officials. In like manner, our people have not been aware of the need to make their will known to their public servants. Our officials on all levels need new awareness of the need, and the enormous pool of latent support, which exists for cleanup.

A striking comparison is New York, whose fiscally responsible Governor rammed through a water quality program, probably better than that possessed by any other State in the Union, involving substantial State funding by loans and grants of municipal projects, and involving remarkable expansion of State enforcement powers. These programs passed the legislature unanimously and were adopted by the people of the State when presented to them by referendum with better than a 4 to 1 margin.

Certainly this shows the willingness of people to support proper action by States and municipalities for cleanup of our waters.

More immediately, a program of cooperation based upon mutual trust and common purpose between State, local and Federal Government is required.

Substantial expenditure of funds by State and local agencies will be required.

Increased funding on the Federal level is required. The $280 million for matching grants to States and communities for water pollution abatement works is less than half the amount needed. For this reason, last session I introduced legislation to increase Federal expenditures under Public Law 660 to $500 million and to increase fourfold the size of grants to communities.

The State of Michigan should be prepared to participate in the funding of local endeavors, and active consideration should be given to tax benefits for industrial waste treatment works by the State.

Secondary treatment plants should be regarded as mandatory for all municipal systems, except for the very small and isolated communities. High standards of treatment on a local and State level for septic tanks and similar private treatment works are a must.

Disinfection of municipal waste effluent must be practiced to reduce coliform densities to below 5,000 organisms per 100 milliliters. Combined storm and sanitary sewers must be prohibited in newly developed urban areas and eliminated in existing areas wherever possible. Urban renewal must be used as a vehicle for accomplishing this purpose. Alternative methods, less complicated and more economical than actual physical separation, are now being developed and should be applied as soon as they are successfully demonstrated.

State, county, and city officials should determinedly embark on a course of action to encourage combined treatment of municipal and industrial wastes in the same treatment plant. This spells economy of operation and savings for both the public and industry. Where industry locates on the city's environs, it will still pay the community to install an interceptor sewer to bring that industry's wastes to the city plant for treatment.

All new sewage facilities must be designed to prevent the necessity of bypassing untreated waters, something which is a major contributor to the pollution of the Detroit River.

The operation of waste treatment plants should be entrusted only to trained and skilled operators, who should be required to obtain state certification of their competency.

Great emphasis must be given to prevention of accidental spills of waste materials into Michigan's waters. Inplant surveys to prevent accidents should be utilized by State and local officials.

An appropriate system of reporting of unusual increases in waste output and accidental spills to the appropriate State and local agencies must be instituted. Use of waters of the State for disposal of trash, garbage, and other noxious refuse must be prohibited.

Existing dumps along the waters of our State must be eliminated. Industrial plants must be required to improve practices for segregation and treatment of waste to effect maximum reductions of acids, alkalies, tarry substances, oils, phenols, ammonia and nitrogen compounds, phosphorous compounds, and all other wastes with a special emphasis on oxygen-demanding substances.

Federal agencies must be forced to conform to high standards in the discharge of their wastes. The President has issued an Executive order which squarely places this requirement on all Federal installations. Federal water quality standards under the Federal statute just passed under sponsorship of Congressman BLATNIK, Senator MUSKIE and myself must be fixed at the highest feasible levels.

More adequate funding of State programs, and indeed of local programs, must take place to provide for an adequate ability to analyze, trace and prevent sources of pollution. More enforcement personnel on the State and local level must be available to combat pollution.

Since 1956 the Federal Government has increased its expenditures in all areas of water pollution almost sixfold and has assisted generously State programs for prevention of pollution and abatement of this terrible hazard. Communities have bettered this record, yet an enormous construction backlog remains. There is, as New York has shown, reason for State participation in funding projects.

Michigan and other States must have a more realistic system for appraising and reporting needed waste treatment facilities. For example, Michigan's three largest cities report needs for $98 million for construction; Detroit indicating needs of $45,300,000. On the other hand, the Conference of State Sanitary Engineers came up with a figure for the whole State of $4.7 million. The Public Health Service Conference on cleanup of the Detroit River estimates Detroit's needs for secondary treatment to be on the order of $500 million; whereas, the Detroit Water Board says that secondary treatment alone, which is badly needed on the Detroit River, will cost $750 million. It appears that some better way of reporting present and future needs must be devised.

A Senate committee study will shortly show National and State needs and expenditures are vastly larger than any present source indicates.

Local officials must insist on this adequate reporting to enable enactment of adequate State and Federal aid programs.

All State and municipal agencies must require sewerage or water use charges sufficient to finance construction and operation of adequate collection and treatment works.

The Federal Government has been drawn into water pollution abatement by failure of the States to preserve our waters and to abate pollution. If the several States, Michigan included, intend to preserve their ancient right and responsibility in water quality control they must display new vigor and effectiveness.

There must be a full understanding that there is place for Federal, State, and local activity in pollution abatement. The Federal Government neither desires nor has the ability to handle every single source of pollution and every improperly managed and operated cesspool and industrial or municipal treatment works. If the States and communities will accept the invaluable skills and tremendous resources of the Federal Government; if they will support Federal activities to abate pollution by understanding it is a cooperative endeavor; and if they will carry out their own great responsibilities in this area; prospects are good that when we see "water wonderland" it will mean just that, not only for Michigan, but for all America.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. James P. Wesberry, D.D., pastor, Morningside Baptist Church, Atlanta, Ga., offered the following prayer, prefacing it with these words of Scripture: *God is our refuge and strength. Therefore will not we fear, though the earth be removed, and though the mountains be carried into the midst of the sea.*—Psalms 46: 1–2.

O God, our Father, in this day when earth's foundations shake, help us to put our trust in Thee. Forbid that the stress and strain of life should break our spirits. Grant us, we pray, the forgiveness of sin and renewal of faith we need to be more than conquerors over the evils of the world. In all of life's frustrations restore to us the confidence that Thou art ever at work seeking to bring this world to the glorious fulfillment of Thine eternal purpose.

We bring to Thee, our Father, those who hold high the banners of our Nation. We remember the President of the United States, those who work faithfully by his side, the distinguished Speaker, the beloved Chaplain, the gracious Doorkeeper, each and every Member of this illustrious body, the Members of the Senate, all who serve in the military, and all others who share in the responsibility of guiding our national affairs. Give, we humbly ask, wisdom, insight, and courage to our statesmen. May all that makes life nobler and finer inspire their counsels and govern their decisions.

We commend to Thy gracious care all who fight for the freedom and peace of the world on the battlefields of Vietnam. Overshadow, keep, and give them confidence that Thou, Eternal God, art their refuge and strength.

Bless, we beseech Thee, all who out of the bitter memories of war, are captured by a vision of world peace. May Thy Holy Spirit work among the leaders of the nations that they may find with all possible speed the way of peace without the shedding of blood and the horrors of war. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a resolution, as follows:

S. RES. 225

Resolved, That the Senate had heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

death of Hon. Albert Thomas, late a Representative from the State of Texas.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now adjourn.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 115, 78th Congress, entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the U.S. Government," appointed Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. CARLSON members of the Joint Select Committee on the Part of the Senate for the Disposition of Executive Papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 66–11.

CELEBRATE 48TH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, we are celebrating here today the 48th anniversary of the day, after the end of World War I in 1918, when the ancient and proud people of Lithuania reclaimed and declared again their independence as a nation.

It was a time of the breaking of obsolete empires and of the rearranging and reasserting of sovereignty under the principle of self-determination. Four new nations—but nations that were also old in the sense of prior history—found the path of liberation open and declared themselves free and independent during this period when Austria-Hungary was breaking up and when the Communist heirs of the czars were first making deals with Germany and then making war against the treaties reflected in the deals.

The other nations of northeastern Europe that found a new birth of freedom were Poland, Latvia, and Estonia. The fourth was Lithuania, which adequately proclaimed its independence on February 16, 1918.

Lithuania had centuries of freedom behind her, and then experienced generations of occupation and captivity, before her new proud moment in 1918.

The independence of Lithuania—the rebirth—did not exist permanently, but merely for a short span. Another war, another jousting between the Soviets and Hitler's Nazis, trapped Poland and the Baltic States between great powers. The Hitler-Stalin pact divided Poland, and the Red army moved into the Baltic States.

The Red army is still there.

It is perfectly natural, however, that those of Lithuanian birth or ancestry in this country take the time and the trouble to recall that during this 20th century, troubled though it has been, their own native land had a fleeting experience again with the pleasures of total independence. It was only between wars—but while it was there, they drank the wine of freedom.

They hope to drink the wine of freedom again. They hope to see the land of their fathers independent and sovereign again. And so do we all, I am sure, wish to see independence and sovereignty in Lithuania, the other Baltic States, and all the other captive nations of Eastern Europe.

TRANSFER OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my special order, scheduled for Friday, February 18, be transferred to Monday, February 21.

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

There was no objection.

A HEARTY LAUGH FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Washington Post on Tuesday, February 8, which was in exploitation of one of the facets of its leftist philosophy, provided me such a good laugh, that I would like to insert it here in the RECORD for everyone to enjoy.

The title of the editorial was "Experiment in Housing," and it propounds the need for public housing here in Washington. As we all know, the Post is in favor of any project that is paid for by the Federal Government and given to the public. This is true to their belief in the welfare state as being the utopian life.

The amusement in the editorial is found in their admission that private enterprise can build these welfare houses at a cost of $2,000 per unit less than the Federal Government can. They say also that private enterprise can do the job in 14 months whereas it would take the Federal Government 4 years. If there has ever been two better arguments for getting the Federal Government out of this business and turning it over to private enterprise and to the people, I have never heard them.

Until I hear that this bewildered editorial writer has been forgiven this slippage in logic and I am assured that he will not be out of a job because of it, I will worry about him.

Here is the editorial in question:

EXPERIMENT IN HOUSING

This city cannot afford the traditional procedures for building public housing. They are too slow and too costly; the demand for these homes is urgent. The National Capital Housing Authority has once again shown itself ready to experiment, and once again the city will benefit from its initiative.

A new block of public housing for the elderly is to be built at 12th and M Streets NW. To follow the usual administrative routes would consume about 4 years. But the Authority can get the project within perhaps 14 months if it lets a private builder do the work, and then buys the finished building from him. The Authority also expects to save perhaps $2,000 per unit by this method. This innovation deserves the wholehearted encouragement of the city.

The Authority cannot, of course, stop there. Housing the elderly is the least difficult of its many responsibilities; the most difficult is to help the families with many children. Apartments for large families are expensive to build, and wise policy does not permit them to be built in large concentrations. The families who inhabit them usually require other social services as well. Housing for the elderly is needed in Washington, but other kinds of housing are needed even more desperately. The Housing Authority's latest departure will be particularly welcome if it leads to similar ventures in providing homes for families with children.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report on a supplemental authorization for the Department of Defense.

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

There was no objection.

BOYCOTTING RHODESIA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the friendly Government of Rhodesia has been made the victim of an outrageous boycott by the Government of the United States. It is an action taken jointly with the leeching British Government which seeks to destroy the existing Rhodesian Government because it has declared its independence.

