize the impact upon

the natural beauty of the Colorado River. Any grave encroachment upon the Grand Canyon National Park itself would be unthinkable, and even the change of the river into a lake for 13 miles at the western end of the park by the Bridge Canyon Dam ought to be avoided if possible.

While earnestly seeking an alternative, however, it is plain nonsense to speak of this proposed minor change in the park as ruining the Grand Canyon. It would not alter the awesome sight that visitors in the National Park see. The 175-mile Lake Powell behind Glen Canyon Dam has demonstrated, moreover, that stored water in the desolate Southwest can in some cases add greatly to recreational values.

We hope that Congress, in moving to utilize the full potential of the Colorado for the people, will give due weight to scenic and recreational values. Numerous suggestions for a compromise between the demands for water and the demands for preservation of natural beauty have been made. One is elimination of the proposed Marble Canyon Dam and the addition of this gorge to Grand Canyon National Park. Another is reduction of the height of Bridge Canyon Dam so as to avoid any water storage in the park and reduction of the flooding in the Grand Canyon National Monument.

There are various other proposals for enlargement of Grand Canyon National Park by the inclusion of sections of the Kaibab Game Reserve, the Kaibab National Forest and the National Monument. Congress could soften the impact of whatever it finds necessary to do to meet the water problem of the Southwest by adding to the remarkable complex of scenic and recreational preserves in the area.

RECLAMATION IS CONSERVATION

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on June 28, 1966, Floyd E. Dominy, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, delivered an address to the Los Angeles, Calif., townhall meeting entitled "Reclamation is Conservation." Commissioner Dominy has remained silent for many months in the face of bitter and emotional criticism against him by some Americans who erroneously allege that he wishes to destroy the Grand Canyon. In this address, Commissioner Dominy answers his critics.

I am proud of my record as a conservationist in the Senate of the United States for example. I have authored or cosponsored the Wilderness Act and legislation to create a Redwood National Park, the Point Reyes National Seashore, the Tule Lake Wildlife Refuge, the Whiskeytown-Trinity-Shasta National Recreation Area, and many other conservation measures. I have consistently supported conservation legislation. As an American, I object to an exaggerated and emotional attack being focused on a single public servant, the Commissioner of Reclamation, simply because he tries to determine how best to prevent the semi-arid West from blowing away.

So that both sides of the story might be known, I ask unanimous consent that Commissioner Dominy's address be printed in the RECORD, and I express the hope that when legislation to create the Colorado River Basin project reaches the Senate it will receive thorough and searching, and fair and objective, consideration. I hope that the consideration will not be carried on in the aura of emo-

tionalism which has surrounded the great Grand Canyon controversy up to this point.

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

RECLAMATION IS CONSERVATION

(Address by Floyd E. Dominy, Commissioner of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, before the Los Angeles, Calif., town hall meeting on June 28, 1966)

It was a timely invitation which brought me before this Town Hall audience today. A great debate is building up on the manner of preservation, conservation and use of our publicly owned natural resources and the Pacific Southwest is sitting squarely in the center of the argument.

Consequently, it is appropriate that I select this opportunity to offer some remarks that I have been contemplating for some time.

I don't need to tell anyone here that neither Los Angeles nor any other metropolitan area of the Pacific Southwest would be in existence today at their present size and scale if man had not taken some positive steps to correct nature's imbalance of natural resources.

Some people question whether or not this is a good thing. I have read some letters to the editors criticizing your State's and our federally developed cooperative plans on the lower Colorado, which infer it would have been much better if Los Angeles and Phoenix and all the vast sun country in between had been allowed to be just that, sun country and nothing more. But from the fact that you seem to be happy and pleased to be living here, I would judge that you disagree, as I do.

Consequently, I am very proud that our Bureau of Reclamation, placed in business by the Congress back in 1902 under a great conservation President, Theodore Roosevelt, has been a major cooperator with the States of the Pacific Southwest in the development of essential water supplies.

Our role in the early Reclamation development in Arizona, through the Yuma and Salt River projects, is well known. What is not so well known is that when your predecessors here in Los Angeles were scratching around seeking an additional water supply in those same early years of this century, it was the Bureau of Reclamation which found a suitable reservoir site from whence developed the Owens Valley Project. That project was developed by your own local government, which is as it should be, wherever possible. I am a hearty believer in the philosophy that the Federal Government should undertake only those things which local people and local governments cannot undertake for themselves.

I also take some vicarious pleasure in the fact that one of the best Reclamationists we have today worked as a day laborer and roustabout in the construction of the Mulholland tunnel. He is MIKE KIRWAN, now a Congressman from Ohio and Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works.

He is one of the most solid friends and supporters Reclamation has, because he knows what the Bureau of Reclamation has accomplished and how important its mission here in the Western States is to our national economy. He knows, as well as anyone, that Reclamation is conservation.

I emphasize that little word, *is*, because I believe it to be true. Reclamation is conservation. It is the kind of conservation that helped lay the groundwork for the historic Conference of Governors on Conservation of Natural Resources in 1908. It is entirely in keeping with the declaration that came out of that conference and which inspired the past half century of unparalleled advancement in conservation.

"We agree that the land should be so used that erosion and soil-wash shall cease," formally declared the assembled Governors; "that there should be reclamation of arid and semi-arid regions by means of irrigation, and of swamp and overflowed regions by means of drainage; that the waters should be so conserved and used as to promote navigation, to enable the arid regions to be reclaimed by irrigation, and to develop power in the interests of the People; that the forests which regulate our rivers, support our industries and promote the fertility and productivity of the soil should be preserved and perpetuated; that the minerals found so abundantly beneath the surface should be so used as to prolong their utility; that the beauty, healthfulness and habitability of our country should be preserved and increased; that the sources of national wealth exist for the benefit of the People and that monopoly thereof should not be tolerated."

The Bureau of Reclamation has lived up to this credo within the framework of its responsibilities and the West and the Nation are richer for the work we have been able to accomplish in a cooperative effort with the Western States and their people. Nevertheless, today we are being branded as "destroyers" in critical \$25 books and expensive full-page newspaper advertisements. The Congress is receiving a flow of emotional letters, canned postcards, and prepared coupons, most of which clearly stem from the unprincipled and erroneous allegation that we are "flooding out" the Grand Canyon and ruining the National Park System.

Let's take a look first at what Reclamation has accomplished. It may help in determining whether we are destroyers.

Your own growing metropolis outstripped the Owens Valley water supply and started looking for new sources in the 1920's. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California was organized in 1928 and authorized to build another great water lifeline, turning this time to the Colorado River. This project, the Colorado River Aqueduct, was made possible by the Bureau of Reclamation's construction of Hoover Dam, a massive concrete plug which harnessed the Nation's most erratic river. Moving quickly against the threat of new water shortages, the Metropolitan Water District advanced funds to the Bureau of Reclamation to build Parker Dam, an after bay dam below Hoover, and in the mid-1930's started construction of the giant pumping plant and aqueduct to bring Colorado River water across mountains and desert to Los Angeles and San Diego. The American Society of Civil Engineers designated this aqueduct and Hoover Dam as two of the seven engineering wonders of America. But I suppose we and you both are destroyers because these great engineering works were built in the natural serenity of the desert.

And while we were all busy on the Colorado River, the Bureau of Reclamation also was working elsewhere in the West, so much so that a new productive area, equivalent in size to Connecticut and Delaware, has been added to the assets of the Nation. Of course we have altered a lot of desert land, but there are nine million acres of a lush irrigated greenbelt where before there was only desert land or drought threatened cropland. You who prize your irrigated suburban greenery be the judge as to whether we are destroyers.

In addition to water for irrigation, Reclamation projects deliver in excess of 500 billion gallons of water annually to municipalities and industrial areas—serving a population of more than 10 million. Hydroelectric power, produced as a by-product of the stored agricultural and municipal water, is now being generated at a level of 33 billion kilowatt-hours annually—enough to supply the residential needs of a city of 6 million.

This hydroelectric production, incidentally, does not pollute the air and it conserves valuable fossil fuels.

The Bureau of Reclamation has completed nearly 200 storage dams in the West. These impoundments have a storage capacity for 127 million acre-feet (more than 41 trillion gallons) of water. This stored water is cool, clear, and sparkling after the sediment settles out, in stark contrast to its muddy, roily state when it is impounded as it flowed to the sea in the natural rivers during and after the spring snowmelt. In addition to a major flood prevention and flood control role, these man-made lakes provide water-oriented recreation to millions—more than 35 million days of visitor use last year by fishermen, boating enthusiasts, campers, and others.

But of course, we are destroyers because we regulate the rivers and streams, clean them up and keep them flowing the year around, without ruinous seasonal floods or the slim trickles of the dry months.

Construction is now at the half-way point on a third—500-mile-long—water supply line for this area. This is the California State Water Project. The Bureau of Reclamation is proud to be associated with the State of California in one of the key reservoir and canal sections of this great water system, the jointly constructed San Luis Dam and Canal on the west side of the San Joaquin Valley.

The Feather River water will take care of the needs of Southern California until about 1990. But the far-sighted officials of the Metropolitan Water District and the State of California and the Bureau of Reclamation are already actively seeking to assure the additional water for continued growth and development for the 21st Century.

The vehicle for this new future water supply for southern California along with Arizona and Nevada, is one of the most far-reaching resource developments ever proposed. This is the Colorado River Basin Plan, a seven-State proposal that has evolved during the past three years out of the long-planned Central Arizona Project.

Much credit for broadening the Central Arizona Project legislation into a regional water plan goes to Chairman WAYNE ASPINALL of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and to Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall. In 1962, Chairman ASPINALL wrote to the Secretary seeking his views on a coordinated comprehensive pattern for development of the water and power needs of the entire Pacific Southwest. Secretary Udall responded in January 1963 with an announcement of the start of a new study for the Lower Colorado River Basin Plan, aimed at solving the growing water and power problems of the Pacific Southwest.

This proposed plan, wrote Secretary Udall, "erases the outmoded concept limited by State lines, and concentrates on meeting the total water needs of the region. In the parched Pacific Southwest, we can prosper together or slowly shrivel separately."

As a result, a massive assault had been launched against threatening water shortages for the driest and fastest-growing region in the United States. And, parenthetically, a simultaneous attack has been mounted against the Bureau of Reclamation as the "great destroyer."

By August of 1962, a planning report had been completed by the Bureau of Reclamation on the proposed Pacific Southwest Water Plan. It was submitted to the States and interested Federal agencies for review, and legislation subsequently was introduced in the Congress. Sponsors of this regional legislation were members of the Arizona and California Congressional delegations—for the first time in history united behind a water resource development proposal affecting the Colorado River and all the States that look to it for their water lifeline.

Subsequently, the proposal became known as the Lower Colorado River Basin Project and it won qualified approval by the Administration prior to House hearings in the fall of 1965.

But there was still room for further regional expansion in a heartening display of water statesmanship. At the 1965 House hearings, members of the Congress from the Upper Colorado River Basin States had expressed concern about the effect of this downriver project upon future developments contemplated upstream, and they had pointed to the need for additional water in the upper basin by 1990. Accordingly, agreements were hammered out in a series of meetings last winter involving Congressional representatives and water officials of the seven States. Out of these eventful meetings emerged a basinwide project, supported, also for the first time in history, by all seven States of the Colorado River Basin.

This expanded legislation now proposes immediate authorization and construction of the Central Arizona Project. Other water supply projects in the Basin would be authorized also. In addition, it would establish a regional development fund to finance future projects to augment the inadequate water supply of the Colorado River. These future projects—desalination, weather modification, and/or importation from water surplus areas—would be determined in a feasibility study to be completed within three years, according to the proposed legislation. The general objective of the feasibility studies would be to augment the Colorado River water supply by some 2½ to 6½ million acre-feet—the latter amount being equivalent of another river nearly half the size of the present Colorado, which today is totally committed to consumptive uses or long-term storage.

Simultaneously, there is before the Congress a proposal for a national water supply study commission. While detailed research is pressed in desalination and a practical effort is being made to put known principles of weather modification to use in developing an additional water supply, there must be a complete array of facts and figures on water needs, supplies and potential surpluses in the various river basins. Only when these data are in and comparative costs are available, can Congress be expected to act on far-reaching proposals to augment the water supplies in areas of shortage.

Perhaps even more significant than the agreement on the terms of the Lower Colorado River legislation is the fact that the seven States of the Colorado River Basin are now working collectively, with the Federal Government, to solve the most pressing, largest, and most complex water supply challenge of our times. This unity of purpose is vital if the most arid part of the Nation is to enter the 21st Century without facing a water supply ceiling, limiting further economic and population expansion.

Associated with this Colorado River development during the past six decades in the seven basin States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, have been other noteworthy resource activities under Federal-State auspices. These include such major undertakings as the development of the Salt and Gila rivers in Arizona, the \$2 billion Central Valley Project in California, major transmountain diversions to the Rio Grande, Arkansas, North Platte rivers and to the Great Basin in Utah, and headwater development in the Missouri River Basin in Wyoming. Collectively, the Federal-State water resource development in this seven-State area is the largest and most successful water use effort in the world. The existing projects are now a world-renowned demonstration area for arid zone resource conservation and utilization—and will be

for many generations to come. Yet we are accused of being destroyers.

This sketchy resume of water resource development in the Colorado River Basin States is intended to remind you of this area's stake in this program. I again suggest to you that Reclamation is Conservation.

In spite of this background, those of us who have given our careers to water resource conservation and development have been attacked in recent months by massive propaganda and lobbying campaigns, in the name of conservation, which appear directed at discrediting and undermining the Reclamation program.

Consider these sweeping charges and glittering propagandistic generalities used by sincere but misguided preservationists against Reclamation during consideration of the Lower Colorado River Project Bill: Blind planning; faulty arithmetic; threatening the National Park System; wasting water; stretch facts beyond the breaking point; selling a bill of goods; a boondoggle; shaky economic underpinnings; obsolete precepts; hydroelectric power outmoded; reclamation laws no longer appropriate.

These people, carried away by their single-purpose zeal, have failed to recognize the great grey area between total preservation and total development, neither of which is contemplated.

As an example of the scare tactics used to achieve their emotional purpose, the following statement is made in an article in a conservation magazine, later digested in a mass circulation magazine:

"Much of the Grand Canyon habitat of the desert bighorn sheep would be destroyed by Bridge Canyon Dam."

Since my agency had originally proposed this structure, I sought information from the Federal agency which has jurisdiction over such wildlife, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.

This is an excerpt from that Bureau's reply:

"Bighorns known to be in Bridge Canyon Reservoir area, but extent of population little known because of inaccessibility. If bighorns are in fact in Marble Canyon, population would be very limited. There are known populations above Bridge Canyon Reservoir in Grand Canyon National Park and in Lake Mead area (Black Mountains) below dam-site. Bighorns have no particular affinity to river bottom except possibly for watering purposes. They normally range above the valley floor. At Havasu Lake (behind Reclamation's Parker Dam) bighorn populations adjacent to lake have increased in the years since impoundment, and they are commonly seen by boaters on the lake. At this year's Bighorn Council meeting, a Utah game department biologist gave a paper concerning apparent recent increase in bighorn populations adjacent to Lake Powell (Glen Canyon) reservoir."

Hence, the facts appear to be that Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs have actually increased the population of desert bighorns. But propagandists have deliberately distorted or misrepresented the facts and the vaunted editorial review of one of the world's largest circulation magazines apparently accepted this false statement on its face.

A principal impression the preservation propagandists seek to foster in generating their emotional appeal, is that the reservoirs proposed in the original Southwest Water Plan would "flood out" the Grand Canyon and thereby ruin the National Park System.

The Marble Canyon damsite is located 12½ miles above and outside the upstream boundary of the Park and dam and reservoir would be totally outside of either Park or Monument. The proposed Bridge Canyon Dam, which is in the area-sponsored legislation, but which the Administration has recommended be deferred for further study, is

downstream on the Colorado River from both the Grand Canyon National Park and Monument. It would, however, back water in the inner gorge of the Grand Canyon through the National Monument and for 13 miles alongside the boundary of Grand Canyon National Park.

The preservationists have failed to point out that in our efforts to "flood out and destroy the Grand Canyon"—and those are their quotes, not mine—that the same vista from any viewpoint along the rim within the National Park will be visible without change when either or both reservoirs are created.

There are accusations that Marble Canyon Dam will affect the regimen of the river through the canyon. But the regimen was changed when Glen Canyon Dam was built and as a result, there is much clearer and colder water flowing downstream. There is now an excellent trout fishery below the dam where none existed before. It is true that there are power fluctuations but the minimum flow is greater than the natural flow in years of low runoff and the power discharges can help get the river runners through the rapids.

In sum total, the river running season has been extended from a single uncertain month in periods of high runoff, to several months as the result of construction of Glen Canyon Dam. The situation will be improved even more in future years when Lake Powell is higher.

We and the Congress have been bombarded with accusations that the dams are unnecessary to the project, that hydropower is outmoded and will soon be replaced by great thermal generating plants. We have analyzed all of these counterproposals thoroughly and in good faith. Yet, we find them wanting.

For example, the low-cost kilowatts which would come from these new thermal plants are predicated upon high load factor operation which is economically feasible only with a supplementary source of peaking energy such as hydro can supply. We also are aware that the utility industry still contemplates investment of many millions of dollars in hydro facilities, something that would be highly unlikely if hydro is going out of style.

Or their arguments have been that there are alternative means of financing Reclamation development. But such ideas have found a singular lack of practical support in Congress. Thermal or nuclear power alternatives to either or both of these dams are not options open to consideration under present Congressional thinking or experience.

Nevertheless, because we operate within a framework which has been laid down by the Congress in carrying out our water development responsibilities, we are not conservationists but destroyers, in the image these groups are seeking to build up. I say the contrary is true, that Reclamation development which gives full consideration of all existing values and all benefits which will be created, is the real conservation as Teddy Roosevelt and the other broad conservationists who have followed him have repeatedly endorsed.

Our critics have even sought to usurp the image of this great conservationist when they quote President Theodore Roosevelt, as he stood on the south rim of the Grand Canyon in 1903:

"Leave it as it is. You cannot improve on it. The ages have been at work on it and man can only mar it."

Congress took him at his word and incorporated all of the Grand Canyon, as far as the eye could see from his viewpoint and much farther in each direction, in Grand Canyon National Park. And you today, and your children, and your children's children, will be able to see the magnificent vistas Theodore Roosevelt viewed, unchanged, even when Reclamation's task is completed.

Who is to say what Theodore Roosevelt was thinking when he stood on the rim of the Grand Canyon. What was he thinking of when he wrote:

"It is becoming clear that our streams should be considered and conserved as great natural resources. . . . The time has come for merging local projects and uses of the inland waters in a comprehensive plan designed for the benefit of the entire country. . . . It is not possible to properly frame so large a plan . . . without taking account of the orderly development of other natural resources."

This has been a guiding policy of the Bureau of Reclamation through the years and more so now than ever before. The competitive demands of a growing population, a growing economy and vastly greater leisure time and travel convenience, make the careful planning and use of our natural resources of greatest importance.

I am a veteran of 33 years experience in the Federal career service, all of it in natural resources administration and am familiar with the President's record in conservation since his days as a young Congressman, back in the 1930's when my own career was just getting underway.

He and Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall are down in my book as solid conservationists. I am convinced that both have at heart the definition Gifford Pinchot and his aides used so much, that conservation is "the use of the natural resources for the greatest good for the greatest number."

President Johnson is beset with international problems, but nevertheless, he keeps a firm hand on the resources picture, with Secretary Udall as his able and forceful lieutenant. Indicative is the recent transfer of the pollution control administration to the Department of the Interior. It reflects the President's sane judgment and confidence in Secretary Udall that we all share who work with him.

Such belittling and ill-advised references as have recently been made about him are in poorest taste and judgment when balanced against his overwhelming record of accomplishment in the public interest. They reflect the panic of those critics who refuse to recognize that Reclamation is Conservation.

TRIBUTE TO WORTH BINGHAM

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, as many Senators read recently, the oldest son of the great publisher of a Louisville newspaper, Harry Bingham, died in a most unfortunate accident in Nantucket the other day. An excellent story has been written by Norman E. Isaacs, the managing editor of the newspaper; and because Harry was a friend of many Senators and was a great political reporter, I ask that this article be printed in the RECORD. I think it will be of interest to all Senators.

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

WORTH BINGHAM, 1932-66: A PROMISING CAREER CUT SHORT

(By Norman E. Isaacs)

It was the summer of '52, I think. He was on the news staff as a trainee. That morning he'd come to work in tennis shoes, dungarees and an old shirt. One look and he was on "the carpet."

"Worth," he was told, "nobody works for these newspapers looking like that. You go home and get some decent clothes on. Either be back in an hour—or don't bother to report."

Worth Bingham made it back in 40 minutes.

Fourteen years later he was a hard-working, well-dressed assistant to the publisher. Thursday night he stayed down at the office to have dinner with the copy desk staff. There was good-humored jesting, some of it about himself, and serious newspaper talk. He enjoyed both. Friday morning he flew off for vacation in Nantucket.

WELL BACKGROUNDED

Then on Monday afternoon he phoned from Nantucket to report on a negotiation dealing with some future planning. He added happily, "The weather here is gorgeous."

Less than 24 hours later, Worth Bingham was dead, victim of a freak accident, just as was his younger brother, Jonathan, only two years before.

The potential for Worth was a career as one of America's great editor-publishers. He'd prepared well. After Harvard and the Navy, he'd broken in on the Minneapolis papers, writing obits, covering police, doing rewrite. He got his first big break when he was sent to Wisconsin on a lurid murder story. The old pros of the Chicago and Detroit papers were busy making sure the police officials were "tied up" for their purposes. Worth went off on his own and got the big story.

Later, in San Francisco, he worked on two papers there, editing copy and writing headlines. It was out there that he met a pretty art student and it was there that they were married.

SERVED IN WASHINGTON

His years of Minneapolis and West Coast experience complete, he returned to the Louisville newspapers, first to work on the desks and in political reporting, and then to the Washington Bureau where he worked long and hard mastering the intricacies of coverage in the nation's capital.

His series, "Our Costly Congress," which was reprinted all across the country and in Reader's Digest, took endless hours of research. And he wrote, and rewrote, and rewrote himself.

Returning once again to Louisville, he went out on the circulation trucks and knocked on doors, trying to sell subscriptions. Later he sold ads. Once a merchant didn't quite get his name and proceeded to denounce "the Bingham" up one side and down the other. Worth listened to it all with a wry grin on his face.

The training complete, he joined the executive staff. As a member of the editorial conference, he showed he had ideas, he expressed them, and he fought for them. And if it took a 12- or 14-hour day that was all right with him. In short he had a passion for newspapering—and there just wasn't any reason to doubt that he was going to wind up as one of the top figures in journalism.

He was a big, ruggedly handsome man, who had a little of many things mixed up in him—aggressiveness and shyness, pride and humility, reticence and forthrightness. He had great poise, and the indefinable gift of charm.

There were three things that stood out about Worth. One was his dedication to newspapering. The second was his fascination with politics. The third was his addiction to keeping fit. In all of these things, he played to win. At bridge, he could be the picture of elation and dejection within the space of minutes. He would groan loudly over his own misplays—and complain bitterly about losing a dollar.

DISDAINED APPEARANCES

It wasn't the dollar because he came very close to being unconscious about money generally. He just hated to lose.

Appearances meant nothing to him. He drove what others around the office looked on as an old wreck. It was a big station

wagon that had a distinct air of semi-decrepitude. For a long time, the back portion contained a crib.

The fitness kick was quite something. Often he'd spend a lunch hour playing squash. He played tennis, golf, loved to ski, surfboarded. It was a surfboard that snapped forward yesterday, killing him instantly.

Of all his newspaper work away from Louisville, he loved Washington most. Part of this was because of the political atmosphere. Part, too, was that he worked there during the Kennedy era and Worth and Joan fitted perfectly into the setting. And he made deep and close friends all through the place.

As the friend on the phone said yesterday from The Washington Post, his office probably was just like our own: "Numb."

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORTON. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The young man to whom the Senator referred was a classmate of mine in college, and I knew him very well. I share with the Senator from Kentucky the very high regard for the young man and the tragedy of his loss, as well as the sorrow of his family. As the Senator from Kentucky knows, the family has distinguished itself in the journalistic field for many years, and has been deeply concerned with problems of the State and of the Nation.

I join with the Senator from Kentucky in expressing condolences to the family.

THE SALE OF ARMAMENTS ABROAD

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in a recent issue of Saturday Review, the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], has written an article on the sales of armaments abroad which deserves our serious attention.

In describing the scope and value of these armaments exports, he points out several factors of this growing business which tends to increase international tension. First is the growing competition among the world powers to supply military weapons to underdeveloped countries which have neither the need nor the capacity to use them. Second is the tendency of recipient countries to compete with their neighbors even to the point of open conflict. Third is the impact of a prestigious military establishment on internal political developments of these poor nations.

There is reason for a growing concern about the dangers of nuclear proliferation. Recent events in Kashmir and southeast Asia show clearly that the threat of conventional war is no less serious. Just 2 days ago Israel pilots flying French planes had an aerial duel with Syrian pilots flying Russian planes. These incidents do not contribute to international peace, as we do not yet have the ability to control the use of these weapons.

We know that what begins as a small military aid program can result in the involvement of a large scale military commitment of a world power. Therefore, I agree wholeheartedly with the senior Senator from Minnesota that a means must be found to strictly limit the

distribution of these arms throughout the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article "The United States: Supplier of Weapons to the World" be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Saturday Review, July 9, 1966]

THE UNITED STATES: SUPPLIER OF WEAPONS TO THE WORLD

(NOTE.—How our foreign policy is being undermined by \$35 billion worth of armaments exports—while industry and the Pentagon lobby for even larger shipments.)

(By EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, U.S. Senator from Minnesota)

"In the Thirties, companies that sold weapons to foreign nations were called 'Merchants of Death.' Politicians reviled them. They were the subject of a sensational Senate investigation headed by former Republican Senator Gerald P. Nye of North Dakota.

"Times have changed. The U.S. Government is now encouraging defense manufacturers to sell arms overseas."

—Forbes magazine

Over the past fifteen years, the United States has given or sold to other countries some \$35 billion worth of military assistance as part of our foreign aid. The major share of Defense Department arms supplied under our military assistance program has gone to industrialized countries in Europe and the Far East.

We have provided arms, equipment, and training to countries who are allied or associated with us through treaties—NATO, SEATO, CENTO, ANZUS—which are the legacy of the early years of the containment policy and of the John Foster Dulles era. In addition, we have provided military aid to a wide range of countries in such categories as: "forward defense" areas, including the Republic of China (Taiwan), Iran, Philippines, South Korea, Greece, and Turkey (the last two countries are also allied to us through NATO); countries that have given us military base rights such as Ethiopia, Libya, Spain and our NATO ally Portugal; "Alliance for Progress Security" countries—virtually every country in Latin America; and some twenty-three countries in Asia, Africa, and the Middle East that are regarded as having "free world orientation."

Our interest and concern over the threat of nuclear proliferation should not distract us from giving careful attention to what may be an even more serious threat to peace—the proliferation and distribution of non-nuclear weapons. Supplying non-nuclear arms has become a major activity—not only for the modern merchants of death or for illegal gunrunners, but for the governments of the major industrial countries.

France, long a major supplier of arms to the Middle East, is reported to be exporting nearly 40 per cent of its total aerospace production. The Soviet Union is also a major supplier of arms. Great Britain is actively engaged in the arms competition. But today the United States is the world's leading producer and supplier of arms.

In recent years, sales of arms have been taking the place of grants and gifts in U.S. military assistance programs. In 1950, the fourteen countries that obtained U.S. arms and military training all received these on a grant basis. In 1966, of the seventy countries that received any combination of grant aid, direct sales or credit assistance for arms, sixty-two were receiving grant aid, thirty-four were buying arms directly, and eighteen were the beneficiaries of credit assistance.

The principal purpose of most military aid, whether it be in the form of grants or sales, is, of course, to strengthen recipient

countries against Communist aggression and subversion.

Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, in testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on April 20, 1966, stated:

"The governing principle of our military assistance program has been and is that the vital interests of the United States and the defense of the Free World are dependent upon the strength of the entire Free World and not merely upon the strength of the United States."

Over the past decade, however, intergovernmental trade in arms with the developing countries has involved more complex motivations and considerations. Several pressures have combined to increase the arms supply.

First, newly independent countries are frequently anxious to acquire arms for prestige purposes. Lions on golden chains no longer satisfy. To many nations, these arms are status symbols—the tangible manifestation of their nationhood and newly acquired sovereignty.

Second, supplying arms opens the way to influence on the military and also on the political policies of the recipient countries. Experience has demonstrated that when an arms deal is concluded, the military hardware is only the first step. Almost invariably, a training mission is needed and the recipient country becomes dependent on the supplier for spare parts and other ordnance.