Last summer, Congress amended the Export Control Act of 1949, and among the amendments was this:

The Congress further declares that it is the policy of the United States (A) to oppose restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by foreign countries against other countries friendly to the United States and (B) to encourage and request domestic concerns engaged in the export of articles, materials, supplies, or information, to refuse to take any action, including the furnishing of information or the signing of agreements, which has the effect of furthering or supporting the restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by any foreign country against another country friendly to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's boycott of Rhodesia is a moral, if not legal, violation of the Export Control Act, and it is clearly a slap in the face to Congress.

How much longer will Congress spinelessly permit itself to be trampled upon by the President and his stooges in the State Department? When do the proper committees and Members of Congress intend to meet this challenge?

Contrast this to the lack of action in stopping British shipments to Communist Vietnam and to Communist Cuba.

IN SUPPORT OF THEIR COUNTRY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, during recent weeks it has been my pleasure to bring to the attention of Congress the deeds and acts of patriotic men and women in support of their country. I have done this, because I am concerned by the fact that while anti-American demonstrations receive wide publicity, those who truly offer their support and service to our Nation go virtually unnoticed.

In recent weeks I have told of such patriotic Georgia projects as Affirmation Vietnam, Vietnam Mail Call, and have presented various petitions that have been sent to me in support of our efforts against communism in Asia. Today I insert in the RECORD a statement from American Legion, Capitol View Post No. 161, as well as a statement from the Fourth Ward Improvement Council, both of Atlanta, Ga., and both of which show—better than I—the true feelings of Americans in support of their country.

RESOLUTION BY AMERICAN LEGION, CAPITOL VIEW POST NO. 161

Whereas the United States of America and the people thereof are engaged in conflict with Communist forces in Vietnam; and

Whereas the members of the Armed Forces of our Nation are giving their lives in said conflict to protect their homeland; and

Whereas it is the duty of every citizen of every political opinion to avoid giving aid and comfort to the forces in conflict with our Nation; and

Whereas the giving of aid and comfort to the enemy forces has in recent events been dramatized by such activities as draft-card burning, so-called Vietnam peace demonstrations, attempts to block troop trains, statements placing the blame for the conflict on the United States of America, and statements in support of those seeking to avoid military service; and

Whereas this activity not only gives aid and comfort to the enemy but also causes lowering of morale of the members of the Armed Forces who are fighting for our freedom and the freedom of the people of Vietnam: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Capitol View Post No. 161, in meeting assembled at Atlanta, Ga., do deplore this lack of patriotism on the part of a small element in this Nation; and be it further

Resolved, That we believe that this lack of patriotism is evidence of communistic influence over the groups and individuals engaging in these activities; and be it further

Resolved, That we respectfully request a complete investigation by appropriate committees of the Congress of the United States into the probable communistic influence over these individuals and groups, for the purpose of determining the extent of Communist leadership and source of financing; and be it further

Resolved, That the participants in these activities should not be allowed to hold Federal or State office either through employment, appointment, or election; and be it further

Resolved, That we respectfully request legislation by the Congress of the United States and the General Assembly of Georgia to prevent these individuals from holding any Federal or State office, however obtained; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be spread on the minutes of this meeting, with a copy going to each Member of the Congress from the State of Georgia and to each member of the General Assembly of Georgia, and to the news media, and to the fifth district, the American Legion, Department of Georgia.

Approved this 11th day of January 1966.

JOHN D. BARRETT,
Commander.
GEORGE D. COLEMAN, Jr.,
Adjutant.

RESOLUTION OF FOURTH WARD IMPROVEMENT COUNCIL

Whereas it is the duty of every American to give loyal support to the forces of his Nation when they are engaged in armed conflict with foreign forces; and

Whereas this duty crosses all lines of political opinion; and

Whereas the members of this association are dedicated to good citizenship: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we, the members of the Fourth Ward Improvement Council, in meeting assembled, do hereby go on record as pledging our loyal support to our Nation in its conflict with the Communist outlaws of Vietnam, and to further urge all our fellow citizens of the area we seek to serve to do likewise; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be signed by the officers of this council, and copies sent to the Members of Congress from Georgia and to the news media.

A. S. ADAMS,
President.
W. E. KING.
JOHN L. NORMAN.
DAVID C. WILBANKS.
ROWENA W. PHILPOT.
MARY M. STEPHENS.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight to file certain privileged reports.

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

There was no objection.

ACTION TO REVITALIZE OUR GREAT CITIES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has called for a concerted, massive, national effort against blight, poverty, and physical decay in our great metropolitan cities. He has proposed a bold plan to uproot the causes of physical decay and human degradation and to help our great cities realize their full potential of a decent and wholesome life for all the people who reside therein.

Yesterday, I had the pleasure of hearing Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Honorable Robert C. Weaver, outline the administration's plan of attack to realize those goals. It calls for the harnessing of public and private resources and programs, Federal, State, and local, to the concerted effort which must be initiated by local authorities but which the Federal Government will support and stimulate to a successful conclusion. To launch this new effort on the solid foundation it merits, requires new legislation.

Today I have introduced a bill, H.R. 12888, in support of this effort to restore and revitalize our great cities.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR BALANCE OF THIS WEEK AND FOR THE WEEK OF FEBRUARY 21

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished majority leader as to the schedule for the remainder of this week and the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, we have no further business for this week. It will be our purpose to ask to go over until Monday when I have announced the program for next week.

The program for Monday is as follows: Monday is Consent Calendar day. We have no suspensions.

Tuesday there will be a reading of George Washington's Farewell Address.

Wednesday and the balance of the week: H.R. 12752, the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966, and following that act the supplemental defense authorization for fiscal year 1966 and the supplemental foreign aid authorization for fiscal year 1966. The reports on these bills have not been filed, and I make this announcement subject to that contingency and subject to the further contingency, of course, that rules are granted in time to have them called up next week.

Also, next week, S. 1666, to provide for additional circuit and district judges and for other purposes, will be considered under an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

Mr. Speaker, this announcement is made subject to the usual reservations that conference reports may be brought up at any time, and any further program may be announced later.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Is it true that the Committee on Rules has reported out a rule granting 4 hours of general debate on the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished gentleman will yield further, the gentleman is correct. I believe the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] has just received permission to have until midnight tonight to file a report from the Committee on Rules, and I anticipate no difficulty in having that matter considered as the first order of business on Wednesday.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The other two bills, the supplemental defense authorization for fiscal year 1966, and the Supplemental Foreign Aid Authorization Act for fiscal year 1966, have been reported out of the legislative committees. Do we understand that a rule will be sought in each case and that the legislation will be programed, if the Committee on Rules does grant the rule in each instance?

Mr. ALBERT. May I say that the gentleman is correct. However, the reports have not been filed on those bills. Of course, the granting of the rule will be contingent upon the reports getting to the Committee on Rules on time.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. It is anticipated, then, that we will meet Wednesday, Thursday and probably Friday, of next week in order to carry out the schedule which has just been set forth?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] advises me—and I did not hear the request—that he does have permission to file the report on the defense supplemental bill until tomorrow night. So we anticipate no problem in having that bill ready to go to the Committee on Rules next week.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished majority leader.

ADJOURNMENT OVER UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with next week.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION POSITION ON REGULATION OF ALL CATV SYSTEMS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, no doubt in recent weeks the Members of the House of Representatives have received numerous letters, telegrams, and personal visits from community antenna television—CATV—system operators, their subscribers, and their trade association representatives, and also from broadcasters and their trade association representatives with regard to impending regulatory actions by the Federal Communications Commission involving the imposition of limitations on the carrying of television programs by CATV systems.

Most likely the CATV representatives have argued that the Commission at present has no statutory authority to impose these limitations and that their imposition will deprive CATV subscribers of free choice of television programs which they have enjoyed heretofore. Broadcasters, on the other hand, are likely to have argued that the Commission does have the necessary statutory authority and that unless the contemplated regulatory steps are taken by the Commission, the present pattern of local broadcast stations serving their respective communities will be replaced by a system under which the programs of a few metropolitan stations will be made available by cable to listeners who will have to pay for the privilege of seeing these programs. Rural television viewers would then be left without any television service.

The committee has been following closely the vigorous competitive struggle that is now being waged by CATV operators, broadcasters, and their respective national trade organizations. The committee is aware that as seen by CATV and broadcast interests, the impending regulatory actions of the Commission will greatly affect the competitive positions and economic prospects of CATV operators and broadcasters.

Last Monday, February 15, the Commission announced that after meetings held February 10, 11, and 14, it had reached agreement on a broad plan for the regulation of community antenna television systems, including a legislative program. The details of the plan are contained in a public notice which I am inserting in the RECORD following my remarks so that Members of the House will be fully apprised of what the Commission contemplates.

On Monday the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce had before it the Commission for a 3-hour discussion of what the Commission is proposing to do in this field. In addition to Chairman Henry, all other members of the Commission with one exception were present as well as a number of the Commission staff.

It is clear from the discussion had at this meeting that in spite of the representations which may have been made generally and specifically to Members of the House in the past few weeks, the Commission has no intention to cut out service anywhere and fully intends that existing programs on which customers of antenna systems have come to rely fully should be retained. There is only one possible exception to this and that is the system must carry a local television station where the station is truly local but this would not seem generally to have any effect on the ability of the system to continue existing programs. Other than this possible exception there will be no disruption.

The Commission order in this area has not yet been drafted and it will be some days before an order can be promulgated and published in the Federal Register. It could not then become effective in a period less than 30 days. At the very best then it would be some days before the Commission's proposal can go into effect.

In the meantime the Commission, in accordance with its discussion with the committee, will have prepared and transmitted to Congress its legislative recommendations to carry out this program, which it has undertaken to do within 2 weeks. Following receipt of these recommendations this committee promptly will schedule hearings so that there will be adequate opportunity for all to be heard and for the committee to review all aspects of the problem.

Mr. Speaker, the Commission is sending to the Congress proposed legislation within the next 2 weeks, and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will immediately hold hearings on this proposed legislation. The entire subject will be fully aired, and then appropriate action will be taken.

The public notice referred to is as follows:

FCC ANNOUNCES PLAN FOR REGULATION OF ALL CATV SYSTEMS

(Federal Communications Commission Public Notice G, February 15, 1966)

Following meetings held February 10, 11, and 14, the Commission has reached agreement on a broad plan for the regulation of community antenna television systems, including a legislative program. To insure the effective integration of CATV with a fully developed television service, the new regulations will apply equally to all CATV systems, including those which require microwave licenses, and those which receive their signal off the air. Excluded from these rules will be those CATV systems which serve less than 50 customers, or which serve only as an apartment house master antenna. The CATV rules concurrently in effect for microwave-fed systems will be revised to reflect the new rules adopted for all systems.

Coupled with the new CATV rules, to be incorporated in a report and order shortly to be issued, the Commission will send recommended legislation to Congress to codify and supplement its regulatory program in this important area.

The Commission's new CATV program includes eight major points:

Carriage of local stations: A CATV system will be required to carry without material degradation the signals of all local television stations within whose Grade B contours the CATV system is located. The carriage requirements thus made applicable to all CATV systems will be substantially the same as those applied to microwave-served systems by the Commission's first report and order in Dockets 14895 and 15233, adopted in April 1965.