Since the Cuban missile crisis, there has been an increasing inclination on the part of both the United States and the U.S.S.R. to compete in supplying military assistance in areas adjacent to the sphere of influence of the other power. Thus, we tend to concentrate our military assistance to developing areas in those countries, such as Iran and Pakistan, which are on the "forward-defense arc" that borders the Communist heartland. Almost three-fourths of the program proposed for 1967 is for countries adjacent to the borders of the U.S.S.R. and Communist China.

The importance of influence on the military can be seen in Africa. Of the five nations of sub-Saharan Africa where military governments have come to power in recent months, only one, apparently, the Central African Republic, has not been the recipient of U.S. military assistance. The other four—Congo (Leopoldville), Dahomey, Nigeria, and Upper Volta—have all received at least minimal amounts of military aid. Indonesia, where military elements appear to have taken *de facto* control of the government in the wake of the recent turmoil, received, in addition to Soviet military assistance, nearly \$64,000,000 in military-grant aid from the United States between 1959 and 1965. The Soviet Union, on the other hand, tries to increase its influence by assistance to, for example, Cuba, close to our shores.

The third reason for increasing arms sales, and a relatively new one for the United States, is financial and budgetary. Our balance of payments deficit is, in large measure, the result of military expenditures overseas—money that leaves the United States to support our military forces abroad, in Europe, and, particularly now, in Vietnam. The Vietnam war effort is costing the United States some \$16 billion this year. By encouraging other countries to buy arms from us, we can offset to some extent the outflow resulting from these programs. Now, for instance, the Pentagon reportedly is "encouraging" additional purchases of U.S. arms by Germany by threatening transfer of U.S. troops from Europe to Vietnam.

Secretary of Defense McNamara proudly describes the efforts of his department in the arms sales field. In May 1965 he presented the Meritorious Civilian Service Medal to Henry J. Kuss, Jr., Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Logistics Negotiations, the Pentagon's top arms sales-

man. The record of Mr. Kuss and his salesmen—"negotiators," the Pentagon calls them—is impressive. Military export sales since mid-1961 total more than \$9 billion, from which U.S. industry will realize a profit of nearly \$1 billion. For this achievement, the Pentagon credits "the intensive sales effort undertaken . . . in cooperation with U.S. industry."

Forbes magazine recently stated:

"Arms and military equipment are one of the U.S. major export items. Without them, few defense companies would be earning the kind of money they do."

Secretary McNamara cites the "obvious balance of payments benefits" of the arms sales program, noting that the U.S. defense expenditures and receipts entering the balance of payments in fiscal 1961 left a net adverse balance of nearly \$2.8 billion. By 1965, the net deficit had been reduced to just over \$1.4 billion, in spite of rising defense expenditures in Southeast Asia. Arms sales by the Pentagon increased from about \$300 million in 1961 to more than \$1.3 billion in 1965; 1967 receipts are expected to exceed \$1.5 billion.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk has stated that his department is in "very close touch with the Defense Department on the sale of arms." The State Department's Office of Munitions Control coordinates arms sales by issuing or denying applications for the export or import of all articles on the United States Munitions List. Export licenses for Munitions List items are denied for areas under Communist control. But the State Department approves the shipment of arms to other states to meet what are considered to be legitimate defense needs and the requirements of internal security.

Secretary McNamara appears to believe that there is no reasonable alternative to intensified sales of U.S. weapons and, with the traditional rationalization of arms salesmen through history, states that if nations cannot buy them from us they will buy them elsewhere—from Britain, France or the Soviet Union, at higher prices.

But what is the effect of this policy?

The outbreak of war between India and Pakistan is a prime example which was of great concern to this country. Pakistan, which has recently been receiving military assistance from Communist China, is formally allied to us through the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization and is reported to have received from \$1.5 to \$2 billion in military assistance in the last decade. India, the largest democratic nation in the world, refused United States military aid until its borders were attacked, but it had been receiving arms from England. When it became clear that United States-supplied weapons were being used in the Indo-Pakistani war, many Americans must have wondered how our government could have allowed itself to become caught in such a contradiction. Nor was it any comfort when John Kenneth Galbraith, former Ambassador to India, stated before the Foreign Relations Committee on April 25, 1966:

"The arms we supplied . . . caused the war between India and Pakistan . . . If we had not supplied arms, Pakistan would not have sought a military solution [to the Kashmir dispute]."

Also of growing concern in the past several months has been the spiraling arms build-up in the Middle East, where tensions among the Arab states and between the Arab states and Israel have long threatened to explode.

Between 1950 and 1965, we supplied relatively small amounts of grant military assistance to the area: to Iraq \$46,500,000, to Jordan \$33,000,000, to Saudi Arabia \$31,000,000. Now, however, Saudi Arabia is buying \$400,000,000 worth of British supersonic jet fighters and U.S. Hawk missiles. Jordan has received U.S. tanks, and on April 2 the

State Department announced that the United States had agreed to sell Jordan "a limited number" of supersonic fighter-bombers, reportedly Lockheed F-104s. It is not clear how Jordan, which has an annual per capita G.N.P. of \$233 and which has been dependent on U.S. military grants and economic aid, will pay for these planes, which cost some \$2,000,000 apiece. The availability of U.S. credit for arms purchases is undoubtedly an important factor.

(The State Department has been under special pressure in the case of Jordan because of our sale to Israel of weapons that had previously been promised by Germany under an arms deal cancelled last year.)

Secretary Rusk on January 28, 1966, stated, "We have tried over the years . . . not to stimulate and promote the arms race in the Near East and not to encourage it by our direct participation." But it is difficult to reconcile the State Department's policy of refraining from becoming a major supplier of arms with the aggressive arms sales program conducted by the Pentagon.

The United States appears to be abandoning its traditional policy of non-involvement in the Middle East arms competitions in favor of trying to maintain arms "balance" in the interest of political and military stability. But it is difficult to believe that the increasing supplies of sophisticated weapons in the area will contribute to the maintenance of peace or the reduction of tensions.

Tensions between Latin American states are not high at present, but our military assistance through grant aid or sales to some countries appears to be increasing, with Argentina agreeing several months ago to buy fifty jet attack planes from the Douglas Aircraft Company. At the same time, the Chileans are attempting to buy planes from us for defense against Argentina.

One may well question the desirability of strengthening military elements in countries that are, to a greater or lesser extent, trying to move away from a tradition of dominant influence of the military on political affairs, and endeavoring to develop democratic societies dedicated to freedom and social progress.

Among President Johnson's recent proposals to the Disarmament Conference meeting in Geneva is a suggestion that "countries, on a regional basis, explore ways to limit competition among themselves for costly weapons often sought for reasons of illusory prestige." On April 19, 1966, the U.S. delegate to the Disarmament Conference elaborated further the principles by which nations might undertake, on a regional basis, to limit conventional arms. If such regional arrangements could be concluded, potential suppliers should pledge to respect them and not deliver arms to the area.

But the Defense Department's guidelines for its arms salesmen give little encouragement to those who would favor restraint. Its pamphlet, *Information and Guidance on Military Assistance*, states:

"The Department of Defense has embarked on an intensified military assistance sales program.

"Achievement of . . . objectives calls for a very substantial increase over past sales levels. Success in this endeavor will be dependent in large measure upon effective sales promotion. The DOD has taken several steps to assist in the successful conclusion of military sales. . . . Foreign customer preference for U.S. material is being generated by developing an appreciation of its technical superiority, price, availability, and the offer of follow-on support through U.S. logistics systems.

"In many cases, credit arrangements may be made to facilitate military sales, on short or long term basis as needed."

It seems to be a case of the left hand of the government trying to control what the right hand is busily promoting.

Former Ambassador Galbraith has stated: "The policy of arming the indigent . . . has long since acquired a momentum of its own. It owes its existence partly to habit, partly to vested bureaucratic interest, partly to the natural desire to avoid thought and partly because to stop doing what is wrong is to confess past error."

He suggests limiting arms aid to countries that have an annual per capita income of more than \$200, except by specific Presidential determination.

At a minimum, one would hope for some rationalization of the United States policy on arms sales. There is evidence that the Soviet Union might welcome an opportunity to disengage from arms competitions, at least in the Middle East. The United States should pursue any such possibility and, at the same time, use its influence to persuade other major suppliers to agree to some form of conventional arms moratorium. Such a moratorium would be a further step in the direction of the general disarmament and nuclear weapons control which most of mankind so earnestly desires.

[From Forbes magazine]

Weapons sales abroad, 1962-65

[Defense Department estimates, in the thousands of dollars]

Company	Sales
General Dynamics:	
F-111A aircraft	1,072,000
Tartar missiles	34,400
Total	1,106,400
Lockheed:	
P-3A aircraft	23,500
F-104 aircraft	527,100
C-130 aircraft	409,300
Total	959,000
McDonnell Aircraft: F-4 aircraft	703,000
Lockheed-General Dynamics:	
(joint venture), Polaris missile system	427,600
Both Iron Works-Defoe Shipbuilding: (joint venture), guided missile destroyer (DDG)	277,600
Martin Marietta: Pershing missile system	253,100
Raytheon: Hawk missile system	231,800
FMC: Armored personnel carrier, M-113	166,800
Chrysler: Tank, 105 mm. gun, M60A1	154,200
Sperry Rand: Sergeant missile system	149,700
Ling-Temco-Vought: F-8E aircraft	66,000
General Motors: Howitzer, 155 mm., M-109	56,500
Boeing: C-135F aircraft	53,000
Pacific Car & Foundry: Gun, 175 mm., M-107	38,600
Grumman: S-2E aircraft	23,300

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT JOHNSON AT COMMISSIONING OF THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY SHIP "OCEANOGRAPHER"

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on Tuesday of this week President Lyndon B. Johnson spoke at the commissioning ceremonies of the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey ship *Oceanographer*, the most modern oceanographic survey ship in the world, and the first research ship to be commissioned since the enactment of S. 944, the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966.

It is fitting that this new ship will be operated by the Coast and Geodetic Survey, our Nation's oldest scientific agen-

cy—established by another visionary President, Thomas Jefferson, to make a "survey of the coast" of the brand-new Nation.

July 13 was actually a double ceremony, for it marked the first birthday of ESSA, the Environmental Science Services Administration, created from the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Weather Bureau, and the Central Radio Propagation Laboratory of the National Bureau of Standards by Presidential Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1965 in order to, in the President's words, "provide a single national focus for our efforts to describe, understand, and predict the state of the oceans, the state of the lower and upper atmosphere, and the size and shape of the earth."

The President's words were most encouraging to those of us who long have viewed the oceans and their abundant resources as vital to the future of our Nation and the world. They were particularly meaningful to me as they bring a promise of fulfillment to two important pieces of legislation I cosponsored: S. 944, the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966, and S. 2720, to authorize the construction of pilot plants to produce fish protein concentrate.

I ask unanimous consent to have the President's comments printed in their entirety in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE COMMISSIONING OF THE NEW RESEARCH SHIP, THE "OCEANOGRAPHER," NAVY YARD, PIER 2, 2:10 P.M.

Secretary and Mrs. Connor, Reverend Harris, Captain Wardwell, my beloved friend Senator MAGNUSON, Governor Burns of Hawaii, distinguished Members of Congress, guests, ladies and gentlemen, we meet here today at the beginning of a new age of exploration.

To some, this might mean our adventures in outer space. But I am speaking of exploring an unknown world at our doorstep. It is really our last frontier here on earth. I am speaking of mountain chains that are yet to be discovered, of natural resources that are yet to be tapped, of a vast wilderness that is yet to be chartered.

This is the sea around us.

While our knowledge of the sea is quite primitive, we do know something of its great potential for the betterment of the human race and all mankind.

We know that we can, for instance, greatly improve our weather predictions. We can save thousands of lives and millions of dollars in property each year. We just must start learning more about the sea.

We know that the sea holds a great promise of transforming arid regions of the earth into new, rich and productive farmlands.

We know that beneath the sea are countless minerals and fuels which can be found and exploited. We know—most important of all—that the sea holds the ultimate answer to food for the exploding population in the world. Nearly four-fifths of all life, of all life on earth, actually exists in salt water.

Using science and technology, we must develop improved ways of taking food from the ocean.

But catching fish is just not enough. It has been said that throughout history we have been simple hunters of the sea. Men must now learn how to farm the sea.

Our scientists are developing a process for turning whole fish into a tasteless but highly nutritious protein concentrate which can be used as a supplement to our daily diet.

In addition, the United States Senate has recently passed a bill for the construction of several pilot plants to begin the commercial development of this fish protein food. The daily output of one of these plants would provide enough high protein supplement for well over half a million people each day.

It is toward a goal of understanding all aspects of the sea that we have commissioned the *Oceanographer* today.

Oceanographer is one of the Coast and Geodetic Survey's 14 research ships which will begin to help us explore the environment around us. Her sister ship, *Discoverer*, is under construction and also will be commissioned shortly.

In the past decade, our support of marine science and technology has grown from some \$21 million to more than \$320 million.

The Federal research fleet today totals 115 vessels.

Our progress has been the handiwork, of course, of many men. These men are in and out of Government. But the Nation owes a very particular debt to those particular members of the Congress, men such as our distinguished Senator MAGNUSON of Washington, who is here today and whose efforts have accomplished so much for oceanography over the last decade.

I want to pay tribute to the Secretary, the Under Secretary, the Assistant Secretaries, all the employees of the Department of Commerce and the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and other Government officials.

But I also want to say that today we must redouble our efforts. In the months ahead, we shall establish our priorities, we shall then set our timetables—and we shall follow them, just as we have followed an orderly and relentless program for the exploration of space. And the distinguished Scientific Adviser to the President, Dr. Hornig, is going to keep seeing that we do this. The frontier of our deep challenges our spirit and we want to see that that challenge from the deep is fully met.

My Science Advisory Committee has recently completed a report on "The Effective Use of the Sea." Through Dr. Hornig I am releasing that report today. I should like to commend it to the attention of all Americans.

I commend it, in particular, to the 100 outstanding high school students who have joined us here today and who have come to the Capital from the States of this Union. I hope that there are among you some of the great oceanographers of tomorrow. You could not choose, in my judgment, a more important or a more challenging career.

I am referring this report from my Science Advisory Committee to the new National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering set up by statute under the leadership of Senator MAGNUSON. This Council will be headed by our distinguished Vice President; distinguished members of the Cabinet and others will serve on it.

This Council will survey all marine science activities to provide for this Nation a comprehensive program in this field. I will ask them to complete their initial recommendations by the time the new Congress convenes next January.

Truly great accomplishments in oceanography will require the cooperation of all the maritime nations of the world. Today I send our voice out from this platform calling for such cooperation, requesting it, and urging it.

To the Soviet Union—a major maritime power—I today extend our earnest wish that you may join with us in this great endeavor.

In accordance with these desires I am happy to announce that one of the first long voyages of *Oceanographer* will be a six-month global expedition in which the scientists from a number of our great nations will participate. It is our intention to invite Great Britain, West Germany, France, the U.S.S.R., India, Malaysia, Australia, New Zealand, Chile, and Peru to participate in the first round-the-world voyage of *Oceanographer*.

We greatly welcome this type of international participation. Under no circumstances, we believe, must we ever allow the prospects of rich harvest and mineral wealth create a new form of colonial competition among the maritime nations. We must be careful to avoid a race to grab and to hold the lands under the high seas. We must ensure that the deep seas and the ocean bottoms are, and remain, the legacy of all human beings.

The sea, in the words of Longfellow, "divides and yet unites mankind."

So to Captain Wardwell and his distinguished officers and men of *Oceanographer*, we say today: Yours is a most worthwhile mission. May you bring back much for the benefit of all humanity.

We congratulate you on the commissioning of your marvelous new ship. We wish you the best of results, fair winds, and smooth sailing.

And now I look forward with a great deal of personal pleasure to the opportunity to view the ship and some of the developments at first hand.

Thank you very much.

FEEDING 100 SENATORS?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, we have all enjoyed and benefited from the expert management of Mr. Robert Parker, chef of the Senate Restaurant in the Capitol.

I am pleased to see that Mr. Parker's finesse in operating the restaurant is becoming well known elsewhere as well as on Capitol Hill. An article in the *Star-Ledger* of Newark, N.J., on July 10, 1966, noted that a 14-hour day is often spent by Mr. Parker in doing his work. It says that he delights in the "unexpected."

As chairman of the Senate Rules Subcommittee on Senate Restaurants, I am pleased to have the work of Robert Parker made public. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

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

FEEDING 100 SENATORS? NO TREAT FOR THE CHEF

(By Vera Glaser)

The care and feeding of 100 U.S. Senators is enough to give any man a nervous stomach and Robert Parker, maitre d'hotel at the famous Senate restaurant in the Capitol, has one.

But the handsome, conservatively dressed Negro is too busy keeping track of the food foibles of the famous to worry about his own. From apple butter to zucchini, Robert knows what the lawmakers love to eat and loves nothing better than to produce it.

"They're all kings as far as I'm concerned," he said of his Senatorial bosses.

Sometimes Robert puts in 14 hours a day greeting, seating, and master-minding menus. He delights in the unexpected. A Senator may turn up for the breakfast, lunch or dinner with a princess, an astronaut, an ambassador, a lobbyist, or a plain old constituent.

"Is my credit still good, Robert?" Arkansas Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN often teases as he enters.

Once seated, he calls for a "McClellan hamburger" which means a ball of chopped steak cooked slowly on top of the stove, never flattened with a spatula, and brought to the table at medium doneness.

When Mississippi's courtly JOHN STENNIS appears for breakfast, everyone knows he wants his eggs over hard on a plate so hot it has to be carried in another.

And when Florida's SPESSARD HOLLAND requests his "Holland sandwich" the chef combines chicken and lettuce on whole wheat bread, seasoning slightly but using no butter or mayonnaise.

"Bring me what the big shots eat!" quips youthful GALE MCGEE of Wyoming, pointing to the mounds of toasted corn bread, a restaurant specialty automatically placed on the tables of West Virginia's ROBERT BYRD and RALPH YARBOROUGH of Texas.

Vermont's GEORGE AIKEN has a standard lunch—soup, ice cream and coffee—and Oregon's WAYNE MORSE loves fried eggs and link sausage. Missouri's STUART SYMINGTON and Idaho's FRANK CHURCH are rare-roast-beef men. Robert personally selects their cuts in the kitchen.

The "Lausche salad," favorite of Ohio's FRANK LAUSCHE, is grapefruit and orange slices topped with a double scoop of raspberry sherbet.

LAUSCHE's fellow Ohioan, ROBERT YOUNG, is almost indifferent to food, but Virginia's WILLIS ROBERTSON delights in it. He often brings rabbit, ducks or fish from his hunting and fishing trips. The restaurant prepares these for him and his guests, adding plenty of hot spoon bread or biscuits which ROBERTSON douses in bacon grease and syrup.

Tucked away in a sideboard Robert keeps a jug of "Mountain Sourwood Honey" from Ribbon Gap, Georgia for Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, and a container of non-caloric sugar for GALE MCGEE to sprinkle over fresh strawberries.

As he hustles about, Robert listens for the bell signals denoting roll call votes or quorum calls. If a Senator is too absorbed in talk to hear them, Robert touches his shoulder to remind him he is needed on the floor to vote.

The Senator's dining room is tucked away behind the public eating area in the Capitol's north wing. It seats 130 and stays open as long as the Senators, wives, and administrative assistants are admitted.

Even more exclusive is the "inner sanctum" across the hall. There, in two chandelied chambers known as the "Republican Room" and the "Democratic Room," each seating about a dozen, the lawmakers can escape and take nourishment in the company of only fellow Senators.

Staffers with urgent messages simply have to pass notes to their bosses via Robert.

Inner sanctum regulars are Tennessee's ROSS BASS and Illinois' EVERETT DIRKSEN. Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD usually eats at his desk.

"I doubt if three Senators know my last name," said the maitre d' modestly. "Most of them call me Robert or Chef."

But at least two former Senators—President Johnson and Vice President HUMPHREY—know Robert well.

Almost 20 years ago, Parker, a native of Houston, Texas, returned from service in World War II, took a job as postman and began delivering mail to the Johnson residence. Sometimes he helped little Lynda Bird and Luci Baines cross the street.

He knew the family cook, Mrs. Zephyr Wright, with whom he had gone to Bishop College in Marshall Texas.

When the Senate Majority Leader had a heart attack in the mid-fifties, Robert made a special after-hours trip to deliver a letter

to him at Walter Reed hospital, a thoughtful-ness LBJ never forgot.

Recently the President popped in at a luncheon given by Maine's MARGARET CHASE SMITH, spotted Robert, and greeted him warmly.

"Hold the soup until I finish my speech," he said.

Robert's friendship with the Vice President who was instrumental in getting him his present job dates back to his days as maitre de at Twining Court Stables, a favorite Humphrey haunt.

He cherishes a photograph autographed by HUMPHREY, "To Robert Parker, a gentleman and a friend."

With the backing of restaurant manager Joseph Diamond, Robert has improved the service and atmosphere in the Senators dining room, rearranging tables, keeping fresh flowers on each one.

Recently Senator RUSSELL LONG complained that the food in the restaurant was not up to Louisiana's gourmet standards and asked Robert to draw up a list of items needed to perk up the menu.

During adjournment the room will be redecorated in off-white. There will be new draperies and new china, crystal and silver bearing the seal of the United States.

There is some question whether the other 99 Senators want anything fancier than they have now. Currently the most popular items are beef on bun (80 cents), bean soup (25 cents) and toasted corn bread (10 cents).

In four years on the job Robert has never said no to a Senator, but he admits the pressure can get a little rough at times.

"You've got 24 tables. You've got 100 Senators. When they call for a table and you don't have it, you've got to produce somehow. I don't know how I do it some days. You've got to be on the ball."

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION COMMITTED TO IMPROVEMENTS IN THE SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COMPANY PROGRAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Bernard Boutin, the able new Administrator of the Small Business Administration, testified before the Small Business Subcommittee of the Banking Committee this morning.

Mr. Boutin testified on the small business investment program which has been under severe attack.

The small business investment company program has been criticized because substantial Government and private money has been lost in the program. There have been a number of allegations of illegal and unethical conduct by those who have borrowed Federal money under this program.

Now, Mr. President, Mr. Boutin came into the Small Business Administration only 2 months ago. He has acted with speed and decisiveness to get the small business investment company program back on the track.

His statement spells out concisely just what Mr. Boutin has done and what he intends to do.

This Boutin statement also makes it clear that the SBA will do its best to give the American small businessman an increasing opportunity to secure equity and long-term capital. That is the prime purpose of the program.

Mr. Boutin recommended legislation as well as described administrative improvements he is instituting.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement by Mr. Boutin be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF BERNARD L. BOUTIN, ADMINISTRATOR OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, UNITED STATES SENATE, FRIDAY, JULY 15, 1966

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I very much appreciate this opportunity to discuss with you the current condition of the Small Business Administration's small business investment company program. My statement will be brief and my associates and I will be happy to answer any questions.

I would first like to discuss the legislative background of this program, our present overview of the program today, actions that we have taken in the last 60 days and will be taking in the days immediately ahead to improve the program, and, finally, our longer range views for the future. It is, of course, our basic intention to bring this program to the point where the objectives of the Congress at the time the act was passed are fully realized. The objective of the program is to "stimulate and supplement the flow of private equity capital and long term loan funds which small business concerns need for the sound financing of their business operations and for their growth, expansion and modernization."

From the time the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 was passed until the present, there have been a number of amendments which have been enacted to strengthen the program in the light of operating experience.

The current status and the present legislation may be briefly summarized as follows:

1. A small business investment company is incorporated under the laws of the State in which it is to operate.

2. A license is issued to a group of individuals who meet certain standards. A list of these standards is attached to the statement as appendix I.

3. An SBIC may obtain funds from the Government in two ways:

A. From 5 percent, 20 year debentures, in an amount equal to the privately invested capital but not to exceed \$700,000.

B. From 5½ percent, 15 year loans, in an amount not greater than 50 percent of the amount of the privately invested capital plus the amount of government funds supplied in (A) above but not to exceed \$4 million.

4. An SBIC may not borrow funds in excess of 4 times its statutory capital without prior approval. This amount must include all government borrowings under section 303.

5. SBIC's may invest their funds in small business concerns by straight loans and equity type investments with the following major provisions:

A. The amount of funds invested in real estate must not exceed one-third of their portfolio.

B. A 20 percent line limit of their statutory capital to any one concern.

C. Restrictions on affiliated transactions involving the principals of the SBIC.

D. All financing must be for at least five years.

6. SBIC's are given certain types of tax benefits which are shown in appendix II, attached.

SBIC's are subject to certain regulatory requirements:

1. Certain detailed financial reports must be submitted twice a year to SBA. The year end report requires certification of an independent accountant or CPA.

2. SBIC's must obtain SBA approval for certain kinds of transactions or changes in control.

3. SBIC's are subject to regular examinations by SBA Staff for which they are charged a fee.

Our activities under the SBIC program to June 30, 1966, may be summarized as follows:

1. There were 686 licensees remaining in the program, of which approximately 600 were licensed during the period from 1961 to 1963.

2. SBIC's have made in excess of 20,000 financings during the life of the program.

3. From the best information available, indications are that there are approximately 250 companies operating unsatisfactorily for any number of reasons including violation of our regulations. Most of these should not, and will not, remain in the program.

Involved in these companies is about \$125 million of private funds and about \$75 million of Government funds. While we do not have precise information, the former Deputy Administrator for the investment division has estimated that the Government might suffer losses from \$18 to \$20 million on these companies.

4. The total Government investment in SBIC's as of May 31, 1966, was \$270,588,000 as compared to approximately \$462,310,000 of privately invested capital as of September 30, 1965.

I am submitting for the record as appendix III a review of the legislative history of the Small Business Investment Act, as amended, and information concerning the formation and operation of the program under this legislation.

In the roughly 60 days that I have been Administrator, I have devoted much of my time to an evaluation of this program and based on the best information available I have reached conclusions which have been translated into actions to improve the program's performance. My primary intention, which I am sure members of the committee share, is to reinforce the original intent of the Congress when it enacted the Small Business Investment Act and which guided it when it made subsequent amendments. The Congress determined, and we agree, that small business concerns needed an additional source of equity and loan financing. There is nothing in my review which leads me to conclude that the legislation Congress passed in 1958 was in any way unsound. I am convinced that the small business community currently needs and will continue to need long term loans and equity financing from SBIC's.

Since it is my belief that the program was and is based on sound premises, I sought to determine whether it was meeting the goals that Congress had set and, if not, what could be done about it. I do not believe that the SBIC program to date has fulfilled the high hopes which its sponsors held for it. I have, however, seen much evidence that many SBIC's are operating clearly within the framework of congressional intent. We have evidence indicating that many SBIC's are making imaginative, needed contributions to sound, progressive small business concerns in all parts of the country and in many diversified fields.

We know of investments in small business which are playing important roles in the defense effort and I call your attention to attachment No. 1.

They have made investments in very small retail concerns and I refer you to attachment No. 2 which provides some interesting information. Investments have been made in small businesses in large cities, in the suburbs, in rural communities, in growth areas, and in distressed areas. Attachments Nos. 3, 4, 5, and 6 are examples.

New products are being marketed because of the timely financial assistance of SBIC's.

Investments in firms such as those developing processes for the desalinization of sea water, for example, are clearly serving national goals. I refer you to attachments Nos. 7 and 8.

While I recognize the many benefits to the small business community which have resulted from the participation of SBIC's, I nevertheless strongly feel that the SBIC program has hardly begun to reach its full potential. There are many possible explanations and rationales for the problems which have developed. The simple fact that making sound, long term investments in growing small businesses is an extremely difficult and complex undertaking is but an example. There are limited numbers of people with the background and experience that qualifies them to operate SBIC's successfully.

Some of the difficulties experienced in the program can undoubtedly be laid to the door of SBA itself. There are those who feel that earlier in the program there was undue emphasis on the rapid licensing of new SBIC's. There are others who feel that there may have been a tendency in the later stages of the program to concentrate on encouraging profitability of SBIC's. I believe, however, that no real useful purpose is served by looking to the past except that the errors of the past assist us now in developing a more successful program.

I commit myself and my associates in the months ahead to making SBA a strongly administered, well managed, financially responsible organization in conducting the affairs of the SBIC program.

Since one of the basic obligations of the program is to assist the small businessman, greater emphasis must be placed on this premise. I wholeheartedly concur with your excellent statement, Mr. Chairman, "that there has been too little concern for small businessmen who should be the main beneficiary of this program." The prime measure for success or failure of the SBIC program must indeed be the extent it will help the small businessman.

On the other side of the coin, I also support the profit motive as an important part of this program. We must design our administration of the program so as to attract private capital and competent management. The program must, by our rules and regulations, establish clear and certain operating limitations. These rules and regulations, however, must not be so arbitrary and inflexible as to be either unreasonable or unworkable from the standpoint of the SBIC operator.