2. Same-day nonduplication: A CATV system will be required to avoid duplication

of the programs of local television stations during the same day that such programs are broadcast by the local stations. This nonduplication protection, as under existing rules, will apply to prime-time network programs only if such programs are presented by the local station entirely within what is locally considered to be prime time. It will also give the CATV subscribers access to network programs on the same day that they are presented on the network. Nonduplication protection will not be afforded to programs which are carred in black and white by the local station and are available in color from a more distant station on the CATV system.

The new nonduplication rules thus embody two substantial changes from those adopted in the first report and order. First, the time period during which nonduplication protection must be afforded has been reduced from 15 days before and after local broadcast to the single day of local broadcast. Second, a new exemption from the nonduplication requirement has been added as to color programs not carried in color by local stations.

3. Private agreements and ad hoc procedures: The Commission will continue to give full effect to private agreements between CATV operators and local television stations which provide for a different type of degree of protection for the local station than do the Commission's rules. Moreover, the Commission will give ad hoc consideration to petitions from local television stations seeking a greater degree of protection than provided by the rules, or from CATV operators seeking a waiver of the rules.

4. Distant City Signals—New CATV systems in the top 100 television markets: Parties who obtain State or local franchises to operate CATV systems in the 100 highest ranked television markets (according to American Research Bureau (ARB) net weekly circulation figures), which propose to extend the signals of television broadcast stations beyond their grade B contours, will be required to obtain FCC approval before CATV service to subscribers may be commenced. This aspect of the Commission's decision is effective immediately, and will be applicable to all CATV operation commenced after February 15, 1966.

An evidentiary hearing will be held as to all such requests for FCC approval, subject of course, to the general waiver provisions of the Commission's rules. These hearings will be concerned primarily with (a) the potential effects of the proposed CATV operation on the full development of off-the-air television outlets (particularly UHF) for that market, and (b) the relationship, if any, of proposed CATV operations and the development of pay television in that market. The hearing requirement will apply to all CATV operations proposed to communities lying within the predicted grade A service contour of all existing television stations in that market.

Service presently being rendered to CATV subscribers will be unaffected. However, the Commission will entertain petitions objecting to the geographical extension to new areas of CATV systems already in operation in the top 100 television markets.

5. Distant City Signals—New CATV systems in smaller television markets: The Commission's prior approval after an evidentiary hearing will not be required by rule for proposed CATV systems or operations in markets below 100 in the ARB rankings. However, the Commission will entertain, on an ad hoc basis, petitions from interested parties concerning the carriage of distant signals by CATV systems located in such smaller markets.

6. Information to be filed by CATV owners: Pursuant to its authority under section 403 of the Communications Act, the Commission will, within an appropriate time to be prescribed, require all CATV operations to submit the following data with respect to each of their CATV systems: (a) The names, addresses and business interests of all officers, directors, and persons having substantial ownership interests in each system; (b) the number of subscribers to each system; (c) the television stations carried on each system; and (d) the extent of any existing or proposed program origination by each CATV system.

7. Assertion of jurisdiction: To the extent necessary to carry out the regulatory program set forth above, the Commission asserts its present jurisdiction over all CATV systems, whether or not served by microwave relay.

8. Legislation to be recommended to Congress: The Commission will recommend, with specific proposals where appropriate, that Congress consider and enact legislation designed to express basic national policy in the CATV field. Such legislation would include those matters over which the Commission has exercised its jurisdiction, as well as those matters which are still under consideration.

Included in these recommendations will be the following:

(a) Clarification and confirmation of FCC jurisdiction over CATV systems generally, along with such specific provisions as are deemed appropriate.

(b) Prohibition of the origination of program or other material by a CATV system with such limitations or exceptions, if any, as are deemed appropriate.

(c) Consideration of whether, to what extent, and under what circumstances CATV systems should be required to obtain the consent of the originating broadcast station for the retransmission of the signal by the CATV system.

(d) Consideration of whether CATV systems should or should not be deemed public utilities. In this connection, Congress will be asked to consider the appropriate relationship of Federal to State-local jurisdiction in the CATV field, with particular reference to initial franchising, rate regulation, and extension of service.

The Commission, of course, stands ready to discuss all of the above matters with the appropriate congressional committees at any time.

STATEMENT OF COMMISSIONER ROBERT T. BARTLEY

I cannot agree that the Communications Act confers jurisdiction over CATV; however, I endorse legislation which would prohibit a CATV system from originating program matter.

SEPARATE STATEMENT OF COMMISSIONER KENNETH A. COX

I concur fully in those portions of the Commission's action in which it (1) asserts jurisdiction over all CATV operations, (2) requires carriage of local stations on CATV systems, (3) provides for expedited ad hoc procedures for the consideration of special relief requested either by broadcasters or CATV operators, (4) requires disclosure of information as to ownership of CATV systems and certain other matters, and (5) calls on Congress to give prompt consideration to the problem of integrating CATV operations into our overall television system, with particular attention to the questions of program origination by CATV systems, possible extension of the principle of rebroadcast consent, and overlapping jurisdiction with the States.

As to the balance of the action taken. I agree with what is done but believe it falls far short of protecting the public interest in an expanding television service. I agree that local stations should not have their programs duplicated, but believe that the protection afforded them is totally inadequate. As to network programs, they should be accorded exclusivity—that is, should not be duplicated—as to all programs which they propose to present in a comparable time period within 15 days.[1] This Commission found in the first report that, for cogent reasons, delayed nonduplication served the public interest. (See pars. 101–127, 38 FCC at 721–731.) But the majority new cuts back on such delayed nonduplication to a single day. This 1 day protection is patently inadequate as to network programing (see first report, par. 125, 38 FCC at 730, where it is pointed out that only 10.2 percent of local stations' delayed broadcasts are delayed less than 1 day, with roughly 79 percent being delayed between 1 and 15 days). As to nonnetwork programs, the majority previously pointed out that such material was not distributed on a simultaneous nationwide basis and that, therefore, a 15-day protection was "clearly a minimal measure of protection against the duplication of syndicated or feature film programs, considering the extended periods—up to and exceeding 5 years—for which stations now bargain and obtain exclusivity in relation to such programs."

As to feature film, syndicated series, and other filmed or taped programing for which they have acquired local exhibition rights, they should be assured the right of first run—which is only one of the rights normally bargained for, but certainly the most important one. I realize that this is more protection than was proposed in this proceeding, but since I feel this would be necessary to assure the station of the most important of the program rights it has acquired as against prior exhibition by an entity which has acquired no rights at all, I certainly cannot agree with the majority's refusal to recognize any rights as to such programing. Some nonsimultaneous nonduplication is necessary to afford local stations sufficient flexibility to provide the best possible service to those viewers who do not subscribe to the cable service.

Similarly, I agree that some measures are needed to curb the indiscriminate extension of television signals by CATV systems. Section 303(h) of the Communications Act gives us clear authority to establish zones or areas of service for broadcast stations. In television, I think we have undertaken to do this by establishing a carefully designed channel allocation and by fixing maximum limits on heights and powers. While there are many situations in which deficiencies of service can and should be corrected by supplemental means such as CATV, satellites, and translators, I do not believe that any of these auxiliary services should be permitted to disrupt the basic television system that Congress, the Commission, and the broadcasters have worked so hard to establish.

The majority contents itself with saying that it will carefully examine proposals to provide CATV service in the top 100 television markets. I would greatly prefer an approach which would bar new systems—for a specified period—from extending a station's signal beyond its grade B contour, except upon authorization by the Commission in certain carefully defined situations. I believe this is necessary to stem the current proliferation of CATV systems in areas already receiving substantial television service. Without such action, I am afraid that CATV—a supplemental and derivative service—will stunt the future growth of our free television system, and perhaps even impair the viability of some of the service which the public is now receiving.

It is all very well to study the problems posed by CATV's threatened invasion of the major markets. It is true that the most immediate hopes for expanded UHF service are centered there, and that the risk of

[1] I agree that as to network color programs the local station should not be protected unless it will present them in color.

CATV operators' building a pay television system on the basis of signals appropriated from the broadcasters who now provide our free service is greatest there. But if we turn our backs on the smaller markets by assuring cable operators that they can pump in multiple competing signals from New York and Los Angeles unless a local broadcaster can prove that he will be driven out of business, I think we are on the way to substituting a shrinking for an expanding system, with an artificial ceiling on network and local service alike—all in the name of a multiplicity, if no real diversity, of service for a part of the public. I am afraid we may end up with a shrunken, substantially wired pay service for the majority of the public, and a really vestigial system for those who cannot afford, or cannot be provided, this service.

I am not comforted by the majority's confidence that it would reverse such a trend if it really became a clear threat. The Commission does not have a good record for taking such drastic measures—in fact, I think much of my colleagues' reluctance to take more meaningful action now stems from fear of disrupting the existing service of a rather small number of CATV subscribers who have been galvanized into pressuring Congress and the Commission by a campaign of outright misrepresentation by the CATV industry. If this bothers them, what likelihood is there that they will ever roll back any part of the greatly expanded CATV operations which I think their actions will bring into being? New York City signals have already been carried to points near the Ohio border, and service from Los Angeles is proposed for Oklahoma and Texas. Once such service is instituted, I am afraid it is impossible to roll it back. I think the majority itself recognizes this problem, as is indicated by the fact that in the release announcing their action they twice very carefully point out that service now being rendered to CATV subscribers will be unaffected by what they are doing.

I do not mean to suggest that I know or can prove that the consequences I fear will actually result—though I think my concerns are shared by many leaders of the broadcast industry, by certain organizations which represent elements of the public who stand to be disadvantaged by increased reliance on wired television, and by other interested and informed parties. But on the other hand, my colleagues cannot prove that my fears are groundless. My approach would not impair the viability of existing cable systems and would not bar all further extension of CATV service. But it would confine such service to its proper supplemental role in areas which receive substandard over-the-air television for a limited period—say 5 years. That would give Congress and the Commission time to study the whole problem further, would permit continued UHF development, and would, hopefully, permit resolution of the copyright questions which are basic to the future of CATV.

By not taking the admittedly more rigorous course which I favor, the majority has, I believe, invited developments which may make further study futile, may stifle UHF development which otherwise would have occurred, and may make it politically difficult, or even impossible, to adhere to normal copyright principles. I do not think that the benefits it is claimed CATV will bring are worth the hazards to our television system created by the limited action here taken by the majority. If there is one thing that even critics of the Commission concede it is that this agency was created for the purpose of allocating communications facilities. Both sections 307(b) and 303(h) of the Communications Act make this clear. I think the majority is simply refusing to discharge this responsibility. Now is the time to take hold of the problems posed by the explosive development of the CATV industry and to fit cable operations into an appropriate place in the overall television structure. I think we are at a real turning point as far as the development of American television is concerned—and I think the majority has taken the wrong direction.

STATEMENT OF COMMISSIONER LEE LOEVINGER REGARDING FCC CATV PLAN

The analysis of jurisdiction set forth in my prior opinion in this proceeding (38 FCC 683, 746 (1965)) still represents my view. The significance of that analysis and its divergence from the course now adopted by the Commission need no elaboration. On the other hand, the substantive position now adopted by the Commission seems to me to be a moderate and reasonable compromise of conflicting views and positions, and the Commission now recognizes the desirability, if not necessity, of requesting Congress to legislate on jurisdiction and other important aspects of this subject. In these circumstances I think it is more constructive and useful to support affirmative action by the Commission, leaving the jurisdictional issue to be decided by Congress and the courts, rather than stand on legalistic grounds or inflexibly insist on complete adoption of my own ideas. Accordingly, with a dubitante recorded as to jurisdiction, I concur in the plan now approved by a majority of the Commission for regulating community antenna television systems.

REA LOANS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, my remarks here today concern an unconscionable, illegal act by a Government agency.

In our proper concern with the difficulties that beset our Nation in Vietnam, we must not permit our attention to be diverted from the domestic scene. If we are to maximize our effort against the Vietcong, at one and the same time we must sharpen our vigilance at home.

I realize, too, that our President carries arduous burdens. One would think that the least he could expect from his official family is scrupulous adherence to the law at all times. Nevertheless, a member of his administrative family has committed a clearly illegal act involving the expenditure of $22,800,000 of the taxpayers' money.

The man who is guilty of this act is the REA Administrator.

I realize that anything said about REA may evoke a partisan response. If so, it has no place in the discussion which follows, for I address myself to the stanchest supporter of the Rural Electrification Administration on whatever side of the aisle he may sit. The more any person supports REA, the stronger must be his condemnation of the Administrator's action, for to support the Administrator in this instance is to support an act of illegality.

On Monday, February 14, the Supreme Court of Colorado handed down a decision of great importance to the Nation's taxpayers and to those of us who are concerned about any disrespect for and failure to adhere to the law. The court of last resort of Colorado held, in effect, that the REA loan of $22,876,000 to the Colorado-Ute Electric Association was illegal. The REA had made this loan to this generation and transmission cooperative in 1962 to build a 150,000 kilowatt steamplant and extensive transmission lines. The output of these facilities was to be sold to the member cooperatives of Colorado-Ute and to the Salt River district in Arizona. Some of its output would, in effect, be used by the Bureau of Reclamation to firm up the power of the Colorado River storage project produced at dams in Utah, Arizona, and Colorado.

The full background on the granting of this highly controversial and legally questionable loan will be found in the hearings of the Subcommittee on Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations for Department of Agriculture requests for 1963 and 1964.

I fought this loan at that time because, in my opinion, it was clearly, patently illegal.

Section 4 of the REA Act of 1936 provides, among other things that:

> No loan for the construction, operation or enlargement of any generating plant shall be made unless the consent of the State authority having jurisdiction in the premises is first obtained.

Obviously, as this decision demonstrates, "the consent of the State authority having jurisdiction" could not be "first obtained" as long as there was litigation unresolved in the courts concerning the consent of the State. Only on February 14, 1966, did the Supreme Court of Colorado—which, under the constitution and law of that State, has the last word—issue its opinion on the legality of the loan, and accordingly, on whether the State had in fact actually given consent. It held that the loan was illegal; the State of Colorado has refused to give its consent to this loan. As a result, the money advanced by the administrator has been advanced illegally. It has been spent illegally in violation of Federal law.

This is just one example of how the Administrator has flaunted the will of Congress, whether that will be expressed in statute or in instructions and guidance contained in reports of committees of Congress. The motivation for this illegal act was the strength of his desire to be free of all restraints imposed by Congress or by the courts. Like the irresponsible driver, he finally ran afoul of the law and the court caught up with him.

The Administrator is now in the process of making the same mistake in releasing funds to a G. & T. co-op in Indiana. A $60,225,000 loan was made on June 18, 1961, to Hoosier Cooperative, Inc., to be used to build a 198,000-kilowatt steamplant and more than 1,500

miles of transmission lines. The Administrator has already begun releasing these funds, even though the Indiana Supreme Court has not as yet finally passed on the legal issues involved. The Administrator certainly should not release any more of this money until the Indiana courts have finally decided this case. He should heed the lesson of his Colorado experience and not make the same mistake twice.

Mr. Speaker, this decision reveals the REA Administrator as lacking good judgment and understanding of legal processes and knowledge of the very act he is in charge of administering.

Right now, we are being treated to a barrage of propaganda emanating from Las Vegas, Nev., to the effect that the REA needs a substantial increase in its funds over and above the $220 million recommended by the President in the current budget. We have here in this decision of the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado a classic illustration of why this agency continually demands more funds; and precisely why it does not need them. We know now that REA has made an illegal loan in Colorado involving millions of dollars. We also know that REA has made other loans in recent weeks for generation and transmission purposes in Kentucky, in Indiana, and in my State, Illinois, that are directly contrary to the directives outlined by the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate, directly contrary to the provisions of the basic REA Act, and in conflict with policy guidelines established by the President in the budget for fiscal years 1966 and 1967. Obviously, any agency that feels itself above the law and the dictates of Congress can use unlimited funds.

Because of the tremendous importance of this case, I will insert at this point in the RECORD excerpts of the decision of the Colorado Supreme Court in the case of Western Colorado Power Co., against Public Utilities Commission.

EXCERPTS FROM OPINION OF SUPREME COURT OF STATE OF COLORADO RE: THE WESTERN POWER CO., A COLORADO CORPORATION, AND PUBLIC SERVICE CO. OF COLORADO, A COLORADO CORPORATION, VERSUS THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF COLORADO, HENRY E. ZARLENGO, RALPH C. HORTON, AND HOWARD S. BJELLAND, THE INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS OF SAID COMMISSION, AND COLORADO-UTE ELECTRIC ASSOCIATION, INC., A COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION

We will refer to the parties as follows: to the Western Colorado Power Co. as "Western," the Public Service Co. of Colorado as "Public Service," the Public Utilities Commission as the "commission," and the Colorado-Ute Electric Association, Inc., as "Colorado-Ute."

On May 11, 1962, Colorado-Ute filed an application with the commission for a certificate of convenience and necessity. The object of the application was to permit Colorado-Ute to construct near Hayden, Colo., a steam electric generating plant with a nominal rating of 150,000 kilowatts, together with associated transmission lines and related facilities necessary to deliver power to certain new customers it sought to serve at wholesale. On June 14, 1962, Colorado-Ute filed a petition for an order of the commission authorizing it to execute notes payable to the United States of America in an amount not to exceed $22,876,000 and mortgages to secure the notes in order to finance the project.

Public Service and Western filed protests in opposition to Colorado-Ute's requests and the matters were consolidated for hearing. Protests to those applications which were filed by Public Service and Western generally alleged that each was a public utility subject to the jurisdiction of this commission engaged, among other things, in the generation, transmission and distribution of electric power and energy at wholesale and otherwise throughout various areas of the State of Colorado; that all or a portion of the lines, plant, and facilities proposed to be constructed by Colorado-Ute would cause physical and uneconomical duplication of the lines, plants, and systems of the companies which had been lawfully constructed and dedicated to the public use; that the companies then, and for many years past, had maintained electric generating facilities and transmission lines and related facilities adequate and sufficient to meet all present and future needs of their customers and service areas, and hold themselves out as ready, willing, and able to render wholesale electric service to Colorado-Ute or any of its members; that there did not exist any need nor necessity for the construction of the proposed plant and facilities of Colorado-Ute and that if such construction was authorized by the commission it would result in substantial damage to the companies and their electric consumers.

Subsequent to hearing, the commission entered its order authorizing the construction of the Hayden plant and the financing thereof, but denying authority to construct certain of the facilities originally requested. Western and Public Service thereafter commenced certiorari proceedings in the district court, and from the judgment therein entered, affirming the commission's decision, they bring writ of error here.

Colorado-Ute is an incorporated rural electric cooperative association engaged in generating and transmitting electric energy as a wholesaler. It proposes to sell electric energy to various customers, it denominates member as well as to the Bureau of Reclamation, a nonmember. It further proposes to dedicate its facilities to whatever use the public convenience and necessity require, including the wheeling of power to protestants Public Service and Western. It is federally financed by the Rural Electrification Administration under the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (VII, U.S.C.A. 901). Eleven of its members are distribution members and distribute electrical energy directly to their users. Of the two other members, the Arkansas Valley G. & T. generates and transmits energy for its three distribution members, and the Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement and Power District provides both electric and water service in the area surrounding Phoenix, Ariz. Salt River is not a cooperative but is a quasi-governmental organization incorporated under the laws of the State of Arizona.

* * * * *

On this writ of error, contentions of Western and Public Service fell into three general categories: (1) That Colorado-Ute did not prove the need, demand, or necessity required by the law of public convenience and necessity for power to be provided by the Hayden plant; (2) that the financial arrangements of Colorado-Ute with the Rural Electrification Administration are illegal; and (3) that numerous errors of an evidentiary, procedural, and administrative nature were committed by the commission, all to the prejudice of Western and Public Service.

The first category consisted of six subcategories, each of which, it is said, points to error because the action of the commission, and the trial court in affirming the commission, contravened the fundamental concept of public utility law relating to public convenience and necessity. In this respect it is asserted: (1) That the evidence established that proposed new customers of Colorado-Ute already had an adequate power supply and that these customers would merely change their source and commence taking their power from Colorado-Ute; (2) that the construction of the plant would duplicate service made available by Western and Public Service as well as other electric suppliers presently rendering such service; (3) that the estimates of power costs submitted by Colorado-Ute found no support in the evidence; (4) that the generation and transmission of energy at less cost, assuming the record established such fact, is not a factor in establishing public convenience and necessity where reliance upon cheaper energy as basis for certification would be destructive of the concept of regulated monopoly; (5) that it would not be in the public interest to permit the construction of the plant where it would put Colorado-Ute in a debt position of more than 100 percent; (6) that the commission erred in receiving evidence concerning alleged benefits which would accrue to the Colorado River Basin fund as a result of the construction of the plant where the reception of such evidence was based upon the construction of a 600,000-kilowatt plant and basing its decision thereon when the application was for a plant of only 150,000 kilowatts.

* * * * *

The record discloses that the Colorado-Ute was organized in 1941 by a group of rural electric distribution associations on the western slope, but remained inactive for some years. In 1952 Colorado-Ute was reorganized, and it obtained a loan from the Rural Electrification Administration to construct transmission lines and a generating plant to supply the electric requirements of its then members. Upon the completion of the construction of this plant, known as the Nucla plant, Colorado-Ute commenced serving, on a wholesale basis, four distribution cooperatives located in the southwestern portion of the State. At the time of the hearing before the commission there was then pending an application by Colorado-Ute to commence serving a fifth member located near Grand Junction, Colo.

The alleged purpose to be served by the construction of the Hayden plant is to supply the electric requirements not of its 5 members but of 13 members. This would have the effect of making Colorado-Ute the wholesale supplier of electric energy to a large portion of the State of Colorado, as well as to a small portion of the State of Wyoming and the State of Utah, and a large supplier to the Salt River project in Arizona. Each of these eight potential new customers of Colorado-Ute is now receiving service from other sources, and the existing Nucla plant of Colorado-Ute is adequate to serve the requirements of the five earlier members. It is thus apparent that Colorado-Ute seeks to commence rendering electric service on an expanded basis in areas it has not heretofore served, to customers it has never before served, and to customers and in areas where electric service is being supplied and is available from other existing sources.