Therefore, I intend to make it a cardinal rule that we must strike a balance between the interest of the small business community and the SBIC industry for the mutual benefit of both. This will assure the accomplishment of the national policy and make the most efficient use of the public funds which have been entrusted to our administration. I have begun a program to meet these objectives.

I have ordered a review of all current licensing standards to be completed within 60 days to make certain that applicants for licenses are highly qualified, of unquestioned integrity and are adequately financed.

I have instructed Mr. Greenberg and his staff to develop loan guidelines to be followed by the SBIC's and to provide a system of surveillance to see that this industry serves small business as intended.

I have instructed Mr. Greenberg to begin a study to determine whether existing licensees who entered the program under previous standards should be required to upgrade their operations to meet current or future higher standards and, if so, how much time they should be allowed to comply.

I have given instructions that no new licenses will be issued or transfer of control allowed unless the investment division is fully satisfied from meetings with the ap-

plicants that they are fully qualified under our regulations.

I have also established a firm policy that each SBIC will be thoroughly examined at least once each year. Each new licensee will be examined within six months after licensing or whenever it first requests Government funds, whichever date is earlier.

I have taken action to improve administrative control by transferring the examination and investigation function of SBIC's from the investment division to a newly created office of audits and investigations under the jurisdiction of the Assistant Administrator for Administration. This will give the Administrator an independent reading on SBIC operations as well as a tool for determining the adequacy of the management of the program.

Because I am fully satisfied that we have a great lack of current information and because it is essential that we have accurate information as soon as possible on every single SBIC licensed by SBA, I have instructed that all SBIC's currently licensed be fully examined within the next 120 days. I doubt that this can be done with our present staff but we will attempt to borrow qualified persons from other agencies to help us meet this requirement.

In the meantime we are moving as quickly as possible to eliminate from the program those SBIC's which show no promise of satisfactory or productive performance. We further are moving ahead at an accelerated pace to eliminate any undesirable elements from the program. We do not want them in the program. The industry does not need them in the program and I intend to get rid of them.

Looking to the future we also are examining very carefully additional actions we might take administratively. We have begun a review of our regulations, procedures and reporting requirements. This review will be completed in 60 days. Our initial review clearly indicates to me that they are deficient in some respects and unclear in others. We will move rapidly to clarify those needing clarification and to correct any deficiencies which exist.

We are giving serious consideration to lifting the present administrative restrictions on full borrowing under section 302 for debentures.

As I am sure this committee recognizes, one of the interesting aspects of the program is that SBIC's are not alike. Some are small companies in small towns while others are large and operate in major financial centers. Some borrow government funds while others do not. Some are profitable and some are not. It is impossible to generalize about SBIC's in terms of size, length of experience, geographical location or portfolio content. Our rules and regulations must be broad enough for general application but precise enough for individual situations.

The first protection of government funds is the private capital invested in SBIC's. To the extent that private capital becomes impaired, government risk increases. I am, therefore, studying the possibility of lowering the present 50 percent definition of impairment.

There are also ways in which SBA and the Congress can work together to further strengthen the program and we are currently studying all possibilities.

While I personally have no doubt of my authority and responsibility in the SBIC program, I understand there have been some doubts in the past. I, therefore, am strongly of the opinion that the language of section 201 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 should be amended to assure that the investment program is subject to the same principles of management, control, and supervision as all other activities of SBA. I believe that the Administrator of SBA should clearly have full authority to organize and

assign responsibilities within the agency for maximum management control and efficiency of operation. I believe, therefore, that specific reference to a deputy administrator for investment and to an investment division should be deleted from the statute.

We are also considering the possibility of recommending to the Congress legislation which would allow the SBA Administrator to oust undesirable operatives from the SBIC program.

Experience has shown that SBIC's affiliated with banks and other financial institutions have been generally better managed and have been more successful. (I might add, this also applies generally to publicly-owned SBIC's.) To encourage this type we are giving consideration to recommending to the Congress that the limit of permissible bank investments in SBIC's be increased from the present 2 percent.

Present law places two main limits on government fund availability to SBIC's—\$700,000 under section 302 and \$4,000,000 under section 303. These limitations place larger SBIC's at a disadvantage. We are giving serious thought to the possibility of requesting that these limits be either raised or eliminated in order to equalize leverage between small and large SBIC's and to allow both large and small to receive government funds at a ratio of 2 to 1. Presently, of course, only the smaller companies have this advantage.

We, further, are giving our attention to the need for better tools to enable SBA to act promptly and with authority whenever we find our regulations being violated. We may recommend to the Congress that SBA be given the authority to revoke licenses in administrative proceedings. Court action is now required to accomplish this.

We are also carefully evaluating various legislative proposals now pending before the Congress. An example is the legislation which has been introduced to establish an SBIC bank financed with Government funds. We believe that one way to measure the success of a program is the extent to which the Government's financial commitment can be reduced. We will also study the possibility of a privately financed capital bank. Such a bank might obtain part of its initial investment from the Government but would derive its main capital from SBIC's and other private financial sources wishing to become members. Such a bank could function as a secondary market for small business paper much as FNMA operates in the mortgage market. With a privately financed capital bank, SBA participation would likely be limited to licensing and regulation.

I am attempting, Mr. Chairman, to demonstrate to you and the members of your committee the fact that we are taking a comprehensive new look at the program. In some cases we have already drawn firm conclusions and have moved ahead rapidly to take corrective action. In other areas we are studying all of the alternatives and hope to have some sound proposals to discuss with the Bureau of the Budget and, if approved by them, with the Congress.

Undoubtedly, there have been abuses as well as violations of SBA's regulations. Also, undoubtedly SBA has not been as firm a manager as it should have been but it is my firm belief that this industry is capable of performing an important function in the national interest and that it is incumbent upon SBA to do everything possible to get the program on the right track and keep it there.

It has been suggested that the industry be given the authority to police itself. I believe it is too early in our history to place total reliance on self-policing. I will continue to explore this possibility and will work with the industry in developing an appropriate approach. We still have much to do to assure protection to Government funds in the SBIC program.

As I have stated earlier, one of our most pressing needs is accurate and current information. From steps already taken we will shortly have this need fulfilled.

We are anxious to work closely with this committee to find solutions that will assure on a long-term basis that this program fulfills the mandate of the Congress by helping to meet the needs of the small business community.

SUPREME COURT DECISIONS CONCERNING REGISTRATION OF MEMBERS AND OFFICERS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, recent Supreme Court decisions have virtually nullified major provisions of the law concerning the registration of both individual Communists and officers of the Communist Party. As a direct result, the Communist Party of the United States held the first national convention of their party in many years in June of this year.

Mr. Lee Bandy, the noted Washington correspondent of the Greenville News of Greenville, S.C., covered this national convention and has written a series of articles on the Communist Party. These articles appeared beginning on Monday, July 11, through Thursday, July 14, and they are a model of journalistic excellence. They are written with complete objectivity and are interspersed with quotes from and observations about the leaders of the Communist Party and other groups who either had observers at the convention or were noted in the proceedings of the convention. In my judgment, these articles provide an invaluable insight into the thinking of the leaders of the Communist Party in the United States and should prove of inestimable worth to all the Members of Congress. I ask unanimous consent that these four articles be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

[From the Greenville News, July 11, 1966]
THE BATTLE CRY OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY:
"OUR GOAL IS SOCIALISM FOR THE U.S.A."

(By Lee Bandy)

WASHINGTON.—"Our goal is socialism for the United States."

That's the battle cry of the Communist Party, U.S.A., as it breaks ground for its first "open" political year in the history of this country.

Party members claim their task is to win adherents to this goal among the American working people whom they consider the key crowd in crushing the government—big business "conspiracy."

CPUSA faithful, who just wrapped up a four-day 18th national convention in New York City, believe circumstances for accomplishing the goal are in their favor.

They cite successes in socialistic countries abroad and the conviction among growing numbers in this country that radical solutions are required for our economic and social problems.

The party members contend that questions of capitalism have created a soaring interest in the idea of socialism and a rise in socialist consciousness.

Suggesting CPUSA expand the propagation of the idea, American Communist officials urge comrades explain far more widely the

nature and necessity of socialism, its accomplishments in the lands where it already exists, and its enormous potential for the American people.

Members admit socialism in this country is to serve as the basis for building to new heights the size and strength of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

They recognize the battle will not be easily won and that it will require scars, deaths and hardships along the way. However, they declare the fight will be waged come what may.

The starting point will be the American working class which, CPUSA leaders say, must be organized into a "people's party" to break the government-big business "conspiracy" against the poor man.

They also call for the election of an administration and Congress "representative of the anti-monopoly forces."

"The key to the direction of this country lies in the advancement to the center of the stage of the working class and its organized sector," they assert.

"DECISIVE FOR FUTURE"

"Overcoming the present weakness in labor's role is decisive for the future of our country, and it is to this that the progressive forces, and the communists in particular, must address themselves as the central task of the day."

In their struggle, CPUSA officials see encouragement on the horizon. They note:

"Prolonged, hard-fought strikes have become more numerous recently. The war on poverty has stimulated a wave of community organizations throughout the country for a real attack on poverty. And in the Negro people's struggle for full political, economic and social equality, emphasis is shifting more and more to basic economic demands."

"The need for a concerted attack on unemployment and poverty is becoming ever more pressing. At the heart of such an attack lies the fight for jobs, for massive public works programs and other government actions to provide employment, for a 30-hour week, for abolition of overtime for some while others go idle."

Moreover party leaders list as "musts" destruction of slum ghettos, aid to small farmers, rehabilitation of Appalachia, a comprehensive social insurance system, vastly-increased old-age pensions and unemployment benefits, a much higher minimum wage, and the application of such benefits to all workers.

To accomplish such goals, members say: "We must mobilize the broadest possible coalition against the most reactionary, pro-war and pro-fascist sections of monopoly capital, and by defeating these to create the base for mass pressure on those in power to shift their policies in the direction of peace and democracy."

They realize this will mean "a socialist reconstruction of society" through a "government of the working class."

The struggle, they add, will include combining "the most diverse forms of mass action and public agitation with the electoral and legislative process."

The Red officials point out that socialism in this country will bear the marks of the womb from which it springs. It will not be modeled after that in any other country.

"FEATURES OF AMERICA"

"It will reflect the distinct features of American historical development, tradition and environment."

"Socialism here will represent extension of democracy to its fullest, taking as its starting point the democratic traditions and institutions of the American people."

"We believe and advocate that American socialism will guarantee all the liberties contained in the Bill of Rights, including the right of the people to express themselves freely through organizations of their choice,

through different parties and competing candidates.

"Indeed, the freedoms in the Bill of Rights will take on far greater substantive meaning because private ownership of corporate wealth . . . will have been eliminated. Economic democracy is the foundation for a new birth of freedom."

"Once man in the collective becomes master of the economy, man as an individual is freed from its oppressive weight. Making a living ceases to be the desperate struggle it now is; labor loses its onerous qualities and becomes a means of self-fulfillment. Man can at last rise above the animal, jungle level of struggle for existence."

CPUSA officials promise socialism will free this country "of a fountainhead of moral corruption, hypocrisy and degradation that has plagued it from birth."

They praise socialism as the "philosophy of optimism, the affirmation of human progress, of the human potential, of man's capacity to create a rational human society. It is the promise of singing tomorrows."

NEXT: The Communist Party and Civil Rights.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, July 12, 1966]

U.S. REDS HAVE BEEN CALLING FOR "BLACK POWER" SINCE 1959

(By Lee Bandy)

WASHINGTON.—The cry for "black power" is not new to the Communist Party, U.S.A.

It has been calling for it ever since 1959 when CPUSA adopted a resolution at the party's 17th national convention, recommending "Negro political power" today.

The official position, akin to "black power" demands in some Negro quarters now, stated six years ago that:

"Negro people in the U. S. must secure their full rightful share of government power. In those urban and rural communities where they are the larger part of the population generally, and in the Deep South area of the historic American cradleland of the Negro people particularly, they must constitute the majority power in government."

"POLITICAL STRUGGLE"

"In its essence, therefore, the struggle for Negro rights is not a mere 'civil rights' fight, it is a political struggle . . ."

Gus Hall, national secretary of the U. S. Communist party, referred to the resolution in his three-hour keynote address to the 18th national convention which just concluded in New York City.

Saying that the party had taken a "black power" stand some years ago, the top American Communists urged those "who say we are talking events" to read the resolution.

The communist leader criticized persons who become alarmed when the question of "Negro political power" is raised and who looked upon such authority as a "woeful dilemma."

"Where Negro citizens are in the majority they must have the right to exercise political power. This means the transference of that power from the present minority (Whites) to them (Negroes) as the majority," he asserted.

Hall suggested as one avenue of approach the formation of Negro political groups like the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party. The election and candidacy of colored is another, he added.

James E. Jackson, identified as one of the party's Negro leaders, issued a statement during the convention expressing "deep appreciation for the important and continuing contribution of SNCC (Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee) and the Black Panther movement (in Alabama) to the cause of Negro representation—for majority Negro power in the areas of Negro majority, as well as for maximum representation where Negroes are in minority situations."

Stokely Carmichael, SNCC national director, started the "black power" cry while on the recent freedom march in Mississippi. He was joined later by members of the Black Panther crowd and Congress for Racial Equality (Core).

NAACP NOT CONNECTED

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People has disassociated itself from the term.

Jackson told the Communist convention: "We consider the fulfillment of the right of the majority to the power in local areas as an important task in the total program for full integration of Negroes in the nation on the basis of the reconstruction of full freedom and equality."

Turning its guns on other civil rights problems, the party adopted a resolution calling for an end to "grinding" poverty, mass unemployment, substandard wages, the "abominable" ghetto housing, and "above all the unbridled police brutality."

It praised the rioters in Watts for focusing the attention upon those problems, and thanked Dr. Martin Luther King and "large sections of organized labor" for carrying the same "banner."

The party members contend Negroes "are intimately associated with the struggles for shorter hours, higher pay, longer vacations, early retirement, public works programs, and all other measures to increase and raise living standards for all workers."

"To build such working-class solidarity calls for a much greater fight to break down the barriers of White chauvinism in the ranks of labor and to secure labor's full involvement in the economic and other struggles of the Negro people as part of their own, and not least to develop an all-out campaign to organize the South."

One aim of the U.S. Communist party, they say, is to destroy "the power of the Dixiecrats" and increase "election of Negroes to state legislatures and local offices" throughout the South.

VICTORY NOT WON

Party officials concede the basic victory is yet to be won, and major battles lie ahead which demand the commitment and concentrated efforts of all the forces of progress in the country.

Claude Lightfoot, identified as chairman of the Communist party's Negro Commission, declared his party is going to move openly into the civil rights fray whether other groups like it or not.

"We will allow no one in the civil rights movement or the White power structure to block us," he asserted. "Lily white America has not been disturbed too much. In some respects, the situation has deteriorated, especially in the area of economics."

He warned that unless forthcoming programs raise the level of incomes for Negroes there will be further outbursts like Watts and Chicago—the home of Lightfoot.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, July 13, 1966]

U.S. COMMUNIST PARTY—REDS TAKE CREDIT FOR YOUTH GROUPS

(By Lee Bandy)

WASHINGTON.—The Communist party, U.S.A., takes credit for the newly emergent left among college youth.

It claims the "radical" trend is "an outgrowth of the seeds we and others helped to sow."

In its youth report to the party's 18th national convention in New York City recently, the U. S. Communist party listed four student groups as by-products of its efforts:

The Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), which assertedly has "moved rapidly to the left" since its start in the civil rights fight.

Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), called a "first link to left student activity."

W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America, held to have "begun to show the relevance of a socialist approach."

National Coordinating Committee to End the War in Viet Nam.

ONE TAKES ISSUE

Clark Kissinger, national secretary of SDS, takes issue with U. S. Communist claims that his organization and other student left groups are a result of Red party activity.

The SDS leader, an observer at the convention, notes his group was in existence long before the U. S. Communist party was ever organized in this country.

Kissinger adds, however, "we will be glad to work with the Communist party on specific programs." He didn't elaborate.

The U. S. Communist party decries what it calls "ultra-left" youth organizations, citing Youth Against War and Fascism, Young Socialist Alliance, Progressive Labor Party and the May 2nd Movement.

It says these groups have siphoned off talent "into hopelessly narrow and sectarian positions" that "view as a 'sellout' any struggle that doesn't demand 'socialism now.'"

The U. S. Communist party complains that such groups split coalitions seeking "limited goals."

It urges the "ultra-left" to participate in "united front struggles with the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy or other predominantly middle class peace organizations."

Kissinger doubts the American Communists will be successful in their efforts to unite all left groups under the CP banner.

"Too many of the organizations want to run their own show," he points out. "Also, many of the groups have differing ideologies."

The U. S. Communist party believes the "ultra-left" is not aware that refusal to unite is "destructive."

Consequently, the party says its purpose should be to show the "fringe" groups "that revolutionary militance is not in contradiction with the fight for democratic unity."

"We Communists do not see the newly emerged left as a force separate and antagonistic to our party or from the long radical tradition of America, but rather as an outgrowth of the seeds we and others helped to sow."

For some new left groups, the Communist party says, "a radical reorganization of society has become at least a vague socialism. For others, socialism is already taking on a scientific meaning and is leading them to study Marxism and to consider joining the Communist party."

It notes "direction of the new left has been to move closer to Marxism," but at the same time various problem areas exist.

One is that "the majority of the youth movement has not picked out the socialist alternative and become committed to it." However, the party observes "there is a willingness to study these alternatives."

It points out that objections are raised in questions such as:

"Socialism is fine but will it work?" "Socialism is fine but is it possible to achieve?"

The U. S. Communist party contends "there is a new seriousness to these questions that reflect the leftward trend of the Democratic movement."

Gus Hall, national secretary of the American Communist party, told the convention delegates the "youth are now the spirit and the pace-setters of our party."

"They have stood up against the most inhuman brutalities. Their voices have made 'We Shall Overcome' the song of bravery and heroism throughout the world."

The party's youth commission asserts the nation has 100,000 or more young people in a "conscious left component." About 2,000 of them are members of the U.S. Communist party, it reports.

The panel estimated that "at least two million students" had taken part in teach-ins against the Viet Nam War, and "at least one million youth in some other action against the war."

The party leaders admit one of the problems facing the organization is the current age gap between the older officials and the younger sect.

Both discuss the same basic political themes—imperialism, monopoly capitalism, working class struggle.

But they represent two generations, two sets of attitudes so diverse that they find it increasingly hard to get along together under the same red flag.

Robert Duggan, 27, a Los Angeles plasterer's son, says:

"The youth are sharper, more willing to take stands. Anything that's been done in the party during the last four years is the work of young Communists."

Arnold Johnson, 61, public relations director for the party and a member since the 1930's replies:

"What you have here is the impatience of youth. There are, admittedly, some problems of rapport."

There are growing indications the under-30 group is finding its elders more narrow than they expected.

The first clear suggestion of a clash came at the convention when Bettina Aptheker, a founder of the Free Speech Movement, criticized party leadership for underplaying the role of youth.

The effect of the age * * * suggested, was to turn youth leftists away from the party toward such organizations as Students for Democratic Society.

Duggan, who heads a group of Communist-oriented youth clubs in Los Angeles, admits to being troubled by dark interludes in the party's past and questions "the ugly aspect of the old ways."

Older leaders answer that Duggan's generation fails to appreciate the need for discipline and solidarity.

"You've got to understand," Johnson said, "that we'd like to get them into positions of leadership. But we've got to loosen up first."

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, July 14, 1966]

TO GUN FOR OPPONENTS OF COMMUNISM—AMERICAN REDS PREDICTING VICTORY IN POLITICAL ARENA WITHIN 2 YEARS

(By Lee Bandy)

WASHINGTON.—The Communist Party, U.S.A., launches a new political year with an air of confidence never before exhibited in CPUSA history.

The members are predicting "victory" in the political arena with the next two years and destruction of capitalism in the "distant future."

Gus Hall, national secretary of the party, says a chief aim is to organize a "people's party" for the purpose of dislodging opponents of communism from their "dominant political position."

He declines making any forecast, adding: "Only the naive would now either try to set it up or predict when and how it will make the scene. It will be a reflection of a qualitative shift in the relationship of political forces."

"However, it is also not enough to say it is inevitable. It is necessary for the more advanced forces constantly to project the idea into the political dialogue."

The CPUSA leader cites as encouragement a movement for "independent political action" across the country. Such, he contends,

must be organized into a political force to destroy "the two old parties of capitalism."

Hall sees independent movements within the Democratic Party—such as the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, California Democratic Council and New York Insurgents—as an indication of growing dissatisfaction with party machine politics.

He recognizes "these forces" need a political home but that they're not ready for it at this stage of the game; that they still prefer an attachment to a political party.

But the Red official predicts the independents will eventually break the two-party orbit and join a united front.

Hall considers political independence "a very important step." He says "it is a necessary political development before there can be organizational independence—before there can be a people's party."

The party leader takes delight in polls showing a drop in popularity of President Johnson, contending it reflects a growing independent mood among Americans.

He asserts that "grass-roots movements" for an alternative to the chief executive are already in progress across the country.

The idea, Hall adds, "is an undercurrent in the entire civil rights field. It is discussed in relation to the economic needs of the people, the war on poverty, and the problems arising out of automation."

He notes that in some areas "the discussion is already around personalities and the form for advancing an alternative." He declines to disclose any names.

However, the American Red suggests independents "gather their forces now" and "set in motion the movement that will present to our people an independent candidate for President in 1968."

He says "the way to prepare for such a campaign is to build and stimulate the forces of independence in the 1966 elections."

That, he adds, will include the election of peace, Negro, labor and left candidates Nov. 8.

"The concept of defeating the candidates of the ultra-right in 1966 is a necessary preparation for 1968," Hall declares. "Insofar as it depends on us, there are going to be Communist candidates from now on."

"We want to declare: we have put our very best foot forward," the party leader says.

He recognizes CPUSA has never talked this bravely before—at least out in the open. But he notes:

NEW UPSURGE

"The past several years have witnessed a pronounced rise in the strength and prestige of the Communist Party. This has taken place within the framework of the new upsurge of the left, marked by the formation of a number of new youth organizations, the appearance of new publications, and the greatly increased stature of Marxist theory in the country."

Halls boasts the party "has succeeded in stabilizing itself and is once again on the upgrade." He says:

"There is a growing interest in the ideas of Communists among the American people, and there is an unprecedented opening of doors in all communication media. There is a mounting influx of young people into our ranks. The party has broken out of its isolation and today truly speaks to millions."

The CPUSA official credits that to a "series of important victories in the party's fight for legality."

He thanks the Supreme Court for upholding the rights of Reds to hold union office, obtain passports and to work in industry.

"The decision of the Supreme Court nullifying the McCarran Act provision requiring members of the Communist Party to register opens the door to greater freedom of action for the Party, Hall declares.

FIGHT NOT ENDED

He points out, however, the fight for legality is far from ended. "Prosecution under the McCarran Act, tax harassments, HUAC (House Un-American Activities Committee) witchhunts and other persecutions continue." But he contends:

"The fight against these takes place in a period of mounting democratic struggles; hence, possibilities exist for further democratic victories and for the further strengthening of the party."

Hall warns CPUSA members to remain on the alert for "we are not on a path free of problems . . . The Department of Justice is still publicly proclaiming that it will seek new indictments. We have illusions about the dangers of continuing attacks."

"But we also have a sense of confidence that in their defense of the democratic rights of all Americans, the masses will demand the assurance of our party's right to place its position in the market place of ideas."

ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE TO STUDY GOVERNMENT SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] performed a singular service yesterday when he introduced a bill to establish a joint committee to make a continuing study of the programs and operations of the Federal Government relating to science and technology.

This is an excellent proposal. It has my 100-percent support. I urge Senators and Congressmen to give it their close attention and strong support.

In 1954 the Federal Government spent approximately \$3 billion for research and development. In 1967 it will spend over \$16 billion.

This is the age of technological explosion. The development of computers, the computerization of technology, the technological development of the results of scientific study and the great burst of scientific research mean that our economy, our thinking, and our way of life are being radically changed. The Congress if it is to maintain some intelligent control and guidance over Federal expenditures for research and development must expand its scientific competence and understanding.

I have seen this need with ever greater clarity since I came to the Senate 8 years ago. I have spoken numerous times to the Senate on this subject.

I believe the growth of science presents the Congress with a major challenge. If the Congress does not meet this challenge the very principle of representative government will be endangered.

As I said on July 30, 1963:

Increasingly, policy decisions made on programs and funds for science and technology affect in their full relevancy not only the security of the country but the liberty and privacy of every human being everywhere. If democracy and representative government are to prevail in this nation, it is necessary that the Congress understand the importance of these decisions and that it have a role in the making of them. At the present time Congress does not appreciate the importance of scientific decisions and as a result they are made, not in the halls of Congress but elsewhere, not by the elected representatives but by unknown administrative officials.

In this world of cataclysm, change, and of almost impossible complexity representative democracy is put to severe test. How is a popularly elected government to control its own activities? How are elected officials to direct development of something they cannot understand with implications they do not comprehend?

The President has shown that he is quite aware of the importance of coordinating and comprehending the Federal scientific effort. His small but expert Office of Science and Technology serves him well in this capacity.

The Library of Congress in its new Science Policy Research Division under the direction of Edward Wink does an excellent job of assisting the Congress as it struggles to participate intelligently in the making of scientific and technological decisions.

More help is needed. The Congress needs competent advisers within its own house. And that is what the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] proposes to establish with his bill which proposes a joint committee modeled after the Joint Economic Committee. He proposes that the President furnish the Congress each year with a report on the Federal Government's scientific programs. This report would be similar in kind to the President's annual economic report. The joint committee would have no legislative authority because it would need none. By means of hearings and studies it would review the President's report and the Government's programs, and it would make such recommendations to the Congress as it felt necessary. I support this measure, and I intend to provide whatever assistance I can to obtain favorable congressional action upon it.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1966

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I had the pleasure of meeting and chatting with the distinguished jurist and scholar, Justice Michael A. Musmanno, of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, in my office yesterday.

It was a most enjoyable and fruitful meeting, as I have for many years been most impressed by his able and determined defense in the famed Sacco-Vanzetti case, and rank myself amongst the admirers of his laudatory and distinguished career. So that my colleagues may share his profound testimony before the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights regarding the pending Civil Rights Act of 1966, I ask unanimous consent that the text of his statement be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

REMARKS BY PENNSYLVANIA SUPREME COURT JUSTICE MICHAEL A. MUSMANNO BEFORE U.S. SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS, CONSIDERING CIVIL RIGHTS BILLS, ROOM 2228, NEW SENATE OFFICE BUILDING, JULY 13, 1966, 10:30 A.M.

I respectfully urge the enactment into law of Senate Bill S. 3296. Some of the opponents of this measure, and its companion bill H.R. 14765 in the House, have argued that this proposed legislation would invade fields exclusively belonging to the States. I do not agree with this contention and would say, to

the contrary, that I doubt the Federal Government, when the need is apparent, the situation crucial, and the threatened harm irremediable, may ever exceed its authority in intervening to safeguard the constitutional rights of a United States citizen.

Not long ago a man convicted of murder in Pennsylvania sought a new trial because one of the jurors was related to the victim of the homicide, and another juror was kinsman to the chief prosecuting officer. Our court refused a new trial. I dissented. The defendant filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus in the United States District Court and won a new trial on the very ground which had been ruled out by the highest court of Pennsylvania. I felt very happy about this Federal "Samaritanism", not because my position had been vindicated, but because the United States Government, through its judiciary, had prevented a denial of due process.

I rejoice that Senate Bill 3296 empowers the United States courts to intervene when the State courts deny to a United States citizen his right to serve on a grand or petit jury on the basis of race, color, sex, national origin or economic status. The cause of justice in America will also be advanced by section 501 which makes it a federal offense for anyone to injure or interfere with any person "because of his race, color, religion, or national origin while he is . . . participating in or enjoying any benefit, service, privilege . . . or activity provided or administered by the United States or by any State or subdivision thereof."

If this provision had been law in 1927, one of the most appalling miscarriages of justice in the history of the United States courts would have been prevented. It was my privilege to have been associated with United States Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter, then professor at Harvard Law School, in the defense of Nicola Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti in the latter phase of that tragic case. It was proved that the foreman of the jury, Harry H. Ripley, entertained hostility to Sacco and Vanzetti because of their Italian origin, and stated that if he had his way, Italians would not be allowed to enter the country. Before he even heard a word of testimony Ripley remarked to a friend: "Damn them [Sacco and Vanzetti] they ought to hang anyway."

Sacco and Vanzetti were participating in a privilege, the right of trial by jury guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States and the State of Massachusetts. Ripley's declared hostility interfered with that right and contributed to the execution of two innocent men.