Wholesale electric service to many of the proposed new distribution cooperative customers of Colorado-Ute was for many years supplied by other utilities in the area, and later by the Bureau of Reclamation, and all parties to this proceeding are distinctly in the wholesale electric business. Arkansas G. & T. is an organization similar to Colorado-Ute and supplies wholesale electric service to three distribution cooperatives. Arkansas Valley obtains its power by purchase from municipal electric plants and from its own generating plant located near Canon City. This, in turn, it wholesales. The effect of the commission's decision is to substitute Colorado-Ute as the source of supply for all of these proposed new members.

For instance, those receiving wholesale service from the Bureau of Reclamation will terminate such purchases; those proposed new customers which have generating plants will dispose of those plants by one means or another; and those new customers which purchased from municipalities will no longer do so. Arkansas G. & T. which only recently completed the construction of its Canon City generating plant, will no longer obtain any power from its own plant but instead will purchase from Colorado-Ute.

Although there was much conflicting testimony with respect to the ability of the Bureau of Reclamation to continue meeting the wholesale requirements of the proposed new members of Colorado-Ute, all three commissioners concurred in a finding that Bureau power—the existing source of supply of many of these cooperatives—was adequate for the foreseeable future. In addition the record clearly reflects that the Arkansas G. & T. plant is more than adequate to most the anticipated demands of its customers for a considerable period of time. It is also shown by the record that Public Service and Western have adequate generating facilities with which to meet the demands of any wholesale requirements in their respective areas should existing sources prove insufficient.

Under these circumstances, it is apparent that the generating capabilities of existing electric suppliers in the State of Colorado are more than adequate to supply increased electrical needs without the addition of the Hayden plant, which was to be constructed only for the purpose of providing service to substitute for that already being rendered.

* * * * *

QUESTIONS TO BE DETERMINED

First. Does public convenience and necessity require the construction and operation of the Hayden plant in view of the acknowledged adequacy of existing service?

We answer this question in the negative. The State of Colorado has long been dedicated to the principle of regulated monopolies in the conduct of public utility operations. This principle has been the public policy of this State since the year 1913 when the Public Utilities Act of the State of Colorado was first adopted. The concept has never varied in a long line of decisions of this court.

* * * * *

The statute which is determinative of the basic issue in this case is C.R.S. 1963, 115-5-1, which provides as follows:

"115-5-1. New construction—extension.—(1) No public utility shall begin the construction of a new facility, plant, or system, or of any extension of its facility, plant, or system, without first having obtained from the commission a certificate that the present or future public convenience and necessity require or will require such construction. Sections 115-5-1 to 115-5-4 shall not be construed to require any corporation to secure such certificate for an extension within any city and county or city or town within which it shall have theretofore lawfully commenced operations, or for an extension into territory, either within or without a city and county or city or town, contiguous to its facility, or line, plant, or system, and not theretofore served by a public utility providing the same commodity or service, or for an extension within or to territory already served by it, necessary in the ordinary course of its business."

The above statute makes mandatory proof of public convenience and necessity prior to the construction of any new plant or system, subject to certain exceptions. It is obvious that none of the exceptions are applicable in this case, and Colorado-Ute has never contended to the contrary. This statute is the foundation of the regulated monopoly principle and as this court has observed on many occasions it was designed to prevent duplication of facilities and competition between utilities, and to authorize new utilities in a field only when existing ones are found to be inadequate.

* * * * *

We agree with Commissioner Zarlengo when he points out in his dissenting opinion the lack of evidence of public convenience and necessity:

"It appears that the applicant has founded its case, in the main, on the premises that if the Hayden plant and facilities be authorized, the power and energy produced will find a market, all the while ignoring substantial proof and competent evidence as to the availability (58) or nonavailability of power and energy from existing sources and the reasonableness of its cost to the consumers. To say the least, it has glossed over this phase, or, at most, tendered evidence which is vague, indefinite and uncertain."

To affirm the decision of the commission authorizing the construction of the Hayden plant where existing service was already adequate, would require a complete departure by this court from its previous decisions. The fundamental misconception of Colorado-Ute is its failure to recognize that, under regulation, existing suppliers are entitled to serve all desiring service, whether they be existing or potential customers.

* * * * *

In summarizing the factual situation presented by the record, it is apparent that—

1. Adequate electric service is already available in the State of Colorado for the needs and necessities of the proposed new customers of Colorado-Ute; therefore

2. The construction of the Hayden plant, requiring an investment of approximately thiry million dollars, is not necessary to supply any present or foreseeable future electric requirements, and Colorado ratepayers should not be required to support it; and

3. Affirmance of the district court's judgment and the decisions of the commission would sanction a duplication of existing electric facilities which are adequate to supply the needs of the public; and

4. The affirmance of the district court and commission decisions by this court would be inconsistent with the doctrine of regulated monopoly and would, as we stated in *Public Utilities Commission* v. *Verl Harvey, supra,* render regulation "wholly ineffective and meaningless."

Having discussed the Colorado law of public convenience and necessity as a crucial point upon which the decision in this case turns, we must inquire whether there are any other considerations which should, for reasons special to this case, absolve Colorado-Ute from the necessity of proving that the public convenience and necessity requires construction of the Hayden plant. If such considerations exist it must be admitted at the outset that the result would emaculate the concept of regulated monopoly and the entire Colorado structure of public utility law.

Second. Does Colorado Session Laws 1961, chapter 198, 115-1-3(2), which generally conferred jurisdiction over cooperatives in the public utilities commission, violate the constitution of Colorado or of the United States?

This question is answered in the negative. At the commencement of its consideration of this case, the court requested and received an additional oral argument from counsel, upon questions concerning the constitutionality of the 1961 amendments (particularly session laws of Colorado 1961, ch. 198, 115-1-3(2)) to the public utilitiy law, and the consequent investiture of the public utilities commission with jurisdiction of cooperatives.

* * * * *

The 1961 amendments to the public utilities law of the State of Colorado are valid, enforcible, and constitutional, C.R.S. 1963, 115-1-3(2) provides:

"Every cooperative electric association, or nonprofit electric corporation or association, and every other supplier of electrical energy, whether supplying electric energy for the use of the public or for the use of its own members, is hereby declared to be affected with a public interest and to be a public utility and to be subject to the jurisdiction, control, and regulation of the commission and to the provisions of articles 1 to 7 of this chapter."

This statute is couched in clear and cogent terms. It makes no exceptions. "Every cooperative electric association" is a public utility, as well as all other electric suppliers.

No issue has been raised in this case that Colorado-Ute is not a "cooperative electric association." By the terms of the statute, therefore, it is subject to the jurisdiction, control, and regulation of the public utilities commission, and we so hold.

Colorado-Ute in its application before the public utilities commission readily admits that it is a public utility. The application contains the following:

"Applicant is a corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Colorado subject to the jurisdiction of this commission under the provisions of H.R. No. 245 passed by the Colorado Legislature and signed by the Governor on April 23, 1961.

"The public convenience and necessity requires the construction of said generating plant, transmission lines, and related facilities, and the interconnections herein described."

These allegations are consistent only with the concept that Colorado-Ute is a public utility, and are inconsistent with any idea that it is concerned only with the needs and requirements of its cooperative members.

Western and Public Service admit that Colorado-Ute is a public utility. The legislature has declared in no uncertain terms that it is a public utility. It furnishes electrical energy which is used by countless consumers in a very large segment of this State. The widespread interest of the public is clearly shown, and this court should not declare the legislative act to be void, especially when the parties themselves admit that it is valid and enforceable.

There is an abundance of authority to support the classification of a wholesaler of energy to distributors as a public utility. (*North Carolina Public Service Co. et al.* v. *Southern Power Co.,* 282 Fed. 837; *Boone County Rural Electric Membership Corporation et al.* v. *Public Service Company of Indiana, et al.,* 239 Ind. 525, 159 N.E. 2d 121; *Orndoff* v. *Public Utilities Commission,* 135 Ohio State 438, 21 N.E. 2d 334; *Industrial Gas Company* v. *Public Utilities Commission of Ohio,* 135 Ohio St. 408, 21 N.E. 2d 166; *Wisconsin Traction Company* v. *Green Bay & Miss. Canal Co.,* 188 Wis. 54, 205 N.W. 551.)

The cooperative form of organization obviously has nothing to do with the question of what constitutes the public convenience and necessity, or with the obligation of any utility to prove public convenience and necessity in accordance with the theory of regulated monopoly as expressed by the statutes of the State of Colorado and the decisions of this court. These statutes were enacted for the benefit of the public as a whole, and result in the granting of regulated status to a supplier of a commodity essential to the public interest. Under regulation, an electric consumer need not be a member of a cooperative to secure its service. Likewise a consumer located in an area exclusively served by such cooperative must take its service if indeed service is to be received at all. The form of organization delivering service makes no difference whatever to these consumers and the legislature recognizes

reality when it specifically places the cooperatives under the regulatory arm of the State.

* * * * *

Third. Does the fact that Colorado-Ute, a cooperative, has but 13 members who are also cooperatives, warrant treatment of a different kind than that which would be applicable to any other kind of membership?

This question is answered in the negative. We find no merit to the argument that as a cooperative whose members are other cooperatives, Colorado-Ute is merely an extension or adjunct of these member cooperatives so that its act is the act of its members, and for that reason Colorado-Ute is not subject to regulation.

We observe first that Colorado-Ute is in all respects a separate legal entity; it has its own distinct corporate organization, including directors and officers; and it deals with its customers, whether cooperatives or not, by means of long-term power supply contracts. It is obvious that the decision to construct the Hayden plant was the decision of Colorado-Ute itself rather than its members as of the time the decision was made to build the Hayden plant. At that time it had no more than five members. Many of its new members did not become members or agree to power purchase contracts until shortly before the commission hearing commenced, which was long after the decision to construct the plant was made. It is, therefore, apparent that Colorado-Ute, instead of being the alter ego of its members, is the complete master of its own destiny. Thus the concept of it as a mere extension or adjunct of the distribution cooperative members has no legal or factual basis and is a forced and artificial one. But even if we accepted the artificial idea of the nature of Colorado-Ute as an alter ego, so to speak, of its members, no different application of the legal principles here involved would result. There is no contention in this case that those customers of Colorado-Ute that are themselves cooperatives are not public utilities and are not subject to the jurisdiction of the public utilities commission.

Any such cooperative, which had not theretofore generated its own electricity, would be required to secure Commission approval if it proposed to construct such a plant (C.R.S. 1963, 115–5–1), and, of course, if it came before the Commission with such purpose it, like any other utility, would be required to prove that the public convenience and necessity demanded such construction because it would then be engaging in a wholly new and distinct type of utility service (generation) theretofore supplied by a public utility providing the same commodity or service.

* * * * *

It is thus clearly apparent that the business of Colorado-Ute is affected with a special interest far beyond that of its 11 distributive cooperatives and therefore is not immune from regulation.

Fourth. Does that fact that the Hayden plant has already been completed require an affirmance of the judgment of the trial court?

The answer is "No." The court is aware that the Hayden plant is now constructed. This fact, however, cannot subvert the legal principles upon which our decision is based nor be allowed to defeat the doctrine of regulated monopoly to which Colorado subscribes. It is clear that both Colorado-Ute and the REA, its financing associate (who was not before the commission) recognized that construction of the Hayden plant during litigation was attended with substantial risk, and they engaged in such activity with full knowledge of the possible consequences.

For good reason, no contention is made that the construction precludes decisions by this court. It is the law that when the interest of the public is concerned it is not only the right but the duty of an appellate court to determine the issues, regardless of interim construction.

* * * * *

Colorado-Ute solemnly assured the commission and district court that in the event of the reversal of the commission order, Colorado-Ute and its Colorado consumers would escape scatheless from adverse economic consequences because Salt River of Arizona would then assume the obligation for the Hayden plant. The record discloses that counsel for Colorado-Ute wrote the commission under date of March 21, 1963, specifically stating that Salt River had agreed to take the Hayden plant off the hands of Colorado-Ute at no loss to Ute in the event that some court subsequently ruled that the certificate should not be issued.

* * * * *

When litigation in accordance with the statutes and procedures of the State in question is in progress, it needs no citation of authority to establish that consent of the State authority to the construction has not been obtained, nor could any reasonable person believe that security for the proposed loan is adequate and that the loan will be repaid in due course when the very right to construct the plant is still in litigation.

* * * * *

The judgment of the trial court is reversed and the cause remanded with directions that it vacate its judgment and thereafter direct the commission to vacate and set aside its decision No. 60156.

Mr. Justice Sutton concurs in the result.

Mr. Justice Frantz dissents.

OPTICAL ILLUSION OF GUNS AND BUTTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KREBS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the so-called Great Society has done it again. Once again, it is attempting to create an optical illusion of both guns and butter by seeking to transfer funds from time-tested and successful programs to its own controversial and politically motivated Great Society schemes.

I have heard many people say that the administration knows Congress will reinstate many of the programs cut in the budget, thus taking upon itself the responsibility for exceeding the record $112.8 billion budget figure.

I believe that, while this may be good politics, it is terrible statesmanship, especially when the so-called Great Society callously runs the risk of literally destroying as basic and successful a program as the Land Grant Act of 1862.

Mr. Speaker, the so-called Great Society budget for 1967 calls for a cut of nearly $12 million of instructional funds for the 68 land-grant colleges and universities. This is a cut of 80 percent, leaving only $2.5 million to be divided equally among the 50 States and Puerto Rico—about $50,000 to a State. In 17 States, the $50,000 must be subdivided between two institutions.

The budget also calls for a cut of $8.5 million in agricultural research funds, within the experiment stations conducted by the land-grant institutions. This is at a time when the President sends Congress a special message on the seriousness of the world food crisis.

The budget, in addition, calls for the transfer of $9.6 million from the cooperative extension program, also administered by the land-grant institutions, to Federal allocation for use in the rural antipoverty program. Yet, for decades, the cooperative extension service has had experience fighting poverty and if given the challenge would make great headway again as evidence has come to me recently.

No program in history has been more successful in fighting rural poverty than the cooperative extension program. For decades, county extension agents have raised the standards of rural America.

Mr. Speaker, I am shocked, amazed, astounded, and dismayed by these proposed budget cuts. Is this a Great Society or an ungrateful administration?

I am grateful and proud that in 1862 Senator J. S. Morrill, of Vermont, a Republican, sponsored the Land Grant College Act.

I am grateful and proud that a Republican Congress passed it into law.

I am grateful and proud that Abraham Lincoln, a Republican President, signed it into law.

I know from personal experience that the so-called Great Society has no ear for constructive Republican proposals, but it would seem to me that it might have some small bit of admiration for this Republican program which has worked so well for the past 104 years.

For a century, educators, Congressmen, and the public at large have hailed the Land Grant Act as the keystone of Federal participation in higher education. In 1951—under the Truman administration—the U.S. Office of Education bulletin summarized the feeling of many decades in these words:

> The whole realm of higher education in this country and to a lesser degree even in some other countries, has been profoundly influenced by the developments of the land-grant colleges and universities in popularizing higher education. They have demonstrated the partnership of the Federal and State Governments in the maintenance of a system of higher education which is designed to fulfill Federal, State, and local needs. They have spread widely the concept that higher education is something in which all people have a stake. They have, therefore, a place of deep affection in the hearts of the people. They are growing in strength and influence with each passing year.

Mr. Speaker, in 1967 is an ungrateful administration to move so far toward destruction of the Land Grant Act?

There are no other Federal programs to replace the instructional funds. State legislatures are virtually the only source of replacement revenue. Not only are they already overburdened in many cases, but most of them are not meeting this year.

College administrators must make their instructional arrangements for next fall within 2 or 3 months.

Where are they to get the money?

Mr. Speaker, 16 of the land-grant institutions are predominantly attended by Negroes and all of the 68 are fully integrated. Alcorn Agricultural and Mechanical College of Mississippi is a predominantly Negro institution. It depends on the land-grant funds for 25

percent of its entire instructional budget. Fort Valley State College of Georgia is a predominantly Negro college. It depends on these funds for 14 percent of its instructional budget and South Carolina State College is dependent to the extent of 13 percent. Where are they and the other 13 predominantly Negro institutions to find the money?

In fact, where are any of the 68 land-grant institutions to find the needed money if this budget cut is allowed?

In 1960, Congress took into account inflation and rising enrollments and unanimously increased the instructional funds of the land-grant colleges and universities from $5 million annually to $14.5 million. Now the Johnson administration wants them cut from $14.5 million to $2.5 million. Yet between 1960 and 1965 enrollments in these institutions increased 67 percent—from 639,489 to 1,027,498. The figure will be even higher next fall, for total college enrollment has been increasing at rates between 7 and 15 percent since World War II, with no end in sight. The land-grant college enrollments have grown more rapidly than any other type of college except junior colleges.

The proposed cut in both instructional and research funds of more than $20 million represents more than 2,000 faculty members and if put in terms of endowment represents a capital of $400 million.

Where are the 68 land-grant institutions to get the money?

Mr. Speaker, let us carefully examine the following chart, which shows how much would be lost to each of the land-grant institutions:

Funds for instruction and facilities (Morrill-Nelson, and Bankhead-Jones funds)

LAND-GRANT INSTITUTIONS	
All land-grant institutions	$14,500,000
Alabama:	
Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical College	95,170
Auburn University	182,477
Alaska: University of Alaska	205,376
Arizona: University of Arizona	230,951
Arkansas:	
Agricultural, Mechanical, and Normal College	66,125
University of Arkansas	176,333
California: University of California	573,580
Colorado: Colorado State University	241,689
Connecticut: University of Connecticut	260,260
Delaware:	
Delaware State College	42,122
University of Delaware	168,486
Florida:	
Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University	103,307
University of Florida	214,386
Georgia:	
Fort Valley State College	83,507
University of Georgia	210,216
Hawaii: University of Hawaii	215,040
Idaho: University of Idaho	215,858
Illinois: University of Illinois	439,618
Indiana: Purdue University	310,822
Iowa: Iowa State University of Science and Technology	265,544
Kansas: Kansas State University of Agricultural and Applied Science	251,783

Funds for instruction and facilities (Morrill-Nelson, and Bankhead-Jones funds)—Con.

LAND-GRANT INSTITUTIONS—continued	
Kentucky:	
Kentucky State College	$39,471
University of Kentucky	232,743
Louisiana:	
Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College	188,920
Southern University and Agricultural and Mechanical College	88,496
Maine: University of Maine	223,038
Maryland:	
Maryland State College, Division of the University of Maryland	32,844
University of Maryland	240,856
Massachusetts:	
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	16,667
University of Massachusetts	305,709
Michigan: Michigan State University	385,949
Minnesota: University of Minnesota	281,144
Mississippi:	
Alcorn Agricultural and Mechanical College	127,519
Mississippi State University	124,253
Missouri:	
Lincoln University	18,917
University of Missouri	283,760
Montana: Montana State College	216,038
Nebraska: University of Nebraska	233,546
Nevada: University of Nevada	206,781
New Hampshire: University of New Hampshire	214,426
New Jersey: Rutgers, the State University	344,201
New Mexico: New Mexico State University	222,605
New York: Cornell University	598,897
North Carolina:	
Agricultural and Technical College of North Carolina	101,737
State College of Agriculture and Engineering, University of North Carolina	206,557
North Dakota: North Dakota State University	215,032
Ohio: Ohio State University	430,710
Oklahoma:	
Langston University	25,534
Oklahoma State University of Agriculture and Applied Science	229,807
Oregon: Oregon State University	242,040
Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University	469,049
Puerto Rico: University of Puerto Rico	255,846
Rhode Island: University of Rhode Island	220,429
South Carolina:	
Clemson Agricultural College	128,316
South Carolina State College	128,316
South Dakota: South Dakota State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts	216,175
Tennessee:	
Tennessee Agricultural and Industrial State University	51,599
University of Tennessee	233,187
Texas:	
Prairie View Agricultural and Mechanical College	106,924
Texas Agricultural and Mechanical University	320,774
Utah: Utah State University of Agriculture and Applied Science	221,169
Vermont: University of Vermont and State Agricultural College	209,267

Funds for instruction and facilities (Morrill-Nelson, and Bankhead-Jones funds)—Con.

LAND-GRANT INSTITUTIONS—continued	
Virginia:	
Virginia Polytechnic Institute	$196,193
Virginia State College	98,097
Washington: Washington State University	267,818
West Virginia: West Virginia University	244,220
Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin	293,929
Wyoming: University of Wyoming	207,845

Mr. Speaker, equally serious to my mind is the proposed cut of some $8.5 million in agricultural research funds. I have said many times that we need to export our technology as well as our surpluses, so that the rest of the world can better learn to feed itself and help to meet the increasing food crisis.

How important is that crisis? On January 18, 1966, speaking before the U.N. World Food Program Conference, Secretary of Agriculture Freeman said:

> The problem is staggering. Unquestionably, there is a serious race between population and the food supply * * *. It will take an unprecedented effort to break the chain of hunger and despair in the developing nations of the world. No single nation and no single technique is powerful enough to solve a problem so vast in scope and complex in nature. It will take the combined resources of many nations and a broad application of the entire spectrum of agricultural knowledge in undeveloped nations to conquer such an adversary.

Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States, on February 10, 1966, sent to the Congress a special message in which he said:

> One new element in today's world is the threat of mass hunger and starvation. Populations are exploding under the impact of sharp cuts in the death rate. Successful public health measures have saved millions of lives. But these lives are now threatened by hunger because food production has not kept pace.