To prevent any misunderstanding at this point, let me state at once that, as much as I applaud the efficacy of the provisions of this proposed legislation, I do not want you to think that I am claiming for it retroactive jurisdiction or resurrectorial powers. Sacco and Vanzetti are dead, and nothing will recall them to the land of the living, but this bill, when enacted into law, would impel state officials into doing their duty and not neglecting, as certain Massachusetts officials did, their bounden and sacred obligation to the law and elementary justice, to say nothing of fundamental humanity, decency and American fair play.

If the provisions of this bill had been in effect two months ago, I doubt that James Meredith would have been shot down while he was walking on a public highway, armed only with a walking stick and the Holy Bible under his arm. James Meredith was participating in a program provided and administered by the State because he was seeking to have Negro American citizens register under the voting laws of the State. I am absolutely certain that any person or persons charged with having wounded James Meredith will be properly tried in accordance with law, and I do not mean by my reference

to that case to suggest anything to the contrary.

The colloquialism "Don't make a Federal case out of it," is intended to indicate the gravity, solemnity, and importance that attach to a Federal prosecution, and properly so. Had this present bill been law in early June, James Meredith would have walked the highways in a continuing protective aura of United States law, and it is probable that the great fear that any intending assailant would have felt in becoming involved with the sovereignty and austerity of United States law might have been enough to stay aggression. Indeed, had this bill been law prior to June 5, 1966, it may well be that James Meredith would not have started on his fateful journey.

No one can question the majesty and the greatness of the United States. Whether we see the words "United States" on a spaceship orbiting the earth, on a document of history, or stamped on the haversack of an infantryman, we thrill to the image it evokes of unsurmountable power, superb dignity and undeviating impartiality in the administration of justice. The United States Government is the greatest government in the world, as the country for which it speaks is indubitably the most wonderful of nations that ever existed, flourished and progressed in the tide of time.

The right to appeal to an authority beyond local sovereignty has basis in biblical history. When Saint Paul was hailed before Festus, Governor of Caesaria, to give answer for alleged transgressions of the law, and he feared justice might not come from the provincial judgment seat, he asked to be judged by the central authority in Rome, he asked to be sent to Augustus. And as a Roman citizen, he was accorded that right.

Senate Bill 3296 would assure to every American citizen the right to appeal to the central authority of the land. The Constitution of the United States, to which we turn not only for inspiration, encouragement and strength, but also for authority and power to transform into reality the dreams and the aspirations of America, declares in its preamble: "We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure Domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

The people, and not the individual States, ordained the Constitution and so the first responsibility is to the people. Pardon me, Mr. Chairman, for this reference to the obvious, and apparent emphasis on the patent, but so much has been said about the alleged unconstitutionality of this proposed legislation that I allow myself simply to point to a mountain range when so many see only marshes and a desert. One need go no further than the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments to the Constitution of the United States to find not only justification for this legislation, but indeed a mandate for it. More than that, these three amendments were forged in the fires of the Civil War, sanctified by the blood of those who were wounded and killed in that conflict, and adopted by the people when the emancipation of the Negro population was the immediate subject of consideration and not simply an academic topic for discussion or governmental experimentation. It could well be that the laws already on the statute books and the decisions of the highest Court of the land already embossed on the pages of our books of jurisprudence are adequate for the authoritative projection of the principles enunciated in this legislation and that all that is required now is the detailed planning for effectuating in practice the constitutional ends to be accomplished. In 1866, after the

adoption of the 13th amendment but before the 14th amendment was attached to the organic instrument of the land, Congress enacted the first Civil Rights Act which provided that: "Citizens of every race and color shall have the same right to purchase, lease, sell, hold and convey real and personal property as is enjoyed by white citizens."

The Civil Rights Act of 1875 provided that: "No citizen, possessing all other qualifications which are or may be prescribed by law, shall be disqualified for service as grand or petit juror in any court of the United States, or of any State, on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude."

One of the magnificent virtues of Senate Bill 3296 is that it is primarily preventive rather than retaliatory in operation. It places in the hands of government a weapon, wholly painless in performance and yet far more effective than the punitive provisions of the past. Criminal sanctions step in after the constitutional right has been denied. Equity locks the stable door before the horse is stolen.

Section 202 declares that when it appears that a citizen of the United States is about to be deprived of his right to serve as a juror, the Attorney General may institute equity proceedings to prevent the threatened deprivation.

Had Senate Bill 3296 been law in 1925, the tragedy of the Sweet case in Detroit would never have stained the social fabric of our nation. In June of that year, Dr. Ossian Sweet, a young, talented, Negro physician in Detroit purchased a house in a foreign-born workingman's section of Detroit. An organization which became known as the Waterworks Park Improvement Association formed to keep Dr. Sweet out of his home. The first night that Dr. Sweet and his wife, with friends, stayed in the house, a mob formed and pelted it with stones and its occupants with threats. No serious disturbance occurred but the conduct, cries and agitation of the restless throng was as prophetic of what was to follow as the rumble of thunder, a high wind carrying dust into the air and an occasional flash of lightning proclaims the coming of a storm. The next night the storm broke. Five hundred mobsters rushed the house calling out, with opprobrious terms: "Get them! Get them!" In the ensuing tumult a shot was fired and one of the invaders, Leon Breiner, was killed. The eleven occupants of the house were charged with murder. Two trials followed. I heard Clarence Darrow deliver his masterful oration in the second trial.

I say that had this bill been law in 1925, Leon Breiner would not have lost his life and this sorrowful chapter in the social history of our nation would not have been written. Section 405 of the bill provides:

"No person shall intimidate, threaten, coerce, or interfere with any person in the exercise or enjoyment of, or on account of his having exercised or enjoyed, or on account of his having aided or encouraged any other person in the exercise or enjoyment of any right granted by section 403 or 404."

On the first or second day of Dr. Sweet's occupancy of the house he had purchased, the Department of Justice would have filed an action in the United States District Court to enjoin the Waterworks Park Improvement Association from gathering to accomplish its diabolic deed, and any mob which might have followed would have found itself attacking not poor Dr. Sweet, but confronting the might and the power of the indomitable United States.

It is not enough to have a right; there must be a way to have it respected. Thus it is that while civil rights are guaranteed by the Constitution, by statute and court decisions, their enjoyment is often curtailed and even made impossible by harassment, subterfuge, subtle threat and outright defiance. Hence the necessity for the supervi-

sion, the control and the machinery so well described in this excellent bill.

Mr. Chairman, I may say here that in 1955 our Pennsylvania Legislature established a Human Relations Commission to carry into effect the legislatively declared policy of our Commonwealth "to foster the employment of all individuals in accordance with their fullest capacities . . . and to secure commercial housing regardless of race, color, religious creed, ancestry or national origin."

Mr. Chairman, I would not abuse your kindness in honoring me with the opportunity to appear here to speak on this vital legislation, by repeating arguments, reasons and statistics with which you are already familiar. Our President, in urging enactment of this legislation, already has delivered an informative, stirring and eloquent appeal to the mind, heart and conscience of the nation. The Attorney General presented you with a masterful analysis of this bill in all its particulars, leaving hardly anything to doubt or surmise.

And now it is in the hands of Congress. It is a matter of infinite comfort to me that the Congress of the United States, in this new era of American history, has here on Capitol Hill been transforming legislative Sermons on the Mount for the poor, the sick, hungry, aged, economically disabled, oppressed, overburdened and underprivileged into bread, medicine, hospital beds, school houses, jobs, pensions, suffrage, human dignity, and all the rest. Government is no longer cold and aloof. It is warm, it throbs with understanding and compassion. This particular legislation calls for physical security, for peaceful participation in the administration of justice, for unhampered education and for freedom of the home for all people.

I have no fear that the enactment of this legislation will undermine, as opponents say, our dual form of government and make the federal authority too powerful. Federal sovereignty cannot be too powerful in advancing the interests, the freedoms, and the destiny of American citizens. Each time I look at this transcendently beautiful Capitol I see in it the Declaration of Independence in imperishable stone, the Constitution of the United States in perpetual marble, and, in its graceful dome soaring in the skies, I see the assurance that the representatives of the people assembled thereunder are dedicated to obtaining for them the rights, to which, in the words of Thomas Jefferson, "the laws of Nature and Nature's God entitle them."

THE RIGHT OF DISSENT: FROM THE CAMPUS TO THE CAPITOL

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on July 6, 1966, Senator GALE McGEE gave an address before the student body at Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oreg., concerning "The Right of Dissent: From the Campus to the Capitol."

I believe Senator McGEE's speech is worthy of being placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of his remarks be placed in the RECORD at this point.

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

THE RIGHT OF DISSENT: FROM THE CAMPUS TO THE CAPITOL

(Address by Hon. GALE McGEE, Oregon State University, July 6, 1966, Corvallis, Oreg.)

Until recent years, it was a sacred axiom of American politics that academic life and political life did not mix. Professors in the political arena were few and far between.

For a budding candidate for public office to be suspected of professorial traits was tantamount to political suicide. Yet when I arrived on the political scene in 1958, straight from 23 years in the classroom, the event was heralded by some observers as the beginnings of a new transition that would some day enmesh the Halls of Ivy with the Halls of Government. That day is now upon us.

The Russians are suspect for having aided and abetted this new trend with the launching of Sputnik in October of 1957. For since that event, academics in public office have continued to multiply; and their acceptability at the ballot box has risen steadily. In a sense, the electorate was probably frightened into the necessities of the new political integration by the stark discovery that even the Communists in Moscow were capable of great scientific feats. But the fact that it continues to happen is important to the new profile of the politics of responsible, free government.

What was an orderly transition for nearly a decade has suddenly been thrust stage center by a single issue—Vietnam. Both in campus teach-ins and in Senate hearings, the dominant force has been dissent. The form and implications of that dissent have sometimes obscured the main focus of the war itself. Therefore, in a university forum setting such as this one at Oregon State University, it is doubly significant that students, scholars, and public officials have a hard look at the "Anatomy of Protest." In the few minutes at my disposal, I propose to examine the impact of Vietnam on the Right of Dissent—first, in the university forum and, second, in the Senate hearing room. Thus, the title of these remarks—The Right of Dissent: From the Campus to the Capitol.

For too long after World War II the college campus seemed altogether too quiet on public questions. Whether this was due to lethargy, or indifference, or a sense of making up for the time lost in the war is irrelevant to our purposes at the moment. The point is that the arrival of the late John F. Kennedy on the national, political horizon triggered a new and more acute sense of public interest among the new student generation.

In its initial resurgence, it was epitomized in the Peace Corps. But more to the point now, it has bloomed during the nationwide great debate on Vietnam. Because the preponderance of the publicity from the campus teach-ins has been critical of our Asian policy, the university has rightly or wrongly become a symbol of the attack on the Administration position. Perhaps I am especially entitled to defend the voices speaking out from the Halls of Ivy, not because of my own professorial days, but rather because I strongly believe in the present position of the United States in its firm stand in Vietnam. But equally, I believe in the traditional academic right—in fact, the obligation, of the campus to provoke dissent.

This is not to suggest that the dialogues on campus have always been conducted with circumspection. In too many instances they have lapsed into monologues, with the more extreme participants resorting to tactics beneath the dignity of honorable disagreement. Public policies have been described as reflecting the new imperialists, "power-mad" militarists, and warmongers out to conquer the world. Some of the critics may be professional revolutionaries, and some few even lack the credentials of campus residents. Some of them, too, might like to think they take orders from Moscow or Peking. But none of these should be used as an excuse to extinguish the obligation to inspire ferment on the campus.

In all fairness, the voices from the campus haven't been as one-sided as the headlines suggest. Protest always claims more attention than support. Willfully or otherwise,

there has indeed been a distortion of the complete state of mind in the academic world. But more germane to our subject here tonight, the image that these vociferous protests and demonstrations from both students and faculty have projected has sometimes panicked those groups in the land who have solemnly assumed their self-appointed roles as keepers of patriotism and Americanism.

What concerns me is that we are about to be caught up in a series of witchhunts and new predatory raids on academic freedom—usually, of course, in the name of the Constitution but aimed at stifling the other point of view. Already it threatens to shut the doors on free inquiry and to inhibit free expression. In recent years this trend has made worrisome headway, aided and abetted by the resurgence of numerous extremist groups who have promoted a lucrative trade in suspicion, fear, hate, and smear.

The classroom, long a handy object of suspicion in the lexicon of the extremists, has suddenly become even more so because of the rising anxieties over Vietnam. That the current attacks on academic freedom may get out of hand is a serious prospect. The record is already replete with warning signals.

On one state university campus in the West, a Professor of English—identified at one time with SNCC—has come under attack from certain self-appointed censors of his conduct. His job remains in jeopardy. On another campus, a law against leftists speakers has been revived. This statute enacted by the North Carolina Legislature in 1963 prohibited Communists and pleaders of the Fifth Amendment from speaking at any state education institution.

Dr. Frank Graham, speaking about the Carolina law has said, "The free market of ideas in the historic American view is a basic part of the American tradition of free enterprise. 'Gag laws' repressing the freedom of assembly and speech are expressions of the totalitarian way and are contrary to the American way."

The North Carolina case is by no means the end of the line. Just across the border in neighboring Virginia the Virginia Department of one of the larger veterans' organizations adopted a resolution urging the State Assembly to ban Communist speakers on the campus. There are similar proposals pending in other states. It brings squarely into focus the right of a faculty and of student representatives to invite and to hear speakers of all persuasions, including the extremes of the right as well as of the left. Once leftist speakers have been banned, there is little defense left even for the extreme right-wingers.

With both of the extremes out of the way, what remains of the rights of the center? As John Donne put it so well, "... and therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee."

A teach-in on the campus of the University of Miami in Florida prompted the use of one of the newer weapons of the extremists—the recorded telephone message. Invented by a Florida physician, W. C. Douglas of Sarasota, this device plays back messages previously recorded under the patriotic name "Let Freedom Ring." It can be connected into any telephone exchange around the country. Over 100 are now known to be in existence. It's a convenient tool for extremists coast to coast because of its particular advantage that it has not been the subject of regulation by the Federal Communications Commission, and the voices and sponsors of its often extreme accusatory messages remain strangely anonymous.

After the Miami teach-in, residents in the area were telephoned by unidentified callers and asked if they knew what was taking place on the campus of their very own university. If they wanted to know, they were told to dial 221-6767. In response to that number a woman's voice said in part, "This is 'Let Freedom Ring.' Last Tuesday

night at Miami's own little, red schoolhouse, there was a strange assortment of pinks, punks, beatniks, and left-wing educators assembled for the purpose of pleading for a Soviet line against the Communists." An extended diatribe then proceeded to link anyone who had attended the teach-in with individuals who were accused of being Socialists, Communists, Pacifists, and odd-balls. A United States Senator who participated was described as being "shoulder to shoulder with a Marxist who advocates selective assassination."

That such irresponsible and reckless assaults on character and on people in general excited the fears of otherwise well-meaning citizens was not surprising. The storm which threatened to engulf the campus jeopardized much more than the rights of the participants themselves.

It would be inaccurate, however, to leave with you the impression that such outbursts and assaults are the private property of extremist groups or of self-designated patriotic societies. The quest for "conspirators" and "plotters" behind our many complex public problems has readily found sponsors in the halls of Congress itself. A current member of the United States Senate has gone "Let Freedom Ring" one better. From a western campus, he sought to warn the world that "the little, red schoolhouse is redder than you think." He asserted that on the modern campus Communistic beatniks and foreign-born, fuzzy professors are destroying true Americanism.

Equally alarming was the outburst of a Member of the House of Representatives who has questioned whether a professor who had participated in a teach-in and was critical of Vietnam policy should be allowed to receive funds from the Federal Government. Mr. Congressman charged that for the professor to be granted those funds was a "shocking inconsistency."

What is even more "shocking" is that a Member of the Congress should raise such a question in the first place. Colleges and universities have always had to contend with those who wish to proscribe teaching and research with limits reflecting the political and cultural convictions of the time. But I agree with the thought embodied in a decision of the Supreme Court of this Nation which declares, "If there is any fixed star in our constitutional constellation, it is that no official, high or petty, can order what shall be orthodox in politics, nationalism, religion, or other matters of opinion or force citizens to confess by word or act their faith therein."

It must remain a fundamental of Federal participation in education that such assistance never command conformity, nor limit the direction of inquiry, nor warp the substance of thought. To those who are upset with what one editorial writer described as "the cockeyed professors and pacifists and anarchists" on the campus, I would remind them that to enforce thought control upon our institutions of higher learning would do far more damage to our civilization and our Nation than can the fulminations of the most radical of students and the most irresponsible of professors.

Nor dare we take comfort in the lame hope that the current attacks are mere nipping-at-the-heel assaults that will soon fade away. As our past history long since should remind us, such small beginnings can readily explode into dangerous attacks on everyone's freedom. It's not a very long step from the Vietnam critics to other critics. From Vietnam to the suspension of all unpopular dissent, it is but a short hop, skip, and a jump. Let us remember the warning of the venerable Tom Paine when he said, "He that would make his own liberty secure must guard even his enemy from oppression."

Even now the issue of academic freedom is assuming major proportions on the national, political scene. It reared its head a

few months ago in the New Jersey gubernatorial contest where the question at issue was retaining a professor who embraced the Viet Cong on the payroll of a state school. More recently, it has popped up in the Governor's race in California. There the issue is a demand by one candidate for Governor to investigate affairs on the campus at Berkeley. The temptations for politicians to plunge into predatory missions on the campuses of our state universities are great, but they must also be discouraged. Mr. Justice Frankfurter of the Supreme Court, who had academic experience at Harvard, once noted the importance of defending the four essential freedoms of a university—to determine for itself on academic grounds who may teach, what may be taught, how it shall be taught, and who may be admitted to study.

To this note should be added a statement of Chief Justice Earl Warren who cautioned, "to impose any straightjacket upon the intellectual leaders in our colleges and universities would imperil the future of our Nation . . . Scholarship cannot flourish in an atmosphere of suspicion and distrust. Teachers and students must always remain free to inquire, to study and to evaluate, to gain new maturity and understanding; otherwise our civilization will stagnate and die."

Freedom is a precious possession. And we should periodically inventory its blessings and its ramifications. To destroy freedom in the name of protecting it betrays—not preserves—our national traditions. Yet, there have always been those among us who would in the name of liberty seek to deny it to their opponents.

To pass laws against ideas is utter folly. No matter how unpopular and unwanted, ideas cannot be legislated out of existence. Neither can they be silenced by a resolution from a veterans' convention.

The only way to defeat an idea is with a better one.

Neither patriotism nor loyalty, moreover, can be invoked by legislative edict, nor decreed by administrative order, nor achieved by loyalty oaths. To endure true patriotism must be inspired, not commanded.

In sum, it is imperative that we not sacrifice freedom of dissent on the altars of censorship, bigotry, or intolerance. To the professors, this is the heartbeat of academic freedom. It is also one of the sustaining pillars of all human freedom.

But even as it is essential that we guard against restrictions on academic freedom, the academic community itself must remember that this is a two-way street. Academic freedom must be balanced with academic responsibility. How best to strike that wise balance must ever remain within the province of good judgment. It cannot be legislated through formula.

This concept is clearly enunciated in the 1940 Statement of Principles of the American Association of University Professors—a portion of which reads:

"The professor as a man of learning and an educational officer should remember that the public may judge his profession and his institution by his utterances. Hence he should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others."

Even as that Principle may be honored by most, we are realistic enough to know, however, that all freedoms are abused by some; that in moments of excitement and crisis men of every station and occupation tend to say things with greater recklessness and impetuosity than with impartiality and dispassion. But this gives no one license to suspend liberty. Intolerance—be it of the left or the right—is still intolerable. And just as discipline and restraint are the hallmarks of the effective advocate, and indeed of civilized man, so the deviation from them reflects human frailties. And as there have

been abuses until now, there will surely be more. But we can survive these as long as the constant pursuit of truth remains the high standard to which we repair, without regard for risks, without concern for costs.

As we pick our way along the tortuous and troubled pathways into the future, let us remember a bit of the eternal wisdom which flowed so generously from the pen of Thomas Jefferson when he wrote in his First Inaugural Address: "Error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it."

The controversy which Vietnam has unleashed on the campuses of the land has intertwined campus dissent with political dissent in the Capitol so thoroughly as to make it difficult to separate the two. Perhaps more than ever before the Halls of Ivy and the Halls of Congress resound with the din of many of the same voices. But there is a difference. On campus the right at stake is the right to think otherwise, or even the right to be wrong. But on Capitol Hill, what is under attack is the right to be right.

The right of dissent is not equal at all levels. On the campus, criticism is accompanied by the luxury of irresponsibility—that is, the professor can afford less concern over the consequences of being wrong than can the Member of Congress. Or to put it in personal terms, Professor McGEE had many more solutions to the problems of the world than has Senator McGEE. And even Senator McGEE, in yet a more restrained sense of responsibility, is not as much on the spot as the Chairman of a Committee on Foreign Relations, or on Armed Services, or of Appropriations. Or none of them are faced with the anguish of measuring the consequences of the decision as is the President of the United States. If the rest of us make a mistake, we may be given yet another chance to correct it. But the President has to be right the first time.

More than ever before in our country's history, criticism from the Capitol ought to be attended by an acute sense of great responsibility. It was not always so. For most of our national history, our role has been largely national in scope and the impact of our decisions rarely reverberated beyond the three-mile limit of our shore line. It was possible to survive demagogues and prima donnas and flamboyant orators in the United States Senate. They could say in very public ways one thing for home consumption and quite another for the Capitol. No longer is this true.

Particularly since World War II the United States has been thrust by the force of history into a role of frightening responsibility for the direction of world events. Not only what the President says or the Secretary of State, but even what a United States Senator may say makes a difference in Katmandu or Cape Town. Whether the issue be civil rights, nuclear disarmament, or Vietnam, the whole world is tuned in on our wave length. The day has long since passed when a United States Senator can carelessly expound his views on the great questions of our time without first pausing to measure the consequences of its impact on the rest of the human race.

Prime Minister Nehru put it vividly when he likened the United States to a modern Atlas with the world on his shoulders. "If you stumble," he said, "the world falls with you."

Demagoguery in the Senate Chamber today can shake the very foundations of international structures around the globe. No issue has made it more difficult to rise to the higher levels demanded by modern leadership than that of Vietnam. This is due in part to the kind of war it is. For the first time the man in the street is watching war on TV. All of the ugliness and the terrible brutalities of all wars have just now been compressed on to a 21-inch screen in the family den. This in

itself has tempted the orators to exploit the heart rather than appeal to the head.

But complicating it even more has been the advent of televised Senate hearings. Great as this medium has been in educating the vast public audience to the facts of international life, it has not been an unmixed blessing. In my brief experiences on the Foreign Relations Committee, I have noted a distinct difference between the manner in which witnesses are interrogated in the privacy of the Committee on the one hand and under the glare of TV lights on the other. In the Senate hearing room it has sometimes been an irresistible temptation to the showman to replace the statesman. Instead of a quest for facts and truth, the TV hearing has on occasion become a thrust for higher Nielsen ratings. Unfortunately, personal invective, anger, harsh epithets, and political vengeance have intruded on the screen. Techniques and tactics better described on the pages of *Variety* rather than the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* have too often prevailed. In that atmosphere, it is perhaps understandable that showmanship displaces statesmanship. Understandable, but still unforgivable.

Both Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara are cases in point. Each has a thankless responsibility in making decisions of the greatest importance. They also have the responsibility of suffering the consequences for what they decide. At times under Committee bombardment, however, they were abused, harried, and insulted in the extreme. A stranger dropping in from another planet might have thought them to be enemy agents or worse. The respectability of the high trust which is theirs was demeaned—even their personal integrity was impugned.

The price paid for this kind of conduct in Committee was more than the personal injury to the men involved. It had the effect of downgrading government. It reflected a curious reversal of an American tradition of being innocent until proved guilty. The impression was very strong at times that the questioners of the two Secretaries started with the assumption of their guilt of some heinous crime unless they could come up with a good alibi.

During the dialogues on Vietnam, some have expressed their fear of the "arrogance of power."

The kind of abuse or criticism that is running rampant in the Congress is a form of arrogance in itself—an arrogance of dissent. It seems to assume a monopoly of truth and wisdom, leaving room for not the slightest doubt that there might be another truth. Even as some of the critics have been guilty of ascribing mostly good motives to Hanoi and the National Liberation Front while reserving all of the conspiratorial machinations and infamous plotting for our side, so they have pre-empted to themselves all of the virtues of being right. It never seems to enter their thoughts that just maybe the American position might be right.

In our current concern over the right to dissent, over the right to think otherwise, or even the right to be wrong, we seem to have forgotten that there is also a responsibility to respect the right to be right. As the late Adlai Stevenson once pointed out: "I do not impugn the good faith of those who hold different views than mine. I would only ask them in the name of the courtesies andencies of a free society that they should equally refrain from impugning mine."

Surely there are no differences of opinion so wide that they cannot be explored in the context of responsible debate. The times require of us a much higher level of public dialogue if we are to arrive at the wisest possible decisions. If we indulge ourselves in discursive arguments, in bitter and vitriolic accusations, or in pique and impetuosity, it is only at the peril of failing to reach constructive solutions.

In another time of crisis, Abraham Lincoln once advised "in times like the present men should utter nothing for which they would not willingly be responsible through time and eternity." I am sure it's not too much to ask that we exercise self-restraint and self-discipline and that we honor the heritage of free institutions and of men seeking to work in those institutions to the best of their abilities and with the intentions of an honest and honorable public servant. To disagree without being disagreeable ought to become the hallmark of a responsible democratic society. Only in this pursuit can we thus hope to meet problems which carry with them not only threats to the freedom of man but also to the hopes for achieving peace for all mankind.

SOCIETY'S RIGHTS VERSUS INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I call attention to an editorial entitled "Society's Rights Versus Individual Rights" which appeared in the *Buckhannon, W. Va., Record* of July 13, 1966. The editorial has reference to the recent Supreme Court decision relative to police questioning of suspects, and I feel that the question posed by the editorial to be a pertinent one: How will the new rules affect the rights of the individual, the morale and effectiveness of police officers, the orderliness of community life and the safety and security of every law-abiding citizen?

I ask unanimous consent that its editorial be printed in the *RECORD*.

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

SOCIETY'S RIGHTS VERSUS INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS

The individual's right to fair play versus society's right to maintain law and order has been brought into sharp focus by a recent Supreme Court decision. *Newsweek* magazine states in a feature article that the court's ruling, "... imposed sharp new limits on the public power to question suspects—a power lawmen claim is vital to convictions in four out of five criminal cases." The new rules provide, among other things, that after arrest police may not question a suspect until they have told him that he has a right to remain silent, that what he says may be held against him and that he is entitled to have his lawyer with him in the interrogation room. It is almost certain that according to ethical practice and "good professional judgment" the lawyers will advise their clients not to answer. It appears to many law enforcement officers, and with some justification, that under these conditions it will be almost impossible to ever get a confession.

Chief Justice Earl Warren, expressing for the court the bitterly contested five to four majority opinion, states that, "... The ... practice of incommunicado interrogation is at odds with one of our nation's most cherished principles—the individual may not be compelled to incriminate himself." In his dissenting opinion, Justice Harlan stated that, "This doctrine ... has no sanction, no sanction ... It's obviously going to mean a gradual disappearance of confessions as a legitimate tool of law enforcement." Although, in general, law enforcement agencies across the country were apprehensive and critical of the court's decision, opinions are sharply divided even among police offices and their closest allies, prosecuting attorneys.

Despite the Supreme Court's legal rhetoric and the debate which follows it, certain facts stand out. The rights of the accused

have been further protected, but the problems of law enforcement have been vastly increased. This comes at a time when crime is increasing at a sharp rate—six times faster than population since 1958 and still growing. Last year, more than 2,600,000 serious crimes were reported in the United States. In our great cities, minority population ghettos are becoming more and more of a law enforcement problem and in many cases riot spawnners and potential battlegrounds as demonstrated in the Watts district of Los Angeles. Patrolling such areas, day or night, a police officer puts his life on the line every step of the way.

But, as *Newsweek* observes, we are in a time of transition. There is developing a new approach, a renaissance in law enforcement procedures. Law enforcement has become a subject of major study for philanthropic and government research agencies. The Ford Foundation alone, "... has poured more than \$5 million into police studies and education projects." There are such proposals as one for a "two-platoon police force" in which, "One group would handle matters requiring the sophisticated approach: social problems—like juvenile delinquency—and major investigations. The other group would do the manual labor, directing traffic, investigating accidents ..." New ideas are being discussed relative to handling narcotics problems, alcoholics and homosexuals.