Mr. Speaker, an editorial entitled "The War on Hunger," in the October 1965 edition of the Farm Journal says:

> What can be done to step up crop yields? Not much can happen without such basics as stable government, education, and a system of incentives that lets a man keep enough of what he earns.
>
> Farmers anywhere need good seed, fertilizer, pesticides, machinery, experiment stations, extension service, good farm magazines and farm radio, good roads, farm credit and a system of markets that lets them sell something, rather than just feed themselves.
>
> We've done quite a bit about some of these, but this is the area where we need to step up our efforts sharply. Sending food is a necessary aid. Helping build agriculture on the spot is the only real solution.

Mr. Speaker, who has engineered the vast portion of American progress in agriculture which has led to our vast surplus productive capacity from the standpoint of domestic need? It has been the research facilities of the land-grant colleges.

Who has made the findings of the land-grant researchers generally known to farmers as a group? The land-grant cooperative extension program.

Does the Johnson administration really believe that it holds the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth in the field of agricultural technology? Does it feel that no further knowledge is needed?

Coupled with slashes in the budget for the Agriculture Department's own research funds, the actual reduction in federally supported research in this area amounts to more than 20 percent, since research costs increase at the rate of 5 or 6 percent a year. This comes at the same time that the Secretary of Agriculture joins the President of the United States in pointing out the world food crisis. This is indeed, an optical illusion.

The Johnson administration likewise proposes to shift away from the cooperative extension service, which pioneered the fight against rural poverty, $10 million, and to use it in—you guessed it—a rural war on poverty. This is, indeed, an optical illusion.

Mr. Speaker, the following chart shows the loss to individual agricultural experiment stations under the proposed cut, excluding regional research funds:

Effect of reduction on Hatch formula funds

Alabama	—$154,803
Alaska	—39,276
Arizona	—54,246
Arkansas	—125,614
California	—170,852
Colorado	—71,560
Connecticut	—59,084
Delaware	—42,568
Florida	—101,213
Georgia	—166,981
Hawaii	—40,973
Idaho	—67,937
Illinois	—198,255
Indiana	—178,709
Iowa	—187,918
Kansas	—117,055
Kentucky	—185,706
Louisiana	—117,313
Maine	—59,662
Maryland	—84,252
Massachusetts	—72,620
Michigan	—185,031
Minnesota	—176,166
Mississippi	—171,854
Missouri	—174,967
Montana	—63,165
Nebraska	—107,063
Nevada	—38,280
New Hampshire	—46,324
New Jersey	—68,952
New Mexico	—55,340
New York	—181,601
North Carolina	—268,872
North Dakota	—81,446
Ohio	—217,165
Oklahoma	—108,035
Oregon	—81,508
Pennsylvania	—217,112
Puerto Rico	—207,080
Rhode Island	—38,602
South Carolina	—143,824
South Dakota	—81,790
Tennessee	—192,444
Texas	—236,724
Utah	—48,998
Vermont	—50,502
Virginia	—165,377
Washington	—95,018
West Virginia	—98,001
Wisconsin	—176,452
Wyoming	—45,710
Subtotal	—6,120,000

Mr. Speaker, why are these cuts asked? I quote from a February 4 statement by the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges:

> Relationships between the Federal Government and the land-grant institutions, in which for more than a century desirable national objectives have been accomplished with a maximum of institutional independence and decisionmaking, have long been hailed as a model of Federal-State relationships in education. An across-the-board modification of these institutional related programs, at a time when Federal support of higher education is being increased in federally selected categories, may be viewed as raising fundamental philosophic issues. We were of the opinion that these were not fully understood or considered under the unusual conditions which surrounded preparation of the 1967 budget.

TRIBUTES TO WARREN ABNER SEAVEY AND EDMUND M. MORGAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HUNGATE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, it is my purpose at this time to pay tribute to two giants of the law who have recently passed away.

At this time, when we are all concerned with the establishment of world peace and the movement to establish world peace through world law, I think the contributions of such men deserve our consideration, and their memory deserves our attention.

These men were Warren A. Seavey, a professor who taught at Harvard Law School, among other places, and was most noted for his contribution in the field of torts and agency, and also Edmund M. Morgan, who taught the law of evidence there and was also a law professor at Texas and other schools throughout the country.

Professor Seavey was a gentleman who employed the Socratic form of teaching in its highest form. He taught solely by questions, and thereby sought to teach young men and would-be lawyers to think—the most important job, after all, that any citizen can have. Professor Seavey instilled the idea that if we are ever, in our lives or in our world, to obtain the right answers to our problems, we must learn first to ask the right questions.

In the beginning, as he would greet a new class of students, none of whom were acquainted with the mysteries of the law, he would tell them absolutely nothing but ask questions for hour on hour. Frequently it was stated that while he was a man who caused you the most discomfort while you were in the law school, his memory was one that you would treasure more highly than any other as the years went by. I know, in my own case, I found that statement to be eminently correct.

During the period of World War II, Professor Seavey served as acting dean of the Harvard Law School, and during that time he wrote law students and young lawyers all around the world. Anyone who wrote to Professor Seavey was certain to get a response from him. Toward the end of the war the letters came from all parts of the world, and Professor Seavey was designated an adviser to the veterans.

To illustrate the manner in which he wrote, I quote from a sample of his writing furnished by Dean Griswold, of Harvard. When he received a letter from a veteran, he would answer:

> I am glad you want to come to law school. You are just the sort of man we want. When you are released from the service, come to Cambridge and we will be glad to take you in no matter when you come.

These letters were kept by the men to whom they were sent, and they turned up after the war when, indeed, there were thousands and thousands of men seeking admission to law schools all around the country, and the problem of being admitted was most difficult. They were treated by the law school at Cambridge as estoppels by the admission committee, and many men owe their legal education to this kind and tender spot that Professor Seavey had for those who served their country in World War II.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I desire to have printed a statement prepared by Dean Erwin Griswold of the Harvard Law School:

WARREN ABNER SEAVEY, 1880–1966

(Statement of Erwin N. Griswold)

A mighty oak has fallen, but his strength will long contribute to this community and to the law. We are met this afternoon of an old fashioned New England winter day to pay our respect and tribute to Warren Seavey who was a son of New England and shared its many virtues. This is not a time of sadness, for Warren Seavey lived a full and productive life. It is, rather, a time of recognition, a time for us to recall one more great career of the sort whose intertwinings here have given to this university its life, its color, and much of its significance.

Warren Seavey was born in Charlestown, only a few miles from here, in 1880. He came to Harvard College, receiving the A.B. degree in 1902, and then to the law school where he received the LL.B. degree in 1904, with an A average which would today mean a magna cum laude. He then practiced law for 2 years in Boston. But he was at heart a teacher, and in 1906 he started his work as a teacher which lasted for more than 50 years. His first assignment was in China, at the Imperial Pei Yang University, where he established and operated a law school. It was also rumored that he was quite influential with the Old Empress in the closing days of the dynasty. He was decorated with the Order of the Double Dragon, and he kept mementos of his China days in his office all through his active life.

In 1911, Seavey returned to Cambridge for 1 year as a lecturer on law. He then became a professor at Oklahoma State University, where he stayed for 2 years, then at Tulane University Law School, where he stayed for 2 more years, from 1914 to 1916, and then at Indiana University Law School where he was a member of the faculty from 1916 to 1920. But his work at Indiana was interrupted by the First World War. He was commissioned a captain in the infantry in August 1917, and was assigned to active duty in France. After the close of the war in 1918, he became director of the college of law of the AEF University which was established near Dijon in France. He took on this assignment with enthusiasm and energy, and soon had a large and flourishing law school in full operation under great difficulties. He used to tell with relish

how he commandeered mimeograph machines and other items in order to put together case books for use in his school. He was usually just one jump ahead of a court martial, but he claimed, I think rightly, that he was dean of the largest law school then teaching American law. Many members of the Army of the United States must have got their legal start as a result of his devoted work. But, as I have said, he was at heart a teacher. He loved every minute of it.

In 1920, Seavey became the dean of the College of Law at the University of Nebraska. That was a time and place when a dean had to be a man, and Seavey showed on various occasions that he was capable of filling the post. After 6 years there, he started his move east. In 1926, he went to the University of Pennsylvania Law School as a professor of law. In 1927, he came back to Harvard, where he remained a member of the faculty of the law school until his retirement in 1955. For the last 17 years of his tenure, he was Bussey professor of law.

As a teacher Seavey was the acknowledged master of the Socratic method. He questioned, questioned, questioned; and he dissected the students' ideas, and occasionally the students themselves. Though always vigorous in the classroom, he was on the whole a kindly teacher. He liked the students, and he loved to teach. While some faculty members mutter about a teaching load of 6 hours a week, Seavey used to ask the dean to assign him 8 or 9 hours. Naturally there was no opposition to this since he handled the classes so well, and he so greatly enjoyed his teaching.

Seavey's principal fields were agency and torts, and he made substantial and lasting contributions to both areas, as well as to the fields of judgments and restitution. He wrote books and articles in agency and torts, and he played an important part in the writing of the American Law Institute's restatements of agency and of torts, and was primarily responsible for the restatements of judgments and of restitution.

Seavey was not a smooth or polished man. But he was not really gruff, either. He had a measure of reserve; but with that was great loyalty to men and institutions, and devotion to his profession and his students. On many occasions he helped students with loans, always in a quiet and kindly way. Perhaps I may be pardoned a personal reference when I say that when I bought my house in Belmont in 1936 I extended myself to the limit through borrowing at the bank. Just weeks after the mortgage was signed, the lot next door became available. I wanted to have that lot, and it has proved to be a very attractive and useful addition to the house. But I had no money at all. So I went to Warren Seavey, told him my tale, and he immediately reached for his checkbook and advanced the money to me. This was typical of his interest in his associates and his generous spirit.

Seavey was not a warmonger, but he saw sooner than some the way events were developing for the United States in 1939–41. About 1940, he was the principal mover in organizing what was called American Defense—Harvard Group. Many of the participants were members of the law school faculty. The group held regular meetings, and many members made speeches, wrote pamphlets, letters to the newspapers, and so on. Seavey was at the heart of the organization, which played an active role in opposing America First and other isolationist groups of the time.

Then war came, late in 1941. I well remember a meeting of students held in the courtroom shortly after Pearl Harbor. Warren Seavey was one of the speakers. I well remember the occasion. He was calm. He was in no sense exhilarated by the thought of war, but he did tell the students that this was a job that had to be done, that most of them would find it a stimulating and valuable experience. He told them, too, that of course there was some risk, but that most of them would come back—as they had in 1919, and as they did in 1945. It was a very balanced, sober, and extremely useful presentation, and I know it was so received by many of the young men then facing the unknown which he himself had faced in 1917–18.

While the war was on, Seavey wrote to many law students and young lawyers all over the world. Anyone who wrote to him was sure to get a response, a thoughtful, helpful, fatherly answer to the questions which he raised. Toward the end of the war, many of these letters came from people in Tarawa or in Okinawa or in Germany asking about admission to the law school, for Seavey was designated as adviser to veterans. I am sure that the letters he sent were a great comfort to the recipients, for he had a way of writing: "I am glad that you want to come to law school. You are just the sort of man we want. When you are released from service, come to Cambridge and we will be glad to take you in, no matter when you come." Many of these letters turned up, carefully treasured by the men to whom they were sent. Of course we took them in. They were called estoppels by the admissions committee. It would be hard to tell now how many men owed their legal education to the kind and tender spot which Warren Seavey had in his heart for the men who risked themselves in the service of our country in the great war of 1941–45.