However, in the light of such developments as the Supreme Court's present ruling, some authorities feel that we may be moving too fast. Such laws may be too sophisticated to be applicable until our society has evolved to a little higher level than it has yet reached. C. D. DeLoach, assistant director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has put it this way: "... to all those who continually clamour for more restrictions on law enforcement, I pose this question—where will you turn for protection of your individual rights when you have totally destroyed the effectiveness of law enforcement?" This is a question that concerns every person in the nation. How will the new rules affect the rights of the individual, the morale and effectiveness of police officers, the orderliness of community life and the safety and security of every law-abiding citizen.

PROPOSED EXTENSION OF THE WEST FRONT OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, the Congressional Commission for the Extension of the Capitol has recently approved a \$34 million plan providing for a 4½-acre addition to the west front of the Capitol. This group of five men reported, without public hearings, that the implementation of its recommendations would prevent the deterioration of the west front and would make available additional office, restaurant, auditorium, and conference-room space.

I recognize the need for structural support for the west front. And increased office space is always a welcome idea to one who ranks 95th in Senate seniority. But what concerns me is the distinct possibility that what has been recommended is not the wisest way to meet these needs. Indeed, it appears that 150 years of history embodied in the architectural masterpiece that is our Nation's Capitol will be unnecessarily buried under the proposed plan.

It does appear that a shoring up is necessary. If that is correct, an exhaustive study should be made of the alternatives open to us which, while securing an

effective restructuring, would at the same time preserve the grace and beauty of the Nation's most revered building.

Unfortunately, the Commission has apparently not given adequate consideration to the esthetic or historic factors involved in the major rebuilding which it has proposed. For example, the Commission's proposal would, in one thrust, destroy the magnificent architectural accomplishments of some of our most renowned architects and engineers. William Thornton, Charles Bulfinch, Benjamin Latrobe, and Frederick Law Olmsted contributed their special talents in helping to erect the Capitol. To eradicate their efforts, agreed generally to have resulted in a building that epitomizes the excellent in American architecture, is a drastic step. To do so without public hearings as to possible alternatives is even more unfortunate. Proper weight must be given to the significance of tradition and esthetics.

The opposition to the Commission's proposal has been formidable. Professionals and laymen alike have demanded the preservation of the west front. They have emphasized that the needed shoring up can and should be accomplished by a limited restoration instead of by a massive demolition and expansion.

The American Institute of Architects stated the historical consideration succinctly:

If the West Front of the Capitol is extended, we will have buried the last of those walls that date from the early years of the Republic and will have obscured a part of our history that can never be restored.

Francis Lethbridge, Chairman of the Joint Commission on Landmarks for the National Capital, put it this way:

If the old stones of the Capitol are crumbling, let them be restored, or replaced if need be, but let us refrain from padding its bones with layers of rooms until it becomes a shapeless mass signifying nothing but its own bulk. Congress deserves a mid-20th century answer to its space needs, not a misguided mid-19th century alteration to a venerable building deserving of respectful preservation.

In a letter to Vice President HUMPHREY, the Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts, William Walton, expressed "grave concern" over the project to alter the west front, and said that the Commission had concluded "that to erase this great historic facade would be a national tragedy."

Studies have already been completed which demonstrate the feasibility of limited restoration as a preferred alternative to massive expansion. The civil engineering firm of Bernard F. Locraft made a detailed study for the Commission of Fine Arts. It concluded that plans for repairs and limited restoration are sound and sensible. As such, the report is in direct contradiction to the Capitol Extension Commission's assertion that a shoring up of the west front is infeasible and costly.

What is now needed is a full and open hearing. When such eminent professional authorities as the American Institute of Architects, the Joint Commission on Landmarks for the National Capital, and the Commission of Fine Arts, as well

as the Washington Post, the New York Times, and numerous Senators and Congressmen unanimously condemn architectural recommendations, a searching reexamination of the plans is mandated. In my judgment, a scheme of limited restoration can be developed which would preserve the present proportions of the classic Bulfinch-Latrobe front.

Let us resolve the disputes over the considerations of cost, feasibility, architectural excellence and tradition through public hearings. I believe this is the only acceptable course now that the Capitol Extension Commission has recommended alterations without seeking the advice of impartial experts. Too much is at stake to do any less.

BIG BROTHER

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, as an individual grows up in our American society, the many things he does are recorded in many ways on various forms. Records are kept by Federal, State, and local governments as well as private institutions. An article by Helen B. Shaffer, "Editorial Research Reports," published in the Winston-Salem Sentinel of April 23, 1966, points out:

Over a life span, the dossier piles up; data on parents, medical records, school reports, intelligence and psychological test scores, job histories, credit facts, and so on.

Some of this information is voluntarily given by the individual; some of this information is obtained without the knowledge of the individual.

I ask unanimous consent to insert, at this point in the RECORD, the article which appeared in the Winston-Salem Sentinel.

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

ENCROACHMENT INESCAPABLE: PROTECTION OF PRIVACY

(By Helen B. Shaffer)

WASHINGTON.—Congress is looking for new ways to protect the privacy of the American citizen without creating more problems than it solves. The right to privacy is now—thanks to two Supreme Court decisions of the past year—backed by constitutional guarantees. Nevertheless actual encroachment on the privacy of the individual appears to be less escapable than ever.

The trouble is that, in the modern world, a large measure of privacy is necessarily sacrificed and the loss can be mitigated only slightly by new laws. Our society requires extensive record-keeping on every individual. This is a cradle-to-grave process that begins with footprinting the newborn infant and ends only with the cause-of-death notation on the death certificate.

Over a life span, the dossier piles up: data on parents, medical records, school reports, intelligence and psychological test scores, job histories, credit facts, and so on. Some of this information the individual gives up himself, often through filling out the innumerable questionnaires that come his way. The remainder is obtained without his knowledge from sources not known to him.

PERSONAL DATA

The result is that more personal data on the average mid-20th century American can be picked up by a routine check in a few days than scholars have been able to uncover about William Shakespeare—a well-known actor in his day—after four centuries

of digging. And most Americans are so inured to living in the fishbowl age, they willingly disclose information about themselves which their forebears would have considered nobody's business but their own.

But there are limits, even for the privacy-stripped American of today. A few weeks ago, for instance, the State Department put a stop to the practice of asking U.S. embassies to keep watch on American travelers "considered controversial." In a highly publicized case of a different sort, the president of General Motors Corp. apologized on March 22 before a Senate subcommittee for hiring a detective agency to pry into the private life of a subcommittee witness. Ralph Nader had written a book and had given testimony critical of the industry for neglect of safety in automobile design.

No less than a half-dozen congressional subcommittees have investigated some phase of the privacy invasion question over the past year or so. Some of their revelations led to corrective action. The Post Office Department closed down the peepholes through which its agents spied on employees in locker rooms and toilets. Of more general application, the Department curtailed a long-standing practice of placing mail covers—that is, recording information on the envelopes of letters delivered to particular addresses—for use by an investigative agency.

EAVESDROPPING DEVICES

Another area where limits on privacy invasion are being sought involves the use of hidden eavesdropping devices. Practically everyone is agreed that private snooping through wiretapping or the secret placement of miniature microphones and transmitters should have no place in American life. The big argument is under what conditions the police should be allowed to use them in the war on crime.

Telephone tapping was presumably outlawed by Congress in 1934, yet the practice still goes on. Evidence gained from wiretapping is permitted in some state (though no federal) courts. The Justice Department has long sought legislation to permit law enforcers to tap phones in crime investigations. However, Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach told a Senate subcommittee on March 22 it would be better for Congress to ban all wiretapping outright than to leave the situation in its present ambiguous state.

The new miniature eavesdropping devices present an even more difficult control problem. The Federal Communications Commission adopted a rule, effective April 8, forbidding private citizens to use radio devices to eavesdrop, but left it up to the states to decide whether their police should use them. In New York State, a court held on March 1 that court orders permitting police eavesdropping by such a device were invalid because contrary to the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution governing search and seizure.

SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM VITAL TO DAIRY FARMERS' INCOME

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, this is a great week for the dairy farmer. Earlier this week the Senate passed the Ellender child nutrition bill authorizing the extension of the school milk program for an additional 4 years. Today we will approve a bill appropriating \$105 million for the school milk program for fiscal 1967.

These actions will mean a great deal to the millions of schoolchildren across the land, for they will continue to receive the benefits of "nature's perfect food." Just as important, the dairy farmer will benefit substantially from the Senate's decision to give the program

the green light. For the school milk program accounts for 2.5 percent of the Nation's milk consumption. This is an all-important market to the Nation's dairy farmers—not only because it helps him to maintain a barely adequate income, but also because it introduces millions of young Americans to the milk habit.

At a time when thousands of dairy farmers are calling it quits because of low income it is essential to press hard for final congressional action on these two bills. By stimulating the consumption of milk they will keep many dairy farmers in business. In the long run this will assure a continuing adequate supply of milk at prices that are fair to the consumer.

For these reasons I am very hopeful that the House of Representatives will act quickly to pass the Ellender child nutrition bill and to agree with the Senate that \$105 million, at a minimum, is needed for the school milk program for fiscal 1967.

THE CANADIAN-AMERICAN WATER POLICY

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, a lively contribution to the dialog on a Canadian-American intercontinental water policy was carried in the Vancouver, British Columbia, Sun of June 11.

It is a very perceptive and well-written account of the debate which took place between Canada's Gen. A. G. L. McNaughton, who opposed export of surplus water to the United States, and myself, as an advocate of the North American Water and Power Alliance—or NAWAPA concept—or some other similar plan of collecting waters now running off unused to the seas in Alaska and northern Canada, and distributing them to water-short areas of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Vancouver Sun be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

[From the Vancouver Sun, June 11, 1966]

NAWAPA: A THREAT TO OUR SOVEREIGNTY

We've Got Water.
The U.S. Needs It.
It's Canada's Lifeline.
Without It We Perish.

(By Ian Macdonald)

SHERBROOKE, QUEBEC.—Prince George—gone forever beneath the waves like another Atlantis.

Or Prince George—bigger, busier, the centre of a waterworks complex unrivalled anywhere in the world?

B.C.—a reservoir for the United States, many of its people displaced, its resources irreparably damaged.

Or B.C.—A giant powerhouse of North America, scene of one of the world's great tourist attractions, rich, master of its destiny?

Canada—Victim of the fast-talking Yankee trader, its sovereignty foundered.

Or Canada—swimming shoulder-to-shoulder with the U.S. into a great tomorrow, not a drop of its water spilling into the U.S. that isn't superfluous?

NAWAPA—North American Water and Power Alliance—a money-making scheme dreamed up by a Los Angeles engineering

firm, an exercise in sophomore civil engineering, a monstrous threat to Canada's independence.

Or NAWAPA—a continent-wide plan for collection, redistribution, and efficient utilization of waters now running off to the seas totally unused or only partially used—the answer for a thirstier U.S., a boon to its northern neighbor?

General A. G. L. McNaughton, crusty old defender of Canada's rights, and Senator FRANK E. MOSS, a vocal U.S. water warrior from Utah, don't see it the same way.

They were guest speakers at the Royal Society of Canada June meeting on Wednesday at the University of Sherbrooke.

They couldn't agree on whether the U.S. hasn't enough water or Canada has too much.

The Democratic senator maintained the U.S. is starting to feel the pinch and Canada is the obvious source.

IS IT THERE?

The general, who was chairman of the Canadian section of the International Joint Commission from 1950 to 1962 and who battled loud and long over St. Lawrence and Columbia Rivers, argued Canada probably hasn't all the water everyone thinks it has, and probably will have uses of its own for all of it in the future.

One thing is clear.

The U.S. is in the position of the buyer and has to come to the potential seller, although an increasing number of Canadians recoil from the suggestion we would sell our fresh-water heritage.

But, as Sen. Moss pointed out in a friendly but forthright way, we used to say the same about natural gas.

He outlined his position: "After you in Canada have measured your water and projected your own ultimate requirements, it is my hope that you will find that you have water for export . . ."

The senator said if properly handled, water is not a depleting resource and that if Canada and the U.S. want to continue to live in constructive peace "on this richly-endowed continent of North America, and to grow, as St. Luke said, 'in wisdom and stature,' then we must co-operate in taking care of it."

He agreed the U.S. hasn't an unblemished record in water handling, and that it is fighting an expensive battle against years of pollution.

The senator's case seemed to ship water when he turned to the project, but he was honest in his admissions.

Moss said the concept was developed by the Ralph M. Parsons Company of Los Angeles, and its central theme came from one of the outstanding water planning engineers of the west.

But he admitted, "the resulting proposal or concept is based entirely on maps and analysis of published topographical, climateographical and hydrological data. In many areas there have been no on site investigations."

He said the plan calls for collection of about 15 to 18 per cent of the excess runoff from the high precipitation, medium elevation areas of Alaska and western and northern Canada.

GOOD FOR ALL

The result—from a system of tunnels, canals, and improved natural channels linking chains of reservoirs—along with other waters, would benefit "one territory and seven provinces of Canada, 35 states of the U.S. and three states of Mexico."

Moss said Parsons engineers estimate the cost to be an enormous \$100 billion for a 25 to 30-year construction program.

It is estimated by Parsons that about 48 per cent of the investment would be in Canada, about five per cent in Mexico, and the rest in the U.S.

Estimated revenue was \$4 billion a year, with operating expenses of less than \$1 billion.

"This makes the scheme quite practical for amortization within the usual time for water projects in my country," the senator added.

Moss said most of the water revenues would come from the U.S., while more than half of the power available would be generated in Canada with the U.S. providing a market for large amounts.

"B.C. would be the site also of what might be the single most controversial feature of the initial NAWAPA concept," he said, with the understatement of a man who doesn't know B.C. too well.

"This is the proposal to make a huge lake out of the natural defile known as the Rocky Mountain Trench, along the west side of the Canadian Rockies."

He also said: "B.C. would have the greatest NAWAPA investment, in storage, power and navigation facilities. The town of Prince George would be the centre of a complex of waterworks unrivalled anywhere in the world."

"The people of the U.S. cannot expect the people of Canada to consider entering any arrangement such as this unless it is demonstrably and unquestionably for Canada's long-term best interest—and so found by Canadians," he stated.

"We are not devising a scheme to trick Canada. We are not even trying to arrive at a minimum price at which we might cajole and persuade you into selling us some of your water. As a matter of fact, we are working with dedication to avoid the prospect of U.S. dependence on imported water," Moss said.

"Common sense and prudence dictate that both countries keep an eye on a possible continental system as each of us design national water resource projects. Let's make sure that while we are making up our minds about the value of a continental approach, we do not do anything to make it unworkable," he added.

After the senator sat down, the general came winging in on NAWAPA like a dam-buster.

The general said Canada's two resources of land and water are closely related and "we alienate or squander either only at our peril."

Not given to mincing words, he turned to propositions being "touted under the somewhat pretentious name of NAWAPA."

He added: "Of course this proposal is not an alliance at all. It is nothing more than an attempt by the Ralph M. Parsons Co., of Los Angeles, Calif., a private engineering firm, to drum up business for themselves."

The general said he felt obliged to say the proposals "are quite unacceptable."

He added that despite some temporizing pronouncements issued by distracted politicians, he felt his stand is backed up by the best Canadian engineers and informed technical and administrative officers.

JUST EXERCISE

Gen. McNaughton said with one exception the rivers in the schemes are national rivers of Canada.

"Over national waters, there can be no question but that the jurisdiction of the nation in which they are situated is supreme," he stated.

He said B.C., Alberta and Saskatchewan have made the clearest declarations against sale of Canadian waters, and Quebec was too well informed to be drawn into export.

The general said it should be noted that no government or government agency on the continent has commissioned any technical study on NAWAPA, and that the U.S. government had not seen fit to act on a congressional resolution to refer the study to the International Joint Commission for study.

He quoted Trevor Lloyd, professor of geography at McGill University, as saying of NAWAPA: "Clearly we have here an exercise

in sophomore civil engineering which has received far greater attention than it deserves. It underlines the danger, all too familiar to geographers, of allowing the drawing office to replace acquaintance with the land and the people as they really are."

The general said the amount of Canada's fresh water seems to him frequently overstated, and we are suffering from allowing overstatements to go uncorrected.

"In Canada, we have much less habitable and arable land (than in the U.S.). It may be that in the future, we will have to conserve this for ourselves and this in turn means that we do have to look with care before we put any more of it under water," Gen. McNaughton added.

He pointed to recent advice by H. A. New of the National Research Council, who urged formation of a Canadian committee on water, weather and vegetation to carry out certain studies before any water diversion is brought under consideration.

Gen. McNaughton said even the slightest changes in water can have far-reaching effects on vegetation and biological life. A region could become hotter in summer and colder in winter. Plants could die.

He stressed that many of the rivers talked about by NAWAPA are those "which provide a great series of prime power sites, rivers which form the basis of one of the world's great concentrations of the forest product industry, rivers which provide some of the finest salmon runs in the world."

The general said great projects are under way to harness all the resources in these areas and "the NAWAPA promoters would move all this out of Canada, the people, the industry, the water."

"It can only be described as madness to believe that Canada has surplus water in an area that is so obviously earmarked for major resource development, and where so much is already taking place," he added.

The general said NAWAPA is not interested in this but in flooding the valleys of Canada and draining off water for U.S. benefit.

BRITISH COLUMBIA FLOODED

"But the valleys themselves are of vital importance to B.C., because they contain the level land which is so vitally needed for roads and railways, for industries, for people and for agriculture," he said.

"Whitehorse and Prince George would be submerged, and their land with them, as would countless miles of railway and highways. These irreplaceable assets would be destroyed in the name of trans-mountain navigation," Gen. McNaughton added.

He maintained NAWAPA would put under water an area stretching from the Montana border to northern B.C.

The general argued the scheme ignores all the plans in Canada for the use of the waters and lands of the trench—the Peace project, plans for the Fraser and Thompson; the Columbia development.

He said if there is any water left over, the Canadian west, not the U.S. northwest, southwest or midwest, is the logical beneficiary.

Gen. McNaughton said the Parsons engineers had not come up with anything new.

"The capture of Columbia and Kootenay waters in the trench, and their diversion over the Rockies, is the logical first step in development of additional water supplies for the Canadian Prairies," he stated.

He repeated earlier statements of his that the NAWAPA scheme was monstrous not only in physical magnitude, but in that the promoters would displace Canadian sovereignty over the national waters of Canada "and substitute a diabolic thesis that all waters of North America become a shared resource of which most will be drawn off for the benefit of the U.S. midwest and southwest regions where existing desert areas will be made to bloom at the expense of development in Canada."

He stated Canada should not expose herself over water.

"To me it is obvious that if we made a bargain to divert water to the U.S. we cannot ever discontinue or we will face force to compel compliance," said Gen. McNaughton.

NOT LIKE A TAP

"There is nothing in our experience to date which indicates any change in the vigor with which our American friends pursue objectives which they deem in their national interests, however much this may hurt a neighbor who had unwittingly made a careless bargain in other circumstances," he added.

Gen. McNaughton urged Canada be very careful to ensure the rights it thinks it has are admitted and confirmed beforehand.

"We have everything to lose by hasty and ill-considered action, and we have everything to gain by waiting until the essential information is available upon which we can make our own assessment of the subject of sharing resources and our own plans as to the course of action we will adopt."

Sen. Moss came back smiling gamely.

He said he thought he and the general agreed on one thing—that the study should be made, and quickly, before any decision was made by Canada.

But the senator emphasized that once water is diverted, and people and industry thrive around it, it can't be turned on and off like a tap.

THE BUSING DISTINCTION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, an editorial in the Evening Star of Washington, D.C., on July 14, 1966, takes note of a proposal to bus children to schools in certain areas of the District of Columbia.

The editorial concluded that Supt. Carl Hansen should ask the School Board to affirm his determination to operate a temporary busing program only to eliminate overcrowding in some schools and to make use of vacant space in other schools.

As chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, I am in total agreement with the editorial statement that "the proper permanent solution is to build adequate schools where they are needed."

I am also in agreement with the Superintendent's main concern that the busing, if done at all, should be only temporary and that it should be confined to the purpose of relieving overcrowding, and not, as has been suggested by some, as a way of promoting artificial integration. The busing of students to promote integration has no basis in any U.S. Supreme Court decision or in any Federal statute, and I join with the Star in hoping that Dr. Hansen never relinquishes the position taken. This is not to say that I shall, if such is presented, support any proposal for congressional appropriation of moneys for the purpose of temporary busing to alleviate crowded schoolrooms, as I shall reserve any judgment on this point until such time as my subcommittee conducts hearings on the District of Columbia appropriation bill for fiscal year 1967. If the Commissioners and Dr. Hansen wish to present justifications at that time, I shall be glad to consider them. I have grave reservations as to the advisability of such a busing program, for once it is put into operation, the pressures will build for its permanent retention. There are those

who would use the taxpayers' moneys to promote artificial integration in a school system that is less than 10 percent white, but I do not believe that the taxpayers' moneys can justifiably be spent for the busing of students to promote school integration or to deal with racial imbalance in the school population, the U.S. Supreme Court never having ruled, and the Congress never having acted, to date, against de facto segregation.

The U.S. Supreme Court in the case of Brown against Board of Education on May 17, 1954, ruled, quite properly, in my judgment, that children in public schools could not be segregated on the basis of race, as this would contravene the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment. The same Court ruled the same day in the case of Bolling against Sharpe, that racially segregated public schools could not be maintained in the District of Columbia by virtue of the due process clause of the fifth amendment. But the Supreme Court has never ruled against de facto segregation nor against racial imbalance in the public schools. The Court only ruled that race shall not be a factor in the assignment of children to schools in the public school system.

Additionally, it is my understanding that many prominent educators are of the belief that money spent for busing could be better spent for teachers' salaries, new teaching positions, and school equipment.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD.

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

THE BUSING DISTINCTION

Superintendent Hansen's decision to recommend busing children from severely overcrowded public schools to those with vacant space will surprise a lot of Washingtonians. It is important, however, to consider the qualifications which Dr. Hansen attaches to this decision.

The facts of the situation are that about 1,700 children now are attending half-day classes because of congested neighborhood schools, while space for some 1,500 pupils is available in other city schools outside the overcrowded neighborhoods. To use these unused facilities during a period of crisis seems only common sense.

The trouble is that several dangers are inherent in the project.

First, of course, is the danger that this temporary emergency measure might become permanent, and that must not be allowed to occur. The proper permanent solution is to build adequate schools where they are needed. This must remain the goal. Dr. Hansen says he believes that once in the "busing business," the city will "get out as quickly as possible." He should urge the school board to affirm this determination as a flat policy—and to make it crystal clear to the congressional committees which appropriate money for new schools.

The superintendent's main concern, however, is that temporary busing should be confined to the purpose of relieving overcrowding, not, as has been suggested, as a way of promoting "artificial" integration.

We hope Dr. Hansen never relinquishes that position. As a practical matter, no degree of meaningful citywide integration is possible in a school system less than 10 percent white. In trying to reach an unattainable goal, however, irreparable harm could be done to the sound basic concept of neighborhood schools.

THE ROAD TO SAFETY

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, further support of the automobile safety bill passed by the Senate is offered by the Louisville Times.

The Times considers the bill a fair one. It takes editorial note of the fact that Government activity in the field already has induced the auto industry to do many of the things the bill would require.

The Times also supports legislation to improve standards of driving and of highway construction.

As a matter of public interest, this editorial presents a balanced and reasoned viewpoint on auto safety. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

[From the Louisville Times, June 27, 1966]
DOWN THE ROAD TOWARD SAFETY

In the first four months of this year, 15,110 persons were killed in automobile accidents in the United States, compared with 13,650 in the same period last year. In April, the increase in traffic fatalities was 20 per cent greater than in the preceding April.

Perhaps statistics like these had something to do with the Senate's unanimous approval of a more demanding auto safety bill than the original proposals of the administration. Perhaps it was because of an awareness that an increasing number of Americans—though no one knows how many—are becoming genuinely concerned about slaughter on the highways. Possibly the Senate members reminded themselves that the life they save by demanding a safer car might be their own or that of a member of their family.

Whatever the motive or combination of motives, the Senate Commerce Committee is to be congratulated for strengthening the bill before sending it to the floor. Instead of bowing to industry pressure, it has stiffened its back. The bill as approved seems to us a fair one, at least to start with. Not all committee members were happy with it because a provision for criminal penalties was removed. But the bill's schedule of fines for violations, \$1,000 per car to a maximum of \$400,000, ought to be stiff enough to enforce compliance. If experience proves it is not, the law could be amended.

The same could be said for all its provisions. As it stands, it is in a rather experimental stage. It requires the secretary of commerce to set up minimum safety standards for new cars. These "interim" standards would be published by Jan. 31 and put into effect from six to 12 months later. They are not really radical. In effect, they are those established by the federal government for cars it buys, covering such things as seat belts, windshield wipers, collapsible steering columns, padded dashes and visors, outside mirrors, and so on.

The secretary of commerce also would be required to undertake a testing and research program on the basis of which he would publish revised standards by Jan. 31, 1968. He also would have to review the standards at least once every two years, and would be authorized to modify them.

The significant difference between this bill and the administration's first proposal is that the secretary of commerce is required to do all this. Under the other plan, he was given discretionary authority, which he might have chosen not to use.

The spotlight now shifts to the House, where committee approval of a companion bill is forecast within a week or two. We hope these cheerful predictions are realized. The fact is that because of governmental

pressure the automobile industry already is doing a good many of the things this bill would require. We do not see how it could hurt the industry to go the rest of the way.

And now, with a federal auto safety law seemingly so close, if anyone wants to bring up the argument that the same government ought to pay some attention to the kind of people who drive these cars, we will gladly say amen. It never has been our contention that auto design is the sole factor in auto deaths and injuries. Both the motorist and the car he drives should be made as safe as possible, as well as the road on which both travel.

This seems to be the thought behind another bill passed by the Senate authorizing expenditure of \$465 million over a three-year period to help states and cities expand their traffic safety efforts.

PROBLEMS OF THE U.S. MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, a recent conference of the maritime industry, joined by representatives of both labor and management, dramatized the critical situation of our maritime industry. Aptly titled SOS, standing for "Save Our Ships" and "Save Our Shipyards," this conference showed again the willingness of all segments of this vital industry to work together to revive our maritime service and the moribund shipbuilding industry.

The crisis of our maritime industry must be seen in the context of our strength as a world power. Russia has clearly seen the long range importance of the merchant marine as a weapon of economic warfare. We must remember that peaceful coexistence to the Russians does not mean the abandonment of Russia's expansionist economic goals. It is significant that while the United States has allowed her merchant marine to decline to the point where less than 12 percent of our huge foreign trade is carried in American-flag ships, the Russians will add 464 vessels to their merchant fleet. In addition to the powerful thrust this merchant fleet gives to Russia's expansion, it has an obviously harmful effect on our balance of payments.

Two recent articles describe this problem clearly and well. One is a recent column by James Kilpatrick, entitled "Grappling With the Merchant Marine Problem," which appeared in the Washington Star on May 31, 1966. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Another article, "The Future Role of Soviet Sea Power," by Comdr. H. G. Dudley, Sr., USN, was published in the U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings for May 1966. Commander Dudley emphasizes that the Russians consider their merchant marine to be an integral instrument of their naval power, and use it as such. Commander Dudley states:

The growing Soviet merchant fleet will also serve definite political purposes. It will, of course, further the prestige of the Soviet Union as a creditable major power and, more importantly, it will lend itself to the Soviet

design to create a "Socialist commercial bloc" on a global scale, resembling Soviet-Satellite economic ties. The Soviets undoubtedly feel that they have been successful in orienting the economy of Cuba and Egypt toward Moscow and now have confidence that other developing nations will follow at a progressive pace. To accomplish this progress in proper Communist style, all commerce would move in Communist ships; this would permit the Kremlin more positive control over the victims' economy. The ultimate goal of Moscow in this scheme would be twofold: to isolate the United States from the world markets and from the raw materials abroad; and to consolidate control of the economies of the rising nations. This would be in effect the revival of mercantilism, Communist style.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this extremely interesting article be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. These articles make quite clear the serious penalty we may pay in the years ahead for allowing our merchant marine to decline. Not only the short-term economic effect in terms of payrolls, jobs, and the balance of payments must be considered, but the danger of growing economic dominance of our chief rival, the Soviet Union. It is not too late to reverse the trend, but we must act vigorously and imaginatively to do so. I look forward to the recommendations of the SOS conference for positive ways by which we may restore our merchant marine to its rightful place in our economy and to its role in our overall naval policy.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 31, 1966]

GRAPPLING WITH THE MERCHANT MARINE PROBLEM

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

For the last five months, committees of the House and Senate have been grappling futilely with problems of the American merchant marine. They are no closer to an answer than they were when the second session of this Congress began. Meanwhile, the industry is dying.

In 1965, less than 12 percent of U.S. foreign trade was transported under the U.S. flag; this was the lowest percentage on record, and compares with 52 percent as recently as 1951. In terms of a merchant fleet in being, the United States ranks a poor sixth among the nations of the world, but even this rank is deceptive. Most of this fleet consists of vessels built more than 20 years ago. In terms of ships under construction, the U.S. ranks in 14th place, just barely ahead of tiny Finland.

The several reasons for this decline are not obscure. Part of the responsibility lies with the ship operators, who have been unwilling or unable to make the bold and imaginative changes that would permit them to compete for world markets. Part of the responsibility lies with the 32 separate unions that make up the AFL-CIO's Maritime Trades Department; their suicidal in-fighting, manifested in a series of maddening strikes, has reduced the industry to chaos.

Still another part of the responsibility lies with domestic shipyards and with the politicians representing them; they have clung tenaciously to protective and restrictive laws that have had a suffocating effect upon American operators both in foreign trade and on domestic coastal routes.

Yet the greatest responsibility, by far, lies upon the Congress and the executive agencies of the federal government. The Congress has been content to drift along with the basic Merchant Marine Act of 1936, though the law hasn't worked for 30 years. The defense establishment, enchanted by fly-boy visions of airlifted troops and cargoes, has woefully neglected the necessity for a healthy merchant fleet. The Maritime Administration, plagued by weaknesses, has frittered away its research funds on such glamorous ventures as the nuclear Savannah. Nowhere—in labor, in management, in government, in politics—has there been the leadership needed to unite the industry and to find some cures for its wasting disease.

Two major reports on the merchant marine have attempted to diagnose the sickness. Characteristically, neither of them has satisfied everyone.

Last October, an "Interagency Maritime Task Force," composed of government administrators headed by Alan S. Boyd, undersecretary of commerce, brought forth a 20-year plan for restoring the patient to health. To the outside observer—and to a few spokesmen within the industry—the Boyd Report is sound in principle. It would reduce federal subsidies for operations and construction, phase out the subsidies to passenger liners altogether, put an end to certain cargo preferences, and permit fleet owners greater freedom in their operations.

Two months after the Boyd Report, the President's Maritime Advisory Committee brought in a series of recommendations that contradicted almost everything the Boyd group had proposed. Yet the committee itself was sorely divided. One member, H. Lee White, filed a blistering 75-page dissent in which three other members joined in part.

To the concerned outsider, White's blunt prescriptions make considerable sense. A lawyer with long experience in maritime law and operations, White is president of Marine Transport Lines. In his view, a simple increase in subsidies is no answer at all. He doubts that Congress and the taxpayers would stand for handouts and loan guarantees that might reach a billion dollars a year under the Advisory Committee's plan. At some point, he says, it must be explained why other American industries with high labor costs are able to compete on world markets, while America's merchant ships cannot compete profitably even in our own coastal trade.

The first step, in White's view, is to abolish the restriction that limits operating subsidies solely to vessels built in high-cost American yards.

The Boyd Report makes the same recommendation.

Until this is done, American fleet operators cannot obtain the modern bulk carriers and tankers needed to compete with foreign operators. White makes the point that even the Soviet Union, which is adding 464 vessels to its merchant fleet this year, does not insist that all of them be built in Russian yards. The Soviet Union buys its ships wherever it pleases.

Thus far, the hard line advocated by White and by the Boyd Report has picked up little support within the sick industry or on the Hill.

EXHIBIT 2

THE FUTURE ROLE OF SOVIET SEA POWER

(NOTE.—With such modern men-of-war as the Kynda-class missile frigate *Variag* and the world's largest undersea fleet, the Soviet Navy would seem prepared to wage the hottest of wars. Yet, for the foreseeable future, we can expect their Navy's role to be offensive in Cold War and defensive in hot.)

(By Commander H. G. Dudley, Sr., U.S. Navy)

The Russians have been politically interested in sea power since the 17th and 18th century campaigns of Peter the Great. Since Stalin's death, however, Soviet maritime strategy has appeared in a different political concept. It now reflects the Soviet scenario of a struggle best defined by George Kennan who pointed out that the Soviet Union's "main concern is to make sure that it has filled every nook and cranny available to it in the basin of world power." Despite repeated threatening language in speeches and diplomatic exchanges, however, the theme of Soviet strategy is victory by Cold War and diplomacy.

Nikita Khrushchev made it clear that the Soviet Union did not desire to engage in war when he spoke to workers at Novosibirsk on 10 October 1959; and Marshal Vasily D. Sokolovskiy has more recently considered this theme important enough to repeat: "Peaceful coexistence . . . must be correctly understood. Coexistence is a continuation of the conflict between social systems, but by peaceful means, without war . . . We consider this an economic political and ideological struggle, not a military one." Then the Soviets, via the voice of the Twentieth Party Congress, clarified the main target of their "cold" struggle by stating: "In short, the world has moved out of the stage of the capitalist encirclement of the Soviet Union and during the current phase of coexistence is moving into the stage of the socialist encirclement of the United States as a prelude to final victory of Communism." The essence of this declaration supposes that the Soviets will capture the economic and political vitals of the developing nations and, thereby, isolate the United States. This is what Sokolovskiy had in mind when he stressed ". . . politics has available in addition to war, a large arsenal of various non-forcible means which it can use for achieving goals, without resorting to war."

Economic warfare, the co-element of Soviet political and psychological warfare, actually equates to trade-war. It seeks to dominate the economy of the rising nation and is nothing more than "mercantilism." Khrushchev set the Soviet course in this direction when, in 1955, he forecasted intentions to increase foreign trade by 70 per cent. It will be recalled that Khrushchev made this announcement when he introduced the Seven Year Plan shortly after replacing Georgi Malenkov, and thereby used the opportunity to broadcast the Soviet policy of invoking the political instrument of trade and aid as the new tactic in pursuing Kremlin goals.

The unique advantage to the Soviets is their ability to prosecute a trade-war by decision, that is, when the political stakes are high enough, they decide, and manage to afford, the economic policies that help to win them.

Another facet of recent Soviet politico-maritime strategy involves designs to neutralize Western sea power by creating political and military obstacles to free movement of ocean commerce. In this regard, the Kremlin continues to work diligently to fester the political environment around the four strategic, commercial bottlenecks of world trade routes: the Panama and Suez Canals and the Straits of Malacca and Gibraltar.

Efforts have been made by the Kremlin to extend Soviet sea power by proxy to these vital areas by building up the naval power of Cuba, Algeria, Egypt, and Indonesia. Further indications of these tactics are reflected in Soviet construction of seaports such as Hodeida in Yemen. This port, as well as others which may be offered for Soviet naval "blackmail" operations, constitutes a potential fleet-in-being type of haven which could accommodate both submarines and surface ships. Support ships for naval and fishing units could well find strategic ports and coves similar to the facilities which the Soviets enjoyed briefly in Albania for submarine op-

erations. These projections of Soviet sea power are not myths. Indeed, current Soviet political maneuvering and planning lends new significance to them.

The naval—and air—forces which the Soviet Union has provided the developing nations have minelaying capabilities and, though neither first rate nor operational in all cases, these forces pose an additional potential threat in very strategic areas.

Closely associated with neutralizing Western sea power is the Soviet Union's effort to increase the three-mile limit of territorial waters. The political motive is obviously to nibble away the freedom which has always been a hallmark of the high seas and, accordingly, diminish Western sea power's mobility. If, for example, the 12-mile rule were to become international law, vast areas would no longer be free seas and many passages now classed as international would be subject to political wrangling. The Soviet Union's desire for coastal concealment of Communist insurgency activities around the world is another, more covert, motive.

Other political motives which shape Soviet maritime strategy could be cited; they, however, would merely reaffirm Soviet designs to further the Kremlin goal of world domination through maximum use of sea power.

There are important fixed factors affecting Soviet sea power. Professor Nicholas J. Spykman (1893-1943) emphasized that geography was fundamental to the formation of foreign policy, and so it is with Soviet foreign policy. Spykman highlighted the dependence of relative power of states not only on military forces but also on such factors as size of territory, nature of frontiers, size of population, absence or presence of raw materials, economic and technical development, financial strength, ethnic homogeneity, effective social integration, political stability, and national spirit. Credence is added to Spykman's concepts by Alfred Thayer Mahan and Sir Halford Mackinder, both of whom arrived at the same deductions. The former oriented his philosophy toward maritime strategy and the latter more toward the potential power inherently possessed by the Eurasian land mass. It is the wisdom of these three men which provides the tools with which one may analyze Soviet national power and, indeed, sea power, with reliability. The relatively new third dimension of Communism does introduce insidious tactics which challenge old theories. Nevertheless, as Mahan pointed out, his principles "belong to the unchangeable, or unchanging order of things, remaining the same, in cause and effect, from age to age," and that flexibility of application, occasioned by unforeseen developments, is necessary.

Land Mass Orientation. The vast size northern location, and orientation toward the Arctic have significantly influenced everything that is Russian. The high mountains in the east and south, the proximity of the Arctic, and the continental climate combine to produce extremely hot and cold regions, large unproductive areas, and difficult interior transportation. As a result, the bulk of Soviet industry, population and transportation is concentrated in Western Russia in a triangular area consisting significantly of only about 11 per cent of the country, the apex of which is near Lake Baikal.

Another region of less than 2 per cent of the entire land has been developed as the Far East Maritime Province. Geographically isolated, this rear area—1,000 rugged miles east of the apex—has been forced into military and economic seclusion. Both areas, consisting of about 80 per cent of the population, are joined by an excellent, but by itself inadequate, east-west Trans-Siberian railroad.

In reality, then, the vast land of the Soviet Union is literally reduced to a comparatively small, productive portion which is oriented

like a tipped table in the direction of Europe. This feature explains why the Russians have always considered the defense of their western front the key to their survival. It follows, of course, that the isolated nature of the Maritime Province contributes little, if any, to the major power complex which is centered in western Russia.

Peter the Great was one of the first to appreciate the western orientation of Russia; this was symbolized by his moving the capital from Moscow to St. Petersburg. He clearly understood that the wealth and greatness of his country lay in its association with Europe and understood the importance of the Baltic and Black Sea to this greatness.

Geographic Vulnerability. From a defensive point of view, the high perimeter of the "tipped table" is bound by excellent obstacles; frozen seas, wide deserts, and high mountains protect three sides. Only from the west is the Soviet heartland approachable across terrain suitable for any large-scale ground movement, while the remaining large portions of its western frontier are coastal in nature.

Imagine yourself standing in Moscow, the geographic center of the Black, Baltic, and White Seas, and facing west; the vulnerability of Russia from the Muscovites' perspective can thus be more clearly appreciated. Not only do you gain a better understanding of the purpose of the Red Army, but you also recognize more fully the importance of sea power to the vast water-washed shores of western Russia—both from the point of view of defense and of contact with the world, the latter being the source of Soviet progress. Also from this vantage point, one may visualize the industrial triangle of Russia with its base facing quite vulnerably to the west; Eastern Europe and the Baltic directly threaten the center, whereas the Black Sea and the White Sea weaken the extremities. This is to say, the Soviet heartland is vulnerable from four distinct sectors, three of which must rely upon naval power for defense.

In a similar vein, the Soviet Union is militarily weakest where the seas literally penetrate deeply into the base of its industrial triangle. This makes the Soviets sensitive to any threat from the seas and increasingly conscious of the need for sea power. Furthermore, the Soviets become justifiably fearful of the sea-threat when they remember that within the last 115 years, while successfully resisting repeated invasions over land, they have been defeated twice by sea power—in the Crimean War (1853-1856) and the Russo-Japanese War (1904-1905).

Internal Mobility. From the Soviet interior to its seaports, water transportation is seemingly difficult. The combination of waterways enables the interior movement of smaller merchant vessels and naval ships between the Arctic, Baltic, and Black Sea areas. Even though the internal water system is elaborate, it moves one-fifth as many ton-miles by water as the United States which has one-fourth of the mileage. Moreover, Soviet water ways transport only five per cent of the nation's freight turnover. Better use, however, can be expected of the rivers, locks, and canals as the current extension and improvement programs progress. Actually, river transit by ocean ships is now in effect and increasing. However, there is no river which provides free access to the ocean. The large Siberian rivers all empty into the Arctic Sea which is frozen for nine to ten months of the year. The Amur in the Far East deviates to a shallow estuary which is icebound for many months. The Volga, the most important river, carrying over half of the inland water-borne commerce, flows south into the land-locked Caspian; and both the Don and Dnieper rivers reach the Black Sea which, in turn, must exit through the Turkish Straits.

Thus, nature has forced the Soviets to the limits of man's ingenuity in efforts to over-

come natural obstacles. In general, the inland waterways can be considered marginal, being susceptible to improvement but not substantial change.

Although all but one of Russia's major seaports lie in proximity to a river mouth—the exception being Vladivostok—they are relatively unimportant. In fact, the most important, Leningrad, does not rate among the 50 leading seaports of the world. Another point—the remoteness of many consuming and producing centers from the ports—makes international commerce very expensive after the heavy freight from river or rail is added to the ocean freight.

Peripheral Limitations. Access from the Soviet Union, that is the tipped table portion, lies either across the northern plain of Europe or through the Black, Baltic and White-Barents Seas. Not one of these seas has free access to the world inasmuch as each one is severely restricted in at least one of several ways. Exits from the Black and Baltic Seas require passing through narrow waters controlled by Turkey and Denmark respectively. Egress from the White Sea area is through relatively narrow and channelled waters of the Barents and Norwegian Seas. To further the restrictive effects, all three exits are under close surveillance of the North Atlantic Powers.

Likewise, the heartland of the Far East, the Maritime Province, is hemmed in by the Sea of Japan with only three accesses to the Pacific Ocean, all of which are easily dominated by Western-oriented Japan.

In effect, Soviet naval capabilities beyond their contiguous "lakes" depend primarily on the two port areas, Petropavlovsk, in Kamchatka, and Murmansk. And, the Soviets have been forced to make maximum use of these areas irrespective of their relatively remote and isolated locations. Although Petropavlovsk fronts on the Pacific Ocean, it is icebound three months of the year and hampered by extreme climatic conditions. With icebreaker operations, it is usable the year round, and a small portion of the Far East Fleet is based there. Even the major port of Vladivostok is icebound part of the year, requiring icebreakers for year-round use. Murmansk is more useful inasmuch as it is ice-free; in fact, Murmansk is the only Soviet port in European Russia that is unimpeded in its outlet to the high seas by ice or extreme narrows. Nevertheless, it is plagued by inhibiting climatic conditions—and severely so.

Thus, the Northern Fleet and the Petropavlovsk forces represent the major Soviet sea power threat in their respective ocean areas. For the Soviets to project their threat into the Atlantic, however, it would be essential for the forces—surface, sub-surface, and probably air—to funnel via the relatively narrow Norwegian Sea. In addition, channeling through the Greenland-Iceland-Faeroes Gap would increase their vulnerability. Submarine use of the Arctic ice cap would be probable but not without inconvenience and undesirable sacrifices.

A glance at a North Polar Map reveals three salient features which diminish the power position of the Northern Fleet. First, the Barents-White Sea area lies deeply in the Arctic, which extends even into the depths of Russia's Northwest; second, the circuitous route and distance to the North Atlantic is extremely long and vulnerable; third—and this relates to the second—the route to the Atlantic is relatively narrow.

Sokolovskiy has summarized Russia's dilemma from the experience of World War II: "... two of our fleets were based in inland seas [Baltic and Black Seas] and it was difficult to bring out the Northern and Pacific Fleets onto the high seas."

Unfavorable Climate. Although adversities of climate have been mentioned, it is proper to emphasize their limitations on

both commercial and naval activities. Cold and dismal climatic environments seriously affect three of the coastal complexes—only the Black Sea enjoys the milder weather. The White Sea and Far East areas are plagued much of the year by fierce inclement conditions. Only the Satellite countries have Baltic ports with year-round weather conditions that are suitable for reasonably efficient commercial and reasonably effective naval operations.

As a general deduction, the areas from which Soviet naval operations could project into the distant oceans experience climatic conditions which not only discourage, but also preclude operational flexibility. This same limitation applies to ocean commerce. Where the Black Sea has more favorable weather, its accessibility to the open seas is more restrictive including periodic weather limitations on navigating the Bosphorus/Dardanelles.

The Northern Sea Route, some 6,000 miles long, is only open from about mid-July to the end of September; and the use of ice-breakers extends this season by about two weeks. Although the Soviet Union has progressively made greater and greater use of this strategic route, it is inconceivable that, within the foreseeable future, they will be able to enhance the route's military and economic contributions to any significant extent.

The magnitude of the modern Soviet Navy was placed in clear focus by Admiral Arleigh Burke on 26 August 1957, when as Chief of Naval Operations he told the Veterans of Foreign Wars: "They have a large, well-rounded navy with the largest submarine force in history, and they are building subs at the rate of about 100 a year." He also pointed out that "In twelve years the Soviet Union has replaced Great Britain as the second ranking sea power." Subsequently, it became recognized that "the Soviet Union ... has surpassed in some respects the military technology of the West and it also maintains far larger conventional forces." Although these statements were made six to eight years ago, they realistically portray a Soviet Navy today which was commenced in 1928 as part of Stalin's first Five Year Plan.

Stalin, although a "big ship" advocate, emphasized sub-surface warfare and, in 1941, produced the largest submarine force in the world. A naval reorientation during 1956-58 under Khrushchev further stressed the submarine but with a commensurate degradation of the surface navy. "Cruisers," said Khrushchev, "are fit only for diplomatic missions to foreign countries." In 1956, he stopped cruiser construction and replaced the "big-ship" sailor Admiral Kusnetsov with Admiral Gorshkov, a proponent of submarines, missiles, and smaller ships. Since then, missilery has dominated the naval scene (and has even been honored on land as a separate branch of the military). And now, the earlier concept of balanced fleets has given way to an emphasis on missile firing submarines and missile ships in the Northern and Far East Fleet.

The Soviet surface naval force today is the second largest in the world when measured in terms of tonnage. It includes a significant number of relatively modern cruisers, frigates, and destroyers, many equipped with surface-to-air and surface-to-surface missiles. These units are augmented by numerous coastal types which also brandish missiles. In addition, more than 100 oceanographic research ships emphasize the magnitude of Soviet interest in both the military and economic applications of the world's oceans.

The Soviets have a substantial naval air arm which has been dramatizing increased capabilities with long-range reconnaissance flights over the Atlantic and Pacific. Some of these aircraft have been TU-95 turboprops,

the longest range type in the Soviet air inventory useable for oceanic patrol and anti-submarine-surface shipping.

The Red submarine fleet continues to be the world's largest; it includes numerous nuclear and about 400 conventionally-powered types. At least one-third are long-range, while the remainder are medium-range or coastal types; and increasingly large portions of the long-range submarines are being equipped with missiles.

The majority of all Soviet surface and submarine vessels are capable of minelaying, giving the Soviet Navy an unusually extensive mining potential. Smaller units, including trawlers, further increase this capability to significant proportions. Equally important are the continued efforts by the Soviet Union to maintain a highly effective minesweeping force. At present this force is also acknowledged to be the world's largest.

The Soviet merchant fleet has expanded alarmingly fast since World War II, and now has an estimated annual increase approximating 1.2 million deadweight tons and a 1970 projected strength of about 13.5 million tons.* The probable goal for 1980 is 20 million gross tons. Current Soviet ship-building programs call for about 332 dry cargo ships, 131 tankers, and notably, 38 passenger vessels. Meanwhile, at least 1,124 Soviet merchant ships—totaling 7.03 million deadweight tons—are using the high seas today.

The Soviet fishing fleet will soon be the largest in the world. It is already considered to be the most modern. The trawlers are impressively large and capable of distant and extended operations through the organic support of modern salvage ships, tankers, refrigeration ships, and dry-storage vessels. Estimates indicate that the Soviet fishing force has increased from about 36,404 vessels of all types in 1940 to about 75,000 in 1962, and has a program for an additional 14,000. Fishing operations are global.

It must be concluded that the Soviet Union has, or will have, a numerical preponderance of the components essential to sea power; and Soviet efforts to develop a balance of naval, merchant, and fishing fleets are increasing.

The Soviets remain very much convinced that past efforts toward achieving global Communism have been successful, and that their ideology will reap progress under clever and determined leadership, through aggressive policies, and within the framework of Peaceful Coexistence. Hypnotized by their belief in the "inevitable world revolutionary movement," they will continue to seek every possible action short of war to hasten what they feel to be the ultimate crumbling of the world into their lap. Their strategy is shaped by the nuclear stalemate and the predominating influence which economic development has, and will continue to have, in the foreseeable future, both in Russia and throughout the world. In this environment they plan a significant role for sea power as the instrument for implementing Soviet political goals.

The Soviets will experience during the next decade their most serious challenge in the economic sector; and it is apparent that through directing a greater share of their national effort toward agriculture and consumer industry they intend ultimately to realize greater economic viability to meet the consumer needs. In addition, a necessary extension of the Soviet industrial base and greater participation in world trade are to be pursued by the Soviet leaders in an effort to stimulate their economy and enhance their power image. As a consequence, the military posture will feel the pinch and will find it necessary to restrain expansion desires. Thus

the Soviets will probably maintain a military posture, including large naval forces, adequate to preserve the condition of stabilized deterrence and provide territorial security.

Reflection upon the world scene as an image of economic and military power will continue as a paramount Soviet aim. Through this image, the Soviets indeed hope to take full advantage of the high seas more than ever before to gain international prestige and impose blackmail. At the same time they will act to neutralize the effectiveness of Western sea power where possible by choking off the strategic crossroads of ocean commerce and extending their sea power by proxy.

The Soviets are bent on attaining world "socialism" through "economic diplomacy" and without direct involvement in military conflict. They envisage cultural and political co-operation with developing nations as sequel to economic penetration. The eventual aim of course is the development of pro-Communist attitudes and governments. This means that all efforts of aid and assistance will continue to be channeled to ensure profitable political goals irrespective of the resulting hardships to the Russian people.

This political strategic concept frames the future of Soviet sea power; it minimizes the limitations while making maximum use of Soviet sea power capabilities. It provides for the continued modernization of the Navy but will restrict in all probability further expansion; it will promote a progressive and larger commercial fleet; it will foster further growth of the already extensive fishing fleet; and will use these elements of sea power primarily for Cold War objectives while, at the same time, always being prepared to defend the homeland by offensive-defensive naval strategy.

The key to Soviet tactics within this strategy will be to avoid Western positions of strength which is tantamount to avoiding war at practically all cost. Meanwhile, there is no doubt that the strategic missile submarines in the Northern and Far East Fleets will be maintained to reflect creditability of a nuclear deterrent and, in Kremlin diplomacy, as nuclear blackmail.

Increased deployment of surface units primarily into the Mediterranean Sea and the North Atlantic can be expected as part of an effort to enhance the Soviet sea power image and to employ more fully sea power's potential as a diplomatic instrument. Large-scale deployments would seem to be around the corner as the Soviets overcome their logistic limitations, gain experience, and find "friendly" ports. In this regard, close co-operation of Soviet naval units with those of Algeria, Egypt, and Cuba, to mention a few, could well be high on the Soviet priority list. It is more likely, however, that Soviet out-of-area activity will emphasize show-of-strength in furtherance of political goals, inasmuch as the Soviet Navy is not the international "mixer" that other navies have been.

The Soviets will proceed rather cautiously in projecting their naval power into new areas in order to minimize Western reaction; they still recall the Cuban missile incident. A careful "approach" is also necessary to avoid alarming the nations of the Afro-Asian Bloc with their insidious and sophisticated penetration techniques.

The Soviet Navy is a Cold War Navy and highly capable of generating two desired ingredients for Soviet foreign policy—prestige and blackmail. To this end, the Navy will continue to be glossed in secrecy, deceit, and exaggeration.

Meanwhile, the Soviet fishing fleet has given evidence that it will make its presence felt throughout the world and in such fashion as to provide global prestige for the Soviet Union. The vessels, aside from providing economic assistance and intelligence services, serve to augment the Soviet image

of sea power. Eventually, it can be expected that Soviet fishing units will associate themselves rather closely to selected ports as some have done in Cuba. The Soviets will use this technique to improve their opportunities to penetrate a multitude of nations and to expand Communist insurgency activity.

The growing Soviet merchant fleet will also serve definite political purposes. It will, of course, further the prestige of the Soviet Union as a creditable major power and, more importantly, it will lend itself to the Soviet design to create a "Socialist commercial bloc" on a global scale, resembling Soviet-Satellite economic ties. The Soviets undoubtedly feel that they have been successful in orienting the economy of Cuba and Egypt toward Moscow and now have confidence that other developing nations will follow at a progressive pace. To accomplish this progress in proper Communist style, all commerce would move in Communist ships; this would permit the Kremlin more positive control over the victims' economy. The ultimate goal of Moscow in this scheme would be two-fold: to isolate the United States from the world markets and from the raw materials abroad; and to consolidate control of the economies of the rising nations. This would be in effect the revival of mercantilism, Communist style.

The primary mission of Soviet naval forces in wartime is most likely the defense of the water approaches to the Soviet Union. The various fleets would conceivably be confined to their respective "lakes," as in the past. The strategy would be the usual offensive-defensive scenario with fringe benefits from submarine long-range operations.

The Northern Fleet would be the most active inasmuch as it would be the only European Fleet, including submarines, capable of projecting beyond the "lakes" of the Soviet coast. The surface units would probably penetrate as far as possible into the Norwegian Sea without undue exposure to Western opposition. The effort would be to provide defense in depth of the industrial Northwest and its associated bases and, in effect, to neutralize the Scandinavian Peninsula. This projection of naval power would be preceded by submarines of the attack and missile types to blunt the approach of any Western naval forces and to maintain control of the Norwegian-Barents Sea area. The primary mission of the submarines would be to destroy Western surface forces while the modern surface-to-air missile ships, with the assistance of naval air power, would hope to blunt an air strike against the Soviet Northwest. The limited number of Soviet ballistic-missile-type submarines (nuclear or not) could be used against the mainland of the United States; however, this would be out of context with the defensive orientation of the Russians and would probably not be prosecuted energetically after the initial stages, if then.

Assorted missions by submarines against the sea lines of communications would be a definite probability although on a much less efficient scale than the Germans in World War II. In this regard, the maximum effort by the Soviet boats would be expected in the Eastern Atlantic where it would be directed toward isolating Western Europe and supporting the Soviet Ground Forces. As the land battle disfavored the Red Army, or Soviet naval superiority became questionable, retreat of all Soviet naval forces to the proximity of their home bases for operation Fleet-in-being would be most likely.

In the Far East, the operating area for surface forces in defense of the Maritime Province would be confined to the Sea of Japan. Offensive-defensive submarine and aircraft operations could project outside the Japanese-Kurile Island chain to blunt approaching hostile forces to an extent dependent upon Japanese involvement. Full Japanese participation in favor of the Western powers

* See Frank A. Nemecek, "The Soviet Maritime Establishment," U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings, December 1964, p. 26.

would lead to a general withdrawal of Soviet naval forces to the vicinity of their bases with subsequent limited air and submarine operations. The Fleet-in-being concept would be implemented in the interest of retaining an adequate defensive posture to stave off direct attacks against the vital industrial heart of the Maritime Province.

Baltic and Black Sea operations could serve a three-fold purpose: protect the coastal shipping; provide defense in depth against air, surface, and submarine threats; and support ground forces as usual. Naval infantry in moderate amphibious operations would be used to support ground forces. Likewise, an important role of naval air would be to support the respective fleets.

In all four fleets, extensive mining could be anticipated whenever and wherever defensive action so favored. This would include efforts to exclude opposing forces from entrances to the home waters of the fleets.

The merchant and fishing fleets would, of course, be forcibly withdrawn to Soviet controlled waters. There is no conceivable sophisticated plan apparent at this time which the Soviets would be likely to apply in an effort to make military use of these components of sea power except insofar as they do provide a broad base for seafaring manpower. The merchant fleet would not be able to ply the oceans in war since the Soviet Navy does not have the antisubmarine capabilities with which to protect it; in fact, the antisubmarine forces have very limited range in regard to both tactical and logistic support.

The more one analyzes the Soviet Navy, its composition, its history, its disposition, and the Soviet propaganda concerning it, the more one becomes convinced that it serves primarily a Cold War purpose. And the Soviets undoubtedly find it prudent to emphasize Dwight D. Eisenhower's view: "War in our times has become an anachronism. Whatever the case in the past, war in the future can serve no useful purpose." In consonance with political objectives, the Kremlin will avoid direct involvement in war at practically all cost. This is evident by their political efforts and sea power strategy both of which are oriented toward a Cold War environment. If a Hot War should occur accidentally, Soviet maritime strategy would most likely be basically defensive, as history and current behavior tend to indicate.

THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND DEVELOPMENTS IN CONTAINERIZED TRANSPORTATION

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, as a member of the Select Committee on Small Business and the Committee on Commerce, and as a representative from a remote State of the Union, I would like to call attention to current developments in the field of containerization, which are related to the activities of these committees, and are of great importance to my State and to the Nation.

It is apparent in Alaska that efficiency in transportation is vital to the prosperity of business and the welfare of our economy and our people. It is equally true that the lessons learned in carrying goods between our overseas States, and associated States, such as Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, can be directly applied for the benefit of U.S. businessmen who wish to export into foreign markets.

Ultimately, of course, any such improvements directly assist all consumers, who desire to use the goods for the satis-

faction of basic human needs, such as food, warmth, clothing, and shelter.

Because of these interests, it has been gratifying to me to participate in the current inquiry on the potentials and problems of livestock exports, being conducted by the Small Business Committee under the leadership of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Our committee, about 2 years ago, began a systematic exploration of this area, with specific reference to transportation costs and barriers. The committee was encouraged by the announcement at the opening of our hearings in February 1965 that steamship companies would lower their freight rates on beef by an average of 25 percent in order to stimulate the exports of this commodity. Shortly thereafter, the air lines announced similar reductions of 25 to 30 percent.

Testimony at the hearings indicated further savings could be accomplished through the development and use of refrigerated containers. Mr. John Eyre, of the Arthur D. Little Co., stated that containerization would, in the case of beef and beef products, cut the gross transportation cost in half—in some cases by as much as 75 percent.

Our committee's interim report of October 22, 1965, recommended that the data on containerization "be utilized by departments, agencies, and industry associations concerned" in an effort to identify and eliminate transportation bottlenecks—"Expansion of Beef Exports," Interim Report of the Select Committee on Small Business, U.S. Senate, Senate Report No. 939, 89th Congress, 1st session.

Mr. President, I am pleased to report that, with this information before them, American-flag steamship lines initiated the first integrated container service on the North Atlantic trade routes in April 1966. Our Small Business Committee hearings in May brought out that the investment and pioneer technology worked out by our steamship companies made this accomplishment possible. I feel that it should be commended.

Further, these developments are having tangible results. Recent articles in the press confirmed that the breakthrough in meat and livestock exports sought by the Senate Small Business Committee has been achieved by means of shipment in these containers. It is estimated that, if this trade is fully developed, it could yield an additional \$250 million a year in sales for the American beef industry and a like amount in balance-of-payments credits for the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that the articles to which I referred be included at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Baltimore Sun, July 1, 1966]

BEEF EXPORT BY CONTAINER A REALITY

WASHINGTON, June 30.—Federal Maritime Commission Chairman John Harlee said today he believed a "breakthrough" had been achieved in shipping U.S. beef to Europe in containers.

An experimental shipment has already been made by United States Lines Co. and word on the movement received at FMC here from the Texas Farm Bureau was that the container shipments passed "all barriers" and the meat was being sold by one of West Germany's largest retail food chains.

TEXAS SHIPMENTS

More such shipments—in line with efforts of the past two years to increase U.S. beef exports to Europe—were planned from Texas, Mr. Harlee said, and further growth was expected.

Sea-Land Service Inc. was also engaged in similar experimental movements of containerized beef, he added.

Mr. Harlee credited the success he found in the beef export situation to cooperation between the steamship industry, beef raisers and processors and the government.

Mr. Harlee said the U.S. "entry into this market shows the value of teamwork and perseverance in overcoming both inertia and complex sets of barriers to this kind of export trade."

"Credit should certainly be given to Sen. JOHN J. SPARKMAN (Dem., Ala.) for his leadership and foresight and to . . . John Griffith and A. T. Desmedt of the American Steamship Traffic Executive Committee."

He said that "their initiative and imagination reflects credit upon the entire American-flag steamship industry."

[From the New York Times, July 1, 1966]

EXPORTS OF MEAT EXPECTED TO RISE: NEW SHIPPING DEVELOPMENTS CREATE FAVORABLE CLIMATE

Cooperation among business, industry and government has brought about overseas transportation conditions that may mean \$250-million more a year in American beef and livestock exports, it was reported yesterday by John Harlee, chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission.

Mr. Harlee said that reports to the Senate Small Business Committee indicated that a potential market for \$250-million of these products existed in Western Europe alone.

Mr. Harlee recalled that late in 1964 the Senate committee, under the leadership of Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN, Democrat of Alabama, started to study the prospects for exporting high-quality American livestock products to Europe.

American steamship companies soon thereafter told Senator SPARKMAN that ocean freight rates on chilled beef to Europe would be reduced an average of 25 per cent.

Since then, Mr. Harlee noted, three technological developments in ocean shipping have taken place—integrated container service on the North Atlantic; perfection of refrigerated containers for perishables and the development of specialized preservative methods to facilitate shipping of meat.

Mr. Harlee also noted that as a result of these technical advances an experimental shipment of containerized American beef had been marketed competitively in West Germany. Additional shipments, he added, are being planned by the carrier, United States Lines, in cooperation with the Texas Farm Bureau.

Another trans-Atlantic container shipping line, Sea-Land Service, Inc., Mr. Harlee said, has also been involved in beef export movements under another experimental program.

"It is indeed a tribute to the American industry that its responsible officials responded so meaningfully and effectively to the leadership in this area by Congress and such agencies as the Department of Agriculture and our commission," Mr. Harlee said.

Mr. Harlee added that credit should also be given to John Griffith, general freight manager of United States Lines and to A.

Theodore DeSmedt, president of American Export Isbrandtsen Lines, who is an official of the American Steamship Traffic Executive Committee.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, this success, which has been described by Admiral Harlee of the Maritime Commission as an example of cooperation between business, industry, and Government, has much promise for the future of American transportation and American exports.

It is realized, of course, that containerization is in its infancy, and many problems must be resolved. Examples of these problems are contained in two articles which appeared in the Journal of Commerce on July 7, which describe consideration of an international agreement on ocean containerization, and the difficulties being experienced in planning for the inauguration of air containerization service this year. These matters will be coming before congressional committees, executive departments, independent agencies, and industry groups.

It is my belief that it would be useful to have these articles available to those concerned and I ask unanimous consent that they be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

[From the New York Journal of Commerce, July 7, 1966]

DESPITE PROBLEMS: DOMESTIC AIRLINES' CONTAINER PROGRAM LIKELY TO START SEPTEMBER 1

(By Harold Gold)

The domestic airlines are likely to inaugurate their container program on September 1 despite some problems arising from a Civil Aeronautics Board order authorizing the plan.

The CAB in approving the program restricted one aspect of the plan that is causing some concern in airlines circles. The board specifically said that the airlines could not offer an incentive discount for greater density goods moving under specific commodity rates.

While noting that this could hurt the effectiveness of the plan, most airlines report that they are going ahead with the program "as is" in order to get the program "on the road." Trans World, United and the Flying Tiger Line are in this category. All three airlines told The Journal of Commerce that they are taking the steps needed to implement the program on Sept. 1.

STUDYING SITUATION

American Airlines, reported it is studying the situation. The airline has asked the CAB to authorize further industry discussions so that the airlines can deal with the problems arising from the Board's order. The Board has not yet replied to American's request.

The airline program involves a family of modular containers with most of the rates tied to the density of the shipment.

The containers have been designated A, B, C, D. The A container is, in effect, a pallet with the minimum capacity ranging from 370 to 500 cubic feet. The airlines will offer a rate reduction of \$1 per 100 pounds for shipments moving in the A container.

In order to qualify for the B, C, and D container programs, the cargo must have a minimum density of 10 lbs. per cubic foot. This is slightly in excess of what the airlines are experiencing—the average running to about nine lbs. per cubic foot.

In order to get shippers to use these containers the airlines are offering discounts ranging from 75c per 100 lbs. for the B container to 35c for the D container.

One of the main purposes of the plan is to increase the density of air cargo shipments. In order to accomplish this the airlines will be offering a further discount of 33½ per cent of cargo having a density of more than 10 lbs. per cubic foot.

The airlines had originally planned to also offer a 15 per cent added discount for goods moving under specific commodity tariffs having a density of more than 10 lbs. per cubic foot.

The Board in refusing to allow the carriers to introduce this aspect of the program, indicated that the lines had not justified such an incentive.

It said "the record is clear that many specific commodity rates, such as those on magazines and phonograph records, are heavily weighed in favor of the density of such products and any additional discount on such rates might easily put such rates well below economic levels."

QUALIFICATIONS CITED

"In these circumstances, we are not prepared to approve an across-the-board 15 per cent reduction of existing commodity rates provided only that an approved container is used and a minimal density requirement is met."

"This is not to say that the board would not approve specific commodity rates and density incentive discounts applied thereto on containerized shipments, providing such proposals were adequately supported with the required economic justification and tariff data."

The Board also did not allow the carriers to exclude perishables as proposed on the grounds that "containerization incentives should be afforded all products, and that the exclusion of any product should be accompanied by forceful reasons therefore."

"In the absence of a contrary showing, it would appear that the carriers should realize cost savings from containerization of these items equivalent to the savings on other commodities."

The problems over the elimination of the specific commodity discount is twofold; it could result in a situation where, depending on the weight of the shipment, it would be cheaper to send cargo outside a container than in one. Also, it could result in a traffic imbalance.

Almost all specific commodity rates are directional from California eastward. It is estimated that about 25 per cent of the current traffic would be eliminated from the container program under the CAB order.

These areas involve inclusion of all traffic under 10 lbs. per cubic foot within unitization incentive discounts; multi-lateral agreement for the interchange of pallets and containers; third party lessor or container pool; and additional containers of less than 60 cubic feet.

The airlines are hopeful that the program will permit them to get greater density freight, thereby improving load capabilities, and reduce ground handling costs.

While the program involves four basic containers, the airlines note that shippers can use their own containers.

As long as the shipper's container meets the criteria and its specifications are no larger than the corresponding container in the plan, the shipper will be eligible to receive a discount.

American, in a letter to the CAB said, "Disapproval of the 15 per cent density incentive for specific commodity rates in types B, C and D containers focused our attention on an anomalous rating situation which was not contemplated by the carriers party to the agreement."

For example, if carriers publish container rates on specific commodities to the extent authorized by the Board, it would cost less to ship 1,250 pounds of freight in a type C container (125 cubic feet) than in a type D container (62 cubic feet), because a lower rate is discounted (1,000 pound minimum weight vs. 100 pounds).

Obviously, we do not want to encourage a shipper to use twice as much space as necessary, so we do not plan to offer these rates in the tariff.

"At the same time, the Board has indicated that it believes containerization incentives should be afforded all products. If we were to file only general commodity rates on types B, C and D containers, the traffic moving under specific commodity rates would in fact be excluded. This appears to violate the intent of the board order."

In addition, discussions are needed between the carriers on container A concerning: 1-Application extended to sectors of less than 1,000 miles and to all commodities, as ordered by the CAB; 2-Reduction of minimum density from 10 pounds per cubic foot to seven pounds per cubic foot as requested in the Board order and 3-Inclusion of detention times and charges for carrier-owned containers as required by the board.

[From the New York Journal of Commerce, July 7, 1966]

RATIFICATION OF CONTAINER FACTS LIKELY (By Richard Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, July 6.—The United States may soon become an active member of a group of international conventions encouraging the use of container shipments and helping U.S. companies promote their products abroad.

The Administration is seeking Senate consent to U.S. ratification of the conventions, to each of which more than 20 countries are party.

Chances appear to be good that the Senate will approve. The conventions are relatively non-controversial and offer benefits to U.S. exporters and shippers.

TWO CONTAINER FACTS

Under two container conventions, the United States would allow temporary tariff-free imports of shipping containers, such as movable tanks and lift vans, as well as permit goods moved in containers to pass through U.S. customs territory without payment or inspection.

The unhindered in-transit passage of the containers would be expedited under a system of so-called TIR (Transport Internationale Routier) carnets, issued by internationally approved organizations.

The two conventions are roundly supported by U.S. shipping interests who believe that U.S. adherence will help stimulate world container traffic.

U.S. exporters may in turn be helped through the greater use of this relatively new transportation method which promises faster service at cut-rate prices.

Most West European countries now adhere to the two container conventions and U.S. participation would guarantee American exporters and shippers of favorable European treatment.

The other conventions now before the Senate set forth international carnet systems to permit the temporary free entry of professional equipment and commercial samples. The equipment may run from office machines to scientific articles.

These conventions are intended to make it easier for scientists and international businessmen to take their own equipment with them in visiting other countries. There would be less "red tape," too, in bringing in commercial samples or advertising material.

Under the carnet system, the posting of bonds with customs officials would be eliminated.

Instead, a businessman posts bond with a local internationally approved organization, which issues him a carnet. The same carnet may be used for as many countries as participate in the convention.

The U.S. Council of the International Chamber of Commerce in New York is expected to act as the carnet issuer, if the United States ratifies the professional equipment and commercial sample conventions.

Over 30 countries are party to the professional equipment convention and more than 20 are said to be active in the commercial samples carnet system.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, it is my intention to continue to do everything that I can to support the activities of the Senate Business Committees in order to advance the development of containerization in our domestic and international commerce.

THE AIRLINE STRIKE

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, our hopes that the airline mechanics strike was on the verge of settlement were dashed with the announcements of last night and this morning. All of us feel a sense of frustration when there appears to be no settlement in sight. Thousands of innocent people and companies suffer because of the unwillingness of the airline companies and the union to give a little in order to achieve agreement. This is intolerable.

Unless there is quick agreement and resumption of flights, this Congress must address itself to the problem of protecting the public interest in assuring continued essential services to our Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD two wires typical of many now coming in.

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

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH,
July 14, 1966.

Senator FRANK MOSS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The airline mechanics strike is a direct assault on innocent bystanders. Our company can phrase its complaint directly in terms of airport limousine, air freight, rent cars, taxicabs, and tour buses. Since the Federal Government accepted responsibility in the beginning its responsibility is paramount now; this is no cat and mouse political game.

CHARLES A. BOYNTON, JR.,
President, Salt Lake Transportation Co.

DENVER, COLO.,
July 14, 1966.

FRANK E. MOSS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Present air strike is seriously disrupting our business and unless stopped this week will result in serious business losses. Please do everything you can personally or through Congress to correct this national emergency.

THE FRONTIER REFINING CO.,
M. H. ROBINEAU.

ALASKA: A BLUE-CHIP MILITARY INVESTMENT

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, Alaska operations of the Department of Defense costs almost \$300 million a year. By appropriating those funds, Congress

recognizes the strategic location of Alaska.

In a recent speech to the Alaska Bankers Association in Fairbanks, Lt. Gen. Raymond J. Reeves, commander in chief of the Alaskan Command, discussed the growing strategic importance of Alaska in light of Red China's development of nuclear weapons and of the large military force the Soviet Union keeps in Siberia. He also discussed the value of Alaska as a training ground for combat troops and as a refueling center on the fastest route from the Nation's east coast to the Far East.

However, General Reeves went further than to outline Alaska's strategic position in the Nation's defense. He also pointed out that the Nation is getting an extremely good financial deal in the State, and that the good deal has been good for the development of Alaska as well. For example, General Reeves reported that by June 1967, the Department of Defense will be saving \$3.5 million a month by flying the polar route and refueling in Alaska, as compared to sending its planes over the mid-Pacific route. This increase in military air traffic, and the adaptation of military designs to commercial aircraft will help cut passenger fares and freight rates to Alaska, the air crossroads of the world.

The general pointed out:

Alaska is a blue chip military investment. Land was acquired at a low cost—2 cents per acre—developed by the military and now provides a large, economical cold-weather training ground. As technology and science increase the range of weapon systems, the location of Alaska increases in importance, thereby increasing the value of our military investment * * *

The U.S. military investment here could be as important as the British investment at Gibraltar. The importance of the military location of Alaska can only increase in the aerospace age and Alaska, and all Alaskans, will share in the resulting growth. "North to the future" is not an empty phrase—the 49th State truly is the land of the future.

Mr. President, so that other persons may learn of the Nation's blue-chip investment in Alaska, I ask unanimous consent that General Reeves' speech to the Alaska Bankers Association be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Also, General Reeves presented a thought-provoking talk to the Alaska Carriers Association Convention in which he tied development of Alaska to development of the State's roads of the future. I ask unanimous consent that the general's task entitled "Alaska's Road to the Future" be printed in the RECORD.

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

MILITARY INVESTMENT IN ALASKA

(Speech by Lt. Gen. Raymond J. Reeves, commander in chief, Alaskan Command, to the Alaska Bankers Association, Fairbanks, June 2, 1966)

Ladies and gentlemen, the word "invest" is usually defined as putting money into business, real estate, stocks, bonds, etc., for the purpose of obtaining an income or profit, but in military use, "invest means to hem in or besiege an enemy installation.

Both definitions are accurate for the Department of Defense's investment in Alaska, for not only is Alaska a key position in America's effort to hem in or contain our most dangerous potential enemy, but because an investment in Alaska's military force can reduce the overall military expenditure.

To analyze the Alaska investment, let's examine its military significance from the standpoint of the Department of Defense. To do so, requires a look at three points:

- (1) The present investment—that is, what does the military own in Alaska, and how was the real estate acquired.
- (2) The present cost of defending Alaska.
- (3) Most important—the strategic location of Alaska.

The cash outlay for the military real estate in Alaska was small—about two cents per acre—because the military land now in use is government land that we have retained. In most cases, the land was originally in undesirable locations. Often the growth of nearby civilian communities has given the post and the town common borders, thereby increasing the value of the military real estate. In fact, the entire development of Alaska can be characterized by cooperation and mutual growth of the civilian and military communities. Our expansion has kept pace with Alaska until we now have more than two billion dollars in property in Alaska, excluding the value of the military land and 78,000 military personnel and dependents. The military population represents one-third of the total state population. The military, other federal agencies and dependents exceed one-half of the total state population. We can also attribute a sizable percent of the population to military people who have either retired or completed their required military service here in Alaska and elected this as their new home.

Obviously, the Armed Forces in Alaska have a major effect on the present Alaskan economy. This has been true throughout the history of Alaska. The early explorations, carving out the first roads, the construction of the Alaska Highway, and the building of the Alaska Communications complex have all increased the military importance of Alaska. Each of the actions have had a comparable effect on the state's economy.

A classic example is the Alaska Communications complex. This is one of the most important military contributions to Alaska because it opened up Alaska's frontiers, while simultaneously tying the state together by providing rapid, dependable communications.

The communications complex has five parts. The first is the former Army Signal Corps System now known as the Alaska Communications Systems, or ACS. Sale of this long-line system to a civilian company is currently being considered in Congressional hearings.

The other four portions are:

- (1) The White Alice System, a network of large tropospheric scatter stations;
- (2) The Ballistic Missile Early Warning Communications System, an addition to the White Alice system that extends long-line routes from the Ballistic Missile Early Warning site at Clear to the Alaskan borders;
- (3) The Aleutian System, a series of communication facilities collocated with the Air Force radar installations on the Aleutian Island chain;
- (4) The Federal Aviation Agency long-line system, a network of twelve very high frequency radio links.

All five systems provide circuits for commercial use. Collectively, they form the Alaska Communications complex and blanket the state with dependable, rapid communications. The complex was constructed to meet a defense requirement, but has additionally served the general public as a commercial system. It would be uneconomical for a private company to develop the same coverage. The Alaskan Command doesn't want to build

any communications systems, to the exclusion of private firms—we simply must have reliable command control. Communications were and are necessary to the security of North America. The residual effect has helped to develop Alaska.

What does it cost to defend Alaska and maintain the base for strategic action? In round figures, it costs the Department of Defense about two hundred-ninety million dollars annually. This figure is a total of one hundred twenty-six (point five) million dollars for military pay and subsistence allowances; one hundred thirty-seven (point five) million dollars for operation and maintenance (including the civilian payroll) and an average of twenty-six million dollars annually for military construction.

Is it worth two hundred-ninety million dollars a year to maintain the Alaska military contingent? Yes! For two reasons—

First—some of the funds, such as the twenty-six million dollars for construction, improve the value of the military establishment.

But, most important—the cost is justified because of the geographical location of Alaska.

Alaska's location becomes more important each day due to the increasing nuclear threat of Red China, and the increasing range and speed of modern weapon delivery systems.

Red China's development of a nuclear weapon and the Soviet Union's large military force in Siberia make Alaska a strategic location for early detection and interception.

The threat to North America from the Siberian Peninsula stems primarily from air, naval, and missile forces. Airfields located in this area are nearly one thousand miles closer to the Chicago-Detroit industrial complex than are airfields located in other Soviet Arctic areas. The importance of this area in any manned bomber attack on North America is readily evident—it is the shortest route to the Midwestern or Western states. Missiles or aircraft launched from this area toward the United States would pass over or near Alaska. Thus, we are very much involved in an early warning and forward defensive effort should the Soviet Union launch an attack on the United States.

Alaska was one of the three locations deemed most desirable for locating the giant Ballistic Missile Early Warning Sites. These three giant electronic facilities, designed to detect the launch of ballistic missiles are located at Fylingdale, England; Thule, Greenland; and, Clear, Alaska. Each one is an investment of over one-half billion dollars. To Alaska, the Clear facility means an eleven to twelve million dollar yearly contract.

Another aspect to the location of Alaska that we have long realized is its importance as a cold-weather training area. We too vividly recall from World War II and Korea, the rigors of fighting in cold weather. Only through personnel training, in actual cold-weather environment, can we overcome many of the problems encountered in cold weather warfare. Alaska affords us both the environment and the area for large-scale winter exercises with a climate and terrain similar to Russia. Arranging for a similar area in the Lower 48 or a foreign country is more time consuming, and more expensive.

The growth of hostilities in Southeast Asia and the resulting attempts to prepare personnel and test equipment has pointed up the suitability of the present exercise area as a summer training area. The present maneuver site extends southeast from here along the highway to just south of Tok, and affords an excellent environment for summer jungle warfare training. The tractability in summer is similar to Vietnam and Alaska

mosquitoes can hold their own against any nation's insects!

The two infantry battalions recently transferred from United States Army, Alaska, to Southeast Asia have demonstrated their high degree of combat training received in Alaska. During a short period of acclimation in Hawaii, they were re-equipped and integrated with the 25th Infantry Division. Early last month they encountered their first combat mission—about ninety days following their departure from Alaska. This attests to the quality of Alaska as a summer training ground for jungle warfare.

We are experiencing difficulty in the established maneuver area due to the civilian expansion of Alaska. Each year we are required to build new access roads for the joint, combined winter exercise because homestead claims are filed along the roads as soon as the maneuvers are terminated. As a result, each year's training area is moved slightly, to alleviate property rights disputes.

We have considered moving the exercise to a new location—either north or west of Fairbanks—but the cost of developing necessary access roads, bridges, communications, base facilities, petroleum storage and additional airfields to allow necessary air mobility is prohibitive—especially since restrictions have been placed on all construction which is not directly related to Southeast Asia.

Since it is against Department of Defense policy to permanently withdraw this land from public domain, we could not consider the expense of developing a new exercise location as an investment. Facilities in the present maneuver area are adequate and the cost of relocating cannot be justified at this time.

Another Alaska advantage that is currently developing into a major military effort is our location on the great circle polar route. With today's long-range transport aircraft, Alaska serves as the mid-way station on the fastest route to the Orient. Thus, Alaska is playing a vital role in the war in Southeast Asia as a maintenance and refueling stop for the Military Airlift Command's new C-141 Starlifter cargo aircraft.

The C-141's are operating mainly out of Dover, Delaware and Charleston, South Carolina, for a direct flight to Elmendorf Air Force Base where approximately fifteen thousand gallons of fuel are on-loaded while a new aircrew inspects the airplane; then flies direct to Yakota Air Force Base, Japan, near Tokyo or Clark Air Force Base in the Philippine Islands, refuels, changes crew, and departs for Vietnam. The total elapsed time from Dover, Delaware to Saigon is twenty-two and one-half hours. Using Alaska as a refueling point for the long-range C-141 results in savings of approximately ten flying hours per round trip as versus the mid-Pacific route. At an estimated operating cost of one thousand dollars per flying hour for the C-141, this is a ten thousand dollar savings per trip. It is planned that by June of next year, the Starlifters will fly over three hundred-fifty round trips per month via Alaska, yielding a total savings of three and one-half million dollars per month.

Since modern jet transports such as the C-141 require less maintenance than propeller-driven transports and have greater range and larger load capacity, they permit increased aircraft utilization and greater flexibility of operation.

Future aircraft like the C-5 offer even greater growth potential of air traffic through Alaska. The Military Airlift Command estimates that the giant C-5A jet transport, currently being developed by Lockheed Aircraft, can carry a two hundred-fifty thousand

pound payload at five and one-half cents per ton-mile—this is one cent less than the current rail freight rate.

Aircraft comparable to the C-5A are being studied and planned for commercial aviation. These aircraft will give further impetus to Alaska as the "Air Crossroads of the World" by lowering the passenger fare and freight rate.

The examples I have mentioned illustrate that by all banking standards, Alaska is a "blue chip" military investment. Land was acquired at a low cost—two cents per acre—developed by the military and now provides a large, economical cold-weather training ground. As technology and science increase the range of weapon systems, the location of Alaska increases in importance, thereby increasing the value of our military investment. Because we have acquired sufficiently large areas, we can, if required, expand our military forces in Alaska at little additional expense.

Due to the efforts of a few far-sighted leaders, the U.S. Armed Forces are strategically located at the future air crossroads of the world. We have built a citadel at the Polar Gateway.

The U.S. military investment here could be as important as the British investment at Gibraltar. The importance of the military location of Alaska can only increase in the aerospace age and Alaska, and all Alaskans, will share in the resulting growth. "North to the Future" is not an empty phrase—the 49th State truly is the land of the future.

ALASKA'S ROAD TO THE FUTURE

(Address by Lt. Gen. Raymond J. Reeves, Commander in Chief, Alaskan Command, at Alaska Carriers Association Convention, Fairbanks, Alaska, Friday, April 22, 1966)

Gentlemen, as an Air Force General Officer and as the only Air Force Commander in the seven Unified Commands, it would be natural for me to echo the usual arguments for faith in the future of aviation. In Alaska, I would be doubly justified in emphasizing aviation because it has certainly played a major role in Alaska's development and it has particularly accelerated the growth in many isolated areas of the State.

Instead of aviation's future, however, I want to talk about the roads and the commerce that they carry. When Prime Minister Indira Gandhi of India visited the White House, President Johnson told her that, "The journey to our future is over a very long and a very winding road. Every mile will be challenged by doubt." The President was speaking of international accord, but if he had been speaking to you, or perhaps to Governor Egan, he could have been referring to Alaskan highways. Although I marvel at the difficulties that have been overcome in building some of Alaska's roads, I am equally impressed with the need for unrelenting effort in building more. The journey to Alaska's future, . . . that is, a full realization of Alaskan potential . . . depends in large part upon an efficient road network and a healthy trucking industry.

Reverting to aviation's future in Alaska for a moment, I think it is excellent, and I think that the trucking industry in Alaska cannot help but share in some of the benefits of the growth of aviation. As more airports are built or improved, and as bigger and better airplanes are developed, it is inevitable that Alaska's population will spread and will increase. As this happens, there will be a growing justification for a better highway network. This is the pattern which has already been established in Alaska. Helicopters and short take-off and landing aircraft will become increasingly important. As aircraft become larger, faster and more

efficient, there is a constantly declining in cost per ton-mile. The air freight traffic will increase, and will supplement rather than replace surface trucking. Even with a highly competitive rail and air freight network, trucking in the south 48 has grown and prospered. But, and this . . . I think . . . is important, they prospered only where good roads and population centers created a demand.

Alaska's strategic location insures a continuing increase in population. Alaska sits directly astride the Polar Great Circle route from North America to the Orient. It is then the aerial cross roads of the North. Alaska, as an aerial crossroad, can develop just as Hawaii did as a major intersection of sea lanes in an age of ocean shipping. There is also a growing recognition of Alaska's strategic importance as the state closest to Russia and Red China. We in the military have long recognized Alaska's valuable geographical position, and I think it is significant that commercial air carriers are now displaying a growing awareness of its valuable location. The military interest and research in cold weather operations has been a healthy influence on the growth of Alaska. I believe we in the military, along with the civilian populace in Alaska, have dispelled some of the misconceptions that have existed about the problem of working and living in Alaska. Each year we rotate more than 30,000 military personnel and dependents to the South 48. This is good for you, our friends in the trucking business, who move their household goods, but I think there is another and perhaps more important benefit. And that is that these people become ambassadors for Alaska and have the opportunity to tell many people that living and working in Alaska is far better than they had expected. I believe there are some worthwhile long range benefits to be derived from this.

There are some other elements in the growth of Alaska which I think are very healthy and worth mentioning. Alaska can be proud of the improvements in surface travel brought about by the State Ferry System. This "Marine Highway" certainly offers some of the world's most picturesque travel and at the same time is rapidly bringing economic and social development to an area rich in timber, fish and history. The ferry system is literally pushing back the frontiers of southeast Alaska.

Northwest Alaska needs the same sort of stimulus. If the entire state is to realize its potential, it cannot wait for major population centers to develop before building a road. More cities and more areas of home-steading will develop when more roads are built. Alaskan cities, even in outlying areas, will insist upon reliable access to existing economic, medical, and cultural facilities. Rapid development can only come when a vast network of year-round roads are built to permit Alaskan carriers and private vehicles to ply highways and bring the hallmarks of civilization to every Alaskan.

You are to be commended that in spite of the limitations imposed on you by the few highways, the great distances between population centers and the severity of weather, the number of pieces of trucking equipment per capita is greater in Alaska than in any other state, and is increasing each year by more than thirty-five hundred pieces. I doubt that many Alaskans realize that you furnish direct employment to more than seventeen hundred people, pay almost seven million dollars a year in state and federal taxes, that you are capable of handling any type of trucking activity, and that the trucking capacity of Alaska commercial carriers exceeds thirty-five hundred ton/days.

At the present, the members of this association move almost thirty million pounds each year for the military within the State of Alaska. I am referring only to shipments that originate and terminate in Alaska. Three Air Force Stations—Wildwood, Pedro Dome, and Murphy Dome—and all of the White Alice sites on the Alaska and Richardson Highways depend on your trucks for resupply.

Increasing the number of places served by highways will bring increased trucking demand. As easier access is permitted to isolated areas, the Alaskan Command can substantially reduce the cost of construction and resupply. With more highways, we can perform our mission of defending Alaska more effectively and more economically.

For example, look at the present method of maintaining the Alaskan Air Command's Early Warning Network. Each summer, the Air Force ships more than one-hundred fifteen thousand tons during the annual summer resupply program known as Project MONA LISA. After the ice pack closes the northeast shipping lanes, most of the sites are forced to depend on aerial resupply. Two of the radar installations, Sparrevohn and Indian Mountain, depend entirely on aerial delivery year-around. Certainly the cost of maintaining this vital link in the North American Air Defense System will be reduced as the highway network is expanded to reach some of these installations.

In closing, I again refer to a remark made by President Johnson—this time after the signing of the Alaska Purchase Centennial Bill on the 26th of March, this year. The Chief Executive said, "... the permanent projects which are planned as a part of that celebration will contribute to the long-range development of this great and important state."

I am sure that each of us will wholeheartedly agree with the President on the lasting value of the Alaska Purchase Centennial celebration. Some three-hundred thousand people are expected to view the exhibition site here at Fairbanks during 1967.

No doubt, each one of this number will find something in Alaska for them, for Alaska is a vast and varied land that offers something for everyone. I want each one of the 1967 visitors to go away with the same warm feeling that I have for Alaska. I want to see Alaska grow and develop its vast potential.

Transportation is the key that will unlock Alaska's treasure chest, and dependable year-around surface transportation is the essential element of that key.

I submit to all Alaskans that—wherever the trucker goes, there goes progress!

THE AIRLINES STRIKE

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the airlines strike has continued now for a week.

I will make no attempt to comment on the merits of either side to the dispute, but would like to point out the effect on the welfare of all concerned in Missouri, and to observe that in addition to those immediately involved there are many others being hurt by prolongation of the strike.

Telegrams from Missouri businessmen, urging every effort toward resolving the dispute, indicate how vital air service is today. These include not only businessmen who depend on airlines for fast business trips, but shippers whose products range from valuable parent stock poultry

being exported worldwide, to florists and manufacturers.

Hotel operators and retail businessmen also report they are being affected adversely.

One airline, TWA, employs 9,014 persons in Missouri. Today, 5,977 of those employees are off the payroll. This adds up to a monthly payroll loss of \$3,740,000.

There is no question of the harmful effect on the disputants and business generally. It is my hope that both sides will make every effort toward a settlement soon.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a selection of the many telegrams I have received.

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

KANSAS CITY, MO.,
July 14, 1966.

Senator EDWARD LONG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Our firm depends on air freight service into Kansas City for 85 percent of our shipping. Please do what you can to help in this air strike.

EARL G. LACEY,
Wholesale Florist.

KANSAS CITY, MO.,
July 14, 1966.

Senator EDWARD LONG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Respectfully request your utmost effort to promote agreement in strike of five major airlines permitting settlement satisfactory to union, management, and our country. Each passing day multiplies hardships seriously affecting business and the national economy.

A. C. SWANSON,
President,
Western Auto Supply Co.

PLEASANT HILL, MO.,
July 14, 1966.

Senator EDWARD LONG,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Strike on Trans World and other major airlines is seriously affecting our business of exporting valuable parent stock poultry to other nations around the world. Will appreciate your help in pressing for an early settlement of strike.

MR. IRWIN,
President,
Colonial Poultry Farms, Inc.

JULY 14, 1966.

Hon. EDWARD V. LONG,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The pending airline strike is seriously affecting the economy of the Kansas City region and your efforts to bring about rapid settlement will be greatly appreciated by citizens and businesses of this area.

Sincerely,
PLEASANT V. MILLER, JR.,
President, Commerce Trust Co.

NABRIT TO AEC

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, Dr. Samuel M. Nabrit's list of credits is much too lengthy to recite here. And I do not believe it necessary to itemize the list to

strengthen my endorsement of President Johnson's nomination of Dr. Nabrit to the Atomic Energy Commission.

He has had, as the Houston Post states, a long and distinguished career in education and government service.

The Post regrets, in an editorial, the fact that Dr. Nabrit must leave Houston and his post as president of Texas Southern University. But it adds that his contributions as a member of the AEC will be of great value to the Nation.

Dr. Nabrit needs no further recommendation, but I still would like to place this tribute to him in the RECORD.

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

[From the Houston (Tex.) Post, June 23, 1966]

DR. NABRIT TO AEC

The nomination of Dr. S. M. Nabrit to the Atomic Energy Commission should be warmly applauded throughout the country.

Dr. Nabrit, president of Texas Southern University since 1955, has a long and distinguished career in education and the service of his government.

Dr. Nabrit, who would take a year's leave of absence from Texas Southern when his appointment is confirmed by the Senate, has now served three Presidents, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson.

President Eisenhower appointed him in 1956 to the National Science Board. In 1959, Nabrit was named to a national advisory committee to assist the Office of Education in a program to improve modern foreign language instruction.

Under President Kennedy, he became a special ambassador to represent the U.S. at independence celebrations in the Republic of Niger, and, in 1963, he became vice chairman of a new committee on equality of educational opportunity of the American Council on Education.

In 1963, Nabrit served on a committee to study the need for publicly supported institutions of higher learning in the District of Columbia and was one of 10 Americans to attend a UN conference in Geneva on assistance to underdeveloped nations.

Under his leadership, Texas Southern University has achieved high standards of education.

His presence will be missed in Houston. His services on the AEC will be of great value to the nation.

EDWARD KERNAN

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it is with sadness and a deep sense of personal loss that I rise today to announce the death of my good friend and veteran Cleveland Plain Dealer reporter, Edward Kernan. Since Ed came to Washington in 1944 I have known him well and I have respected his fine ability as an objective and sensitive journalist.

Ed was born in Red Wing, Minn., in 1907. After working for Minnesota newspapers, he came to the Akron bureau of the Cleveland Plain Dealer in 1937. While in Washington he covered many presidential conventions.

In 1954 Ed Kernan was elected to the Gridiron Club of Washington. Many of us saw and enjoyed his performance as Crier in the annual skits of that club.

Ed Kernan was a friend and I know that I speak for many in the Congress when I say that we shall miss him.

Ed Kernan was a delightful, jovial friend. It was my privilege to know him well from the time years ago I was Congressman at Large and he was on the staff of the Plain Dealer bureau in Washington. Ed Kernan was a most personable, generous, and kindly individual. He was also a great news reporter; thoroughly discerning and objective. He never overlooked what was important nor failed to discard what was unimportant. During the nearly 8 years I have served as U.S. Senator I came to regard him as a most knowledgeable, likeable, and gracious friend and also a superior news reporter. It was depressing and shocking to me to learn of his death at a comparatively early age.

THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1966

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 1324.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3584) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, no action will be taken on the foreign aid bill this afternoon, but on Monday the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT], will commence with the presentation of this bill.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITMENT OF U.S. MILITARY FORCES—FOREIGN AID BILL—LETTER FROM SECRETARY OF STATE TO SENATOR MANSFIELD

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have received, today, from the Secretary of State, a letter which he has requested the leadership to bring to the attention of the Senate. It concerns the foreign aid bill which will be before the Senate directly.

The Secretary addresses himself to the question of whether or not the commitment of U.S. military forces may be

implicit in the extension of U.S. assistance under aid legislation. If I may say so, the Secretary's letter is a most candid and welcome clarification of this question and I am delighted to read it in full to the Senate at this time.

JULY 15, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: I have noted recent expressions of concern in the Senate over whether the Administration views the extension of aid to a country as a commitment to defend that country with United States troops if it is attacked. I think it important that any confusion on this issue be removed before the Senate considers the 1966 Amendments to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and I would appreciate it if you would bring this letter to the attention of the members.

AID legislation relates to furnishing economic and military assistance to foreign countries. It has no bearing on commitments to employ United States forces to assist in the collective self-defense of other countries. Such commitments are made, pursuant to our laws and the Constitution, where the national interest so requires and not because the United States is or is not supplying the foreign country in question with foreign aid. In short, our aid program neither implies nor prohibits a commitment to use our armed forces in cooperation with the self-defense efforts of a foreign country.

This question has apparently arisen out of the discussion of Southeast Asia. I have stated to Congressional committees and elsewhere that each Administration since World War II has concluded, as a matter of policy, that the security of Southeast Asia was important to the security of the United States. This policy has been supported in a variety of ways. We have furnished substantial economic and military assistance to the countries in Southeast Asia. A specific security commitment was contained in the SEATO Treaty which applied directly to the signatories and to the protocol states. This commitment was reaffirmed by the Joint Resolution of Congress of August 10, 1964. The security commitment did not arise from the AID programs but from the formal and solemn action taken by the United States in accordance with its constitutional processes. I hope this distinction will now be clear.

Sincerely,

DEAN RUSK.

NATURAL DISASTER AT ULAN BATOR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it has been brought to my attention that a natural disaster of great proportions has befallen the people who live in and near the city of Ulan Bator, capital of the Mongolian People's Republic.

According to one source, thousands of families living along the Tula River have been driven from their homes as a result of torrential rains and massive flooding. Scores of persons have been killed, several bridges are out, and the capital, a city of 250,000 inhabitants, is without drinking water, electricity, and other essentials.

Misfortunes of this scope are of concern to all men. Natural calamities do not respect national boundaries, or ideologies. A final assessment of damage has not yet been made, but the indications are that Mongolia will require outside

assistance. I would hope that our national sympathies have already been extended through available channels to the people of the stricken area. I would hope, further, that the American Red Cross or other agencies would stand by to offer promptly such help as might be appropriate in the event the need for it arises.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Ulan Bator Flood Kills Scores, Routs Thousands," written by Harrison E. Salisbury, and published in the New York Times of Friday, July 15, 1966.

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

ULAN BATOR FLOOD KILLS SCORES, ROUTS THOUSANDS—MONGOLIAN FAMILIES HOMELESS AS RAIN SWELLS RIVER—DISASTER PARALYZES CAPITAL DURING NATIVE HOLIDAY
(By Harrison E. Salisbury)

ULAN BATOR, MONGOLIA, July 14.—Mongolia's sprawling capital struggled today to overcome the effects of a disastrous flood that has taken scores of lives and left thousands homeless.

Word spread that the Soviet Union was speeding generator trains south from eastern Siberia to provide power to the stricken city.

Mongolian authorities, assisted by Soviet army units, have been lifting hundreds of families from the flooded valley by helicopters.

The rain has stopped and the weather has cleared, but Ulan Bator is without water, electricity and other supplies. Virtually all industry in this city, with a population of 250,000, has been closed by flood waters or lack of power.

At least 4,000 families, most of whom live along the banks of the Tula River in yurts, the traditional Mongolian abode made of canvas and felt, were homeless and had lost their belongings.

The railroad south to China has been cut at several places and communications with the Ulan Bator airport were precariously maintained.

The flooding struck as the Mongolians prepared to celebrate Nadam, a traditional holiday. On Saturday the sky was clear and the air crystal cool. Sunday the sky clouded over and it began to drizzle. Sunday night the rain started in earnest.

By Monday morning, when all of Ulan Bator and thousands of guests were preparing for the three-day holiday, the rain came down in sheets.

Despite the downpour, a curtailed parade was held. The traditional games—wrestling, archery and horse racing over a 33-mile open country course, started but had to be cancelled.

An Tuesday the rain started anew. In the afternoon emergency radio broadcasts ordered everyone to get north of the river. The bridges were about to go out.

Thousands of Mongolians streamed over the high bridge, which survived the storm. But soon the smaller bridges began to collapse and areas near the river were cut off. Power stations were flooded and the water system knocked out. Communications from north to south were almost cut off.

The Ulan Bator Hotel, where hundreds of foreign guests here for the holiday were quartered, had only candlelight and no water or plumbing.

The homeless were moved to safer ground by trucks, amphibious vehicles, pontoon

boats and rafts. They gradually collected in Sukhe Bator Square, which only a few hours before had been the scene of the holiday. An army field kitchen moved in to serve hot meals at the hotel. Helicopters lifted families from the flooded areas and took them to emergency rescue points in schools and hospitals.

The effects of the disaster have not been completely assessed. A Government commission is trying to determine what help must be sought from the outside world.

Restoration of normal services appears to be some distance off. No local power is expected before Aug. 1.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, July 18, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 15, 1966:

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following distinguished graduates of the Air Force precommission schools for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

John F. Anderson, XXXXXXXX
Thomas B. Carroll, XXXXXXXX
Henry Christian, XXXXXXXX
Jerry M. Christian, XXXXXXXX
Pat O. Clifton, XXXXXXXX
Michael Collier, XXXXXXXX
Wilfred L. Crossman, XXXXXXXX
Gerald W. Deakin, XXXXXXXX
Russel D. Durrett, XXXXXXXX
William Edwards, XXXXXXXX
Don W. Fishero, XXXXXXXX
James B. Fowler, XXXXXXXX
Walter J. Gomez, XXXXXXXX
Otto P. Hannemann, XXXXXXXX
Kenneth L. Hope, XXXXXXXX
Robert P. Howard, XXXXXXXX
William F. Jenkins, XXXXXXXX
Richard A. Keylor, XXXXXXXX
Julien V. Koschmann, XXXXXXXX
William T. Lohman, XXXXXXXX
Michael G. McBride, XXXXXXXX
Joseph L. Pecci, XXXXXXXX
Robert C. Sizemore, XXXXXXXX
Addison L. Smith, XXXXXXXX
David H. Stanforth, XXXXXXXX
Ray K. Stokes, XXXXXXXX
Paul G. Stokholm, XXXXXXXX
Tom S. Thorsen, XXXXXXXX
Warren E. Thurn, XXXXXXXX
John L. Wade, XXXXXXXX
Wallace L. Wiggins, XXXXXXXX
George E. Wilson III, XXXXXXXX
Richard P. Winslow, XXXXXXXX

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

George T. Adams, XXXXXXXX
Robert W. Allerton III, XXXXXXXX

Gordon L. Anderson, XXXXXXXX
Frank N. Assaf II, XXXXXXXX
Sandor Babos, XXXXXXXX
George W. Baker, XXXXXXXX
James P. Baker, XXXXXXXX
Warren S. Barnes, XXXXXXXX
Louis E. Bertrand, XXXXXXXX
Thomas J. Bellanca, XXXXXXXX
Thomas G. Bertenshaw, XXXXXXXX
Monte E. Blews, XXXXXXXX
Donavon F. Bonertz, XXXXXXXX
William G. Bookout, XXXXXXXX
Larry J. Brandt, XXXXXXXX
Lester P. Brown, Jr., XXXXXXXX
Anthony N. Bua, XXXXXXXX
John G. Bulov, XXXXXXXX
David O. Caldwell, XXXXXXXX
Robert L. Cargill, XXXXXXXX
Raymond D. Chuvala, XXXXXXXX
Frank M. Clark, Jr., XXXXXXXX
Ernest J. Clarke, XXXXXXXX
David A. Clevenger, XXXXXXXX
David A. Cochenour, XXXXXXXX
Donald J. Cockrum, XXXXXXXX
Joseph T. Connell, XXXXXXXX
Blaine S. Corrick, Jr., XXXXXXXX
Richard Y. Costain, XXXXXXXX
Robert H. Custer, XXXXXXXX
Philip B. Davis, XXXXXXXX
Leo A. Delbridge, XXXXXXXX
Gerald K. Delles, XXXXXXXX
Frank J. Delzingaro, XXXXXXXX
Richard W. Densmore, XXXXXXXX
George A. Devorshak, XXXXXXXX
Richard L. Dillman, XXXXXXXX
Oliver P. Ditch, XXXXXXXX
Nicholas J. Donelson, XXXXXXXX
Thomas J. Dubeck, XXXXXXXX
Robert A. Duganne, XXXXXXXX
Charles M. Edwards, XXXXXXXX
Donald R. Edwards, XXXXXXXX
Hermann J. Engelbach, Jr., XXXXXXXX
Jerald J. Erskine, XXXXXXXX
Edward J. Erxleben, XXXXXXXX
Leonard P. Estrada, XXXXXXXX
Jerry D. Fifer, XXXXXXXX
Neil Fisher, XXXXXXXX
John P. Flannery, XXXXXXXX
Richard R. Flynn, XXXXXXXX
James Fox, XXXXXXXX
James V. Franklin, XXXXXXXX
Maurice G. Fricke, XXXXXXXX
Charles Fritts, XXXXXXXX
William D. Fuchlow, XXXXXXXX
Manuel C. Garcia, XXXXXXXX
Kevin A. Gilroy, XXXXXXXX
Gerald I. Goldschlager, XXXXXXXX
Kenneth E. Gould, XXXXXXXX
Marvin M. Gradert, XXXXXXXX
Charles E. Graf, XXXXXXXX
Ronald A. Graves, XXXXXXXX
James D. Green, XXXXXXXX
Joseph A. Grimaud, Jr., XXXXXXXX
John H. Hall, XXXXXXXX
Joseph R. Hall, Jr., XXXXXXXX
Gerald J. Hamilla, XXXXXXXX
Trevor A. Hammond, XXXXXXXX
William J. Hanig, XXXXXXXX
David J. Hewer, XXXXXXXX
Charles H. Holden, XXXXXXXX
Thomas R. Howes, XXXXXXXX
Jerry E. Ikner, XXXXXXXX
John A. Jackson, Jr., XXXXXXXX
Donald L. Jacobsen, XXXXXXXX
Robert D. Jeffrey, XXXXXXXX
John E. Johnson, Jr., XXXXXXXX
Gerald D. Johnston, XXXXXXXX
William E. Jones, Jr., XXXXXXXX
Gerald R. Kalling, XXXXXXXX
Donald E. Kaneski, XXXXXXXX
David G. Kanter, XXXXXXXX
Eugene S. Kaye, XXXXXXXX
Louis W. Keeby, XXXXXXXX
Larry R. Keith, XXXXXXXX
Joseph R. Kempton, XXXXXXXX
Robert L. Kennison, XXXXXXXX

Bibb B. Kilpatrick, XXXXXXXX
 William D. Kissler, XXXXXXXX
 Joseph D. Kormanik, XXXXXXXX
 Robert E. Kraig, XXXXXXXX
 William M. Lamos, XXXXXXXX
 Thomas A. Laser, XXXXXXXX
 Roy C. LeCroy, XXXXXXXX
 John L. Lenamon, XXXXXXXX
 Rudolph Liol, XXXXXXXX
 Howard S. Lottwood, Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Marcel I. Loosbrock, XXXXXXXX
 John M. Loring, Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Alvin W. Luedtke, XXXXXXXX
 Larry N. Lydick, XXXXXXXX
 Dewan D. Madden, XXXXXXXX
 Bobby R. Mahoney, XXXXXXXX
 Kenneth G. Martin, XXXXXXXX
 Fredric E. McCabe, XXXXXXXX
 Robert A. McCaughan, XXXXXXXX
 Donald L. McEwen, XXXXXXXX
 Jimmie J. McIlwain, XXXXXXXX
 Eugene P. McKinney, XXXXXXXX
 Thomas J. McQuade, XXXXXXXX
 John A. Milford, XXXXXXXX
 Jerry A. Miller, XXXXXXXX
 Ronald F. Miller, XXXXXXXX
 Joseph E. Monaghan, Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Richard W. Money, XXXXXXXX
 John H. Moore, XXXXXXXX
 Neville A. Morgan, XXXXXXXX
 Malcolm B. Morrison, XXXXXXXX
 James D. Muma, XXXXXXXX
 Richard M. Murphy, XXXXXXXX
 Glen H. Nelson, XXXXXXXX
 Ronald L. Osborn, XXXXXXXX
 William A. Ott, XXXXXXXX
 Francis L. Owens, Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Jerry E. Pankonen, XXXXXXXX
 Gregg O. Parker, XXXXXXXX
 John L. Pasciutti, XXXXXXXX
 Eugene C. Patti, XXXXXXXX
 Robert D. Peel, XXXXXXXX
 Jack A. Phillips, XXXXXXXX
 Oliver L. Pickens, XXXXXXXX
 Michael M. Plecenik, Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Laurence H. Potts, Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Glenn L. Ramsdale, Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Richard L. Reeser, XXXXXXXX
 Kenneth R. Reiff, XXXXXXXX
 Alan L. Rennick, XXXXXXXX
 Jack W. Reppert, XXXXXXXX
 Ronald G. Ribble, XXXXXXXX
 James W. Rice, XXXXXXXX
 Sanford A. Richardson, XXXXXXXX
 Ernest G. Rider, XXXXXXXX
 Charles A. Rinchko, XXXXXXXX
 Thomas L. Rish, XXXXXXXX
 David L. Roberts, XXXXXXXX
 Fletcher R. Robeson, XXXXXXXX
 Ronald D. Ross, XXXXXXXX
 Bruce R. Royal, XXXXXXXX
 Larry J. Runge, XXXXXXXX
 Martin J. Ryan, Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Franklyn J. Selzer, XXXXXXXX
 Lawrence E. Shannon, XXXXXXXX
 Jerry C. Shilt, XXXXXXXX
 Loy D. Shipp, XXXXXXXX
 James S. Smith, XXXXXXXX
 Michael J. Speer, XXXXXXXX
 James E. Speight, XXXXXXXX
 Anthony L. Stamant, XXXXXXXX
 Richard A. Steckley, XXXXXXXX
 Ralph H. Steding, XXXXXXXX
 Edward B. Steele, XXXXXXXX
 John J. Talbott, XXXXXXXX
 Joe D. Tate, XXXXXXXX
 Herbert F. Taylor, XXXXXXXX
 John W. Taylor, XXXXXXXX
 James C. Thomas, XXXXXXXX
 John C. Thomas, XXXXXXXX
 Thomas A. Tomasetti, XXXXXXXX
 Carroll R. Turner, XXXXXXXX
 Robert W. Undorf, XXXXXXXX
 Gerard W. Vanderwaal, XXXXXXXX
 Claude H. Vichierguerre, XXXXXXXX
 Michael A. Vivian, XXXXXXXX

Gary J. Walter, XXXXXXXX
 Ronald W. Wanner, XXXXXXXX
 James F. Ward III, XXXXXXXX
 Paul T. Webb, XXXXXXXX
 Orion B. Whatley, Jr., XXXXXXXX
 James J. Whipples III, XXXXXXXX
 Alton B. Winkelman, XXXXXXXX
 James R. Withers, XXXXXXXX
 Harry J. Witt II, XXXXXXXX
 Edward H. Wittmers, Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Harley A. Yarber, Jr., XXXXXXXX
 George V. Zimmerman, Jr., XXXXXXXX

POSTMASTERS

ALASKA

Fred S. Ryan, Unalakleet, Alaska, in place of Frank Ryan, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Olga W. Morrison, Pinecrest, Calif., in place of A. J. Honett, deceased.

HAWAII

Hazel K. Kobayashi, Kealia, Hawaii, in place of Kenichi Masunaga, retired.

ILLINOIS

John I. Stoltz, Bellmont, Ill., in place of I. C. Stoltz, retired.

Helen M. Harding, Hammond, Ill., in place of E. L. South, retired.

INDIANA

Basil Hoffman, Birdseye, Ind., in place of D. E. Wright, retired.

IOWA

Gerald G. Culver, Dunlap, Iowa, in place of Paul Davie, retired.

John C. Hogan, Winthrop, Iowa, in place of G. E. Brubaker, retired.

KANSAS

Wilma M. Solander, Hutchinson, Kans., in place of E. R. Dicks, deceased.

Dean E. Kohlenberg, Louisburg, Kans., in place of K. L. Cook, resigned.

Lorin L. Sweetland, Seneca, Kans., in place of J. R. Houston, retired.

Raymond W. Reed, Stockton, Kans., in place of E. S. Riseley, retired.

KENTUCKY

David S. Miranda, Ashland, Ky., in place of H. D. Shanklin, retired.

James A. Cash, Fancy Farm, Ky., in place of M. C. Whittemore, retired.

LOUISIANA

Larry G. Chandler, Ida, La., in place of V. S. Clements, retired.

MARYLAND

Ruth R. Telemeco, Maugansville, Md., in place of William Telemeco, deceased.

MASSACHUSETTS

William J. Hogan, Westboro, Mass., in place of C. H. McDonald, retired.

MICHIGAN

Jerry J. Adamek, Chesaning, Mich., in place of J. D. Duguid, retired.

Donald R. Ahnen, Ramsay, Mich., in place of F. L. Brightenti, retired.

MINNESOTA

S. Wayne Sorenson, Fisher, Minn., in place of H. J. Widenhoefer, retired.

Frank T. Ashton, Preston, Minn., in place of W. R. Marx, deceased.

MISSOURI

Charles W. Hamilton, Carterville, Mo., in place of E. O. Griffin, retired.

Robert Harris, Waverly, Mo., in place of N. H. Glascock, retired.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Clarence J. Abare, Troy, N.H., in place of C. L. McGinness, retired.

Richard L. Hutchins, Wolfeboro, N.H., in place of B. A. Landman, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Evelyn L. Bea, Dayton, N.J., in place of E. M. Latzo, resigned.

Joseph Sorelle, Glassboro, N.J., in place of G. H. McCullough, retired.

Frederick A. Moeller, Lavallette, N.J., in place of J. L. Cagni, retired.

NEW YORK

Dominic V. Munger, Fulton, N.Y., in place of G. F. Byrne, retired.

Marietta W. Miller, McLean, N.Y., in place of M. C. Sweetland, retired.

Johnny F. Shaw, Perrysburg, N.Y., in place of H. H. Parker, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Doris I. Cameron, Broadway, N.C., in place of P. L. Morris, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Elayne I. Enger, Erie, N. Dak., in place of C. J. Graff, retired.

OHIO

Helen T. Hanley, Harrod, Ohio, in place of D. F. Mayer, retired.

Thelma M. Davis, Jacksontown, Ohio, in place of W. R. Frye, resigned.

Vaughn A. Collins, Logan, Ohio, in place of C. C. Achauer, retired.

OKLAHOMA

O. P. Marshall, Miami, Okla., in place of W. A. Craig, retired.

Lee A. Adams, Snyder, Okla., in place of Max Anderson, transferred.

OREGON

Richard J. Lorenzen, Amity, Oreg., in place of E. B. Burch, retired.

Emma I. Thomson, Westlake, Oreg., in place of Genevieve Cain, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Samuel E. Turner, Furlong, Pa., in place of A. C. Flounders, retired.

Stanley A. Moskowsky, Jeannette, Pa., in place of E. B. Hebrank, retired.

Mancil E. Bradford, Jr., Modena, Pa., in place of E. E. Morris, retired.

Joseph Sulewski, Nanticoke, Pa., in place of J. E. Bednar, retired.

Bernard J. Brashears, New Oxford, Pa., in place of G. M. Bower, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Herbert S. Bruce, Roebuck, S.C., in place of M. A. Foster, declined.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Joy L. Wallum, Iroquois, S. Dak., in place of G. F. Whites, retired.

VERMONT

Frank J. Varricchi, Burlington, Vt., in place of J. J. Burns, retired.

WASHINGTON

Cora G. Correla, Chimacum, Wash., in place of K. A. Bishop, retired.

Lotus D. Ewing, Lyle, Wash., in place of M. C. West, retired.

Thomas H. Nedderman, Vashon, Wash., in place of W. E. Mitchell, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Franklin D. Rapp, Renick, W. Va., in place of L. H. Christie, retired.

WISCONSIN

Dorothy E. Evjen, Glen Flora, Wis., in place of A. W. Kettering, retired.

David F. Gibson, Lena, Wis., in place of J. S. Rosera, retired.

WYOMING

Edwin Lebsack, Lingle, Wyo., in place of R. M. Smith, retired.