In the immediate postwar period, Seavey was a stalwart of the faculty. In 1947, he was chosen by his fellow law teachers to be president of the Association of American Law Schools. He stayed on as a teacher here until he was 75, retiring in 1955. But he then continued to teach—at Boston College Law School, at New York University, at Hastings College of the Law, at the University of Texas, at Vanderbilt University, at Washington University in St. Louis, and for several years at the Wake Forest College of Law. Here he continued his great contributions as a gifted teacher.

I would not say that Warren Seavey did not grow old gracefully. But he did not grow old easily. He was an activist at heart, and he resented the physical impairments which came to him in his later years. But he never gave in. He never surrendered. He was working right up to the day of his death, though he had been in much pain for many years.

In 1914, he married Stella, his devoted wife for more than 50 years, to whom he was devoted, in sickness and in health. They had three children, of whom two survive. They also had many satisfactions, the result of great accomplishments.

Some people have the quality of being great sources of strength for other people. Warren Seavey was such a person. It is fitting that we should pay him tribute. And all of us who knew him, and were influenced by him, owe him our deep and heartfelt thanks.

JANUARY 24, 1966.

Professor Morgan was a giant in the field of evidence. He was a perfect gentleman at all times in his consideration of his students outside the classroom as well as in. Although he treated them with a kind and courteous manner, he had no soft spot toward any particular students and he had no soft spot as to anyone who was misinformed as to the state and existence of the law.

It seems to me the field in which he labored and contributed much toward the establishment of a model code of evidence is one of great importance today, because the terms "due process of law" and the "fair hearing" are not to have their greatest meaning unless we understand the rules of evidence, the rights of confrontation, the rights of cross-examination, and are able to protect and expand the rights of citizens which fully exist only as they are fully exercised.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HATHAWAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, during my years at Harvard Law School it was my pleasure to get to know Professor Seavey both in the classroom and to a limited extent socially.

In the classroom my first reaction to this master of the Socratic method of teaching was not a favorable one, as I suppose was the reaction of most first-year students to such a seemingly diabolical method of instruction. But, I came to appreciate after several months of listening to Seavey's famous "Because?" and after getting used to the fact that he was not going to give us any pat answers, that learning, especially in the field of law, was not to be adequately gained by reading treatises or textbooks but by being forced to go through the same or similar mental process which plagued those who were responsible for generating the underlying concepts of the law. Seavey's teaching method, which was not his alone, but I give him credit for it because he was the master of it, served also to make us realize that the law was an ever-changing process designed to meet the exigencies of the day and not a mathematical formula that could be applied forever.

I learned from him socially, the social occasions being too infrequent visits to his office both when I was a student and afterward and from an occasional informal talk at a social gathering, that a lawyer had more than just an obligation to meet his material needs. He instilled in me as I am sure he did in others a greater feeling of obligation to make the world a better place to inhabit. In fact the late professor made it crystal clear that it was a lawyer's highest calling to enter the political arena and thereby help fulfill his obligation to mankind by attempting to innovate and improve the rules men live by.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HATHAWAY] wished me to add that he had not had the privilege of personally studying under Professor Morgan but had enjoyed the benefits of his works and wanted me to explain his great respect for Professor Morgan as a teacher.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

EULOGY TO THE LATE PROFESSOR WARREN A. SEAVEY OF THE HARVARD LAW SCHOOL

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HUNGATE] to pay tribute to the memory of a great scholar and educator, the late Prof. Warren A. Seavey, of the Harvard Law School, who recently passed away.

It was my privilege, as a Harvard law student, to study under this great man of the law and thereby come in contact with his vast store of knowledge, his remarkable perceptivity, and his overall humanity.

Professor Seavey was himself a Harvard man, obtaining his law degree in 1904, and entering the practice of law in his native Boston that same year. From 1906 through 1911 he served in the capacity of professor and acting head of the law school at the Imperial Pei-Yeng University in China, where he was awarded the Order of the Double Dragon, by the imperial government. Returning stateside in 1912 Professor Seavey lectured on law at Harvard, and served as a professor at the Universities of Oklahoma, Tulane, and Indiana, before obtaining a captain's commission in the AEF in 1919. As director of the law school at the American Expeditionary Forces University, at Beaune, France, in 1919, he was decorated with the Palmes Academiques, by the French Government. Back in the United States again, in 1920, Professor Seavey was named dean of the law college at the University of Nebraska, where he stayed through 1926. After that, a year at the University of Pennsylvania was followed by appointment to the staff at Harvard Law School where Professor Seavey remained until his retirement in 1955.

Although he was professor emeritus of the Harvard Law School, Professor Seavey continued his distinguished career as an active legal scholar and teacher at the Washington Square College of Law in New York City for several years prior to his death.

Professor Seavey was general editor of the American Case Book series. He personally edited famous casebooks in his special fields of torts, agency, and restitution. His vast erudition in the law made possible his brilliant editorship of the "Restatements of Torts and Agency" for the American Law Institute.

It was, indeed, a pleasure and an honor to study under this great lawyer and educator, whose memory shall linger so long as law prevails.

EULOGY TO THE LATE EDMUND M. MORGAN, FORMERLY OF THE HARVARD LAW SCHOOL

Mr. Speaker, the death of Edmund M. Morgan, for 52 years an outstanding professor of law in some of our greatest universities, is not only a blow to the academic profession, but also to everyone who ever knew, admired, and studied under this most remarkable man.

As a student at Harvard Law School I was privileged to study under him, and came away from the experience convinced that here, indeed, was a man of great distinction.

Born in Mineral Ridge, Ohio, in 1878, Mr. Morgan obtained his law degree at Harvard and practiced law in Duluth, Minn., for a number of years and was elected assistant city attorney of Duluth in 1909, and served in that office for 2 years. Joining the U.S. Army in 1917 Professor Morgan rose to the rank of lieutenant colonel and held the post of Assistant to the Judge Advocate General of the U.S. Army prior to being honorably discharged.

As a law professor Mr. Morgan worked at the University of Minnesota, Yale, Harvard, and Vanderbilt. At the close of World War II he was named principle chairman of a committee which drafted a code of military justice for the Department of Defense. He also served for a time as a member of a U.S. Supreme Court advisory committee on Federal rules of civil service procedure.

Professor Morgan was a member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the American Bar Association, and the American Law Institute. He also was the author of several major books on legal matters, including: "An Introduction to the Study of Law," "Cases of Common Law Pleading," "Cases on Evidence," "The Legacy of Sacco and Vanzetti," "Some Problems of Proof Under the Anglo-American System," and "Basic Problems of Evidence," the last of which works was published as recently as 1963.

A man of brilliance, clarity, and great heart—a man of great talent as a teacher, Professor Morgan won the respect and affection of all who knew him as both a professor and a man.

Mr. HUNGATE. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would simply state that over the doors of the main entrance to the Harvard Law School, inscribed in Latin, are the words which I understand are translated: "Not under man but under God and law." I think all of us revere this country for those principles. I would say that while we live in a land not under man, but under God and law, men such as Professor Seavey and Professor Morgan are essential men if we are fully to understand our obligations and responsibilities under the law and to our God.

COMMUNISM AND THE COLLEGES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, a man for whom my admiration is without limit, stated that the Communist Party of the United States is seizing on the current "insurrectionary climate" on American college campuses to serve the Moscow cause.

This statement was written in his monthly letter to U.S. law enforcement officers. In it, he continued by stating that the college student today is "being subjected to a bewildering and dangerous conspiracy" through "a feigned concern for the vital rights of free speech, dissent, and petition."

On many campuses he faces a turbulence built on unrestrained individualism, repulsive dress and speech, outright obscenity, disdain for moral and spiritual values, and disrespect for law and order.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the House must react to this statement of Mr. Hoover's in one of two ways.

We can ignore it, first of all.

We can say to the people of this country that what Mr. Hoover has said is entirely untrue, that he is mistaken, that there is no harm that can come to this country from the situation he describes.

That is the first thing we can do.

The second is to say, first to ourselves and then to the people, that Mr. Hoover's statement is true in all essential parts.

The difference between these two positions is the difference between the poles. If we take the first position then we have to do nothing. If, however, we take the second position that he has correctly described the condition which exists, then we cannot pass over it and do nothing.

I, for one, see no possible way we can take this first position.

To deny that the turmoil on the Berkeley campus in California is not Communist instigated is simply impossible.

To say that there has not been a decline in moral and spiritual values at the same time there has been an increase in obscenity and, as Mr. Hoover describes it, unrestrained individualism, would be to refute practically every theologian, every social observer in the Nation.

To say that there is no evidence that this strife has not been fomented, agitated, and perpetuated by the Communists would be sheer foolishness.

To hold that the W. E. B. Dubois Clubs which are springing up like mushrooms on campuses from coast to coast are not Communist-supported organizations, would be to deny the accuracy of practically every written report on their activities.

And so, Mr. Speaker, where do we find ourselves? We find ourselves with only one decision inevitable, not two; one position we can take, not two.

We must acknowledge the accuracy of what the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation has said and once we have acknowledged it we must take action. We could not call ourselves representatives of the people if we did not. We could not pretend that we are upholding the oath each of us swore when we took office if we know this condition to exist and do nothing about it.

In his monthly letter, Mr. Hoover reports that the Communist Party's spring convention this year will concentrate on plans to win support from this group of students. He suggested that the public oppose the movement by supporting the "millions of youth who refuse to swallow the Communist bait" and by making it clear, "we do not intend to stand idly by and let demagogs make a mockery of our laws."

Mr. Speaker, I, for one, do not intend to sit idly by.

These statements of the Director of the FBI are official pronouncements. They are not rumors, idly conceived. They are facts arrived at through the resources of the Bureau. The head of this Federal agency is reporting to his officers and, indirectly, to this Congress and the people. We cannot turn our

backs on him and refuse to hear his warning.

I am, today, introducing a resolution which says:

That the Committee on Un-American Activities, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the organizations known as Students for a Democratic Society, the W. E. B. Dubois Clubs, the American Youth Peace Crusade, the American Youth for Democracy, Progressive Youth Organizing Committee, Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, Labor Youth League, and the Black Muslims and to study and report upon their involvement in protests relating to official U.S. policy in Vietnam and for the purpose of aiding the Congress in the consideration of any remedial legislation.

I am prompted to do what I can to support Mr. Hoover for a number of reasons: because I revere this Nation, because I loath communism, because the students who have not "swallowed the Communist bait" need our recognition and support, to name but three reasons.

Each is sufficient; I need not mention others.

I have lent my support to an investigation of the Ku Klux Klan on the premise that un-Americanism should be rooted out of any organization no matter where it exists or what its name is. By the same token and for exactly the same reason, I intend to press for an investigation of these organizations named in my bill. The Director of the FBI has, himself, stated that at least one of them, the W. E. B. Dubois Clubs of America are Communist. His word is good enough for me. It should be enough for any Member to, at least, prompt him to join in a demand for a congressional investigation of it and organizations like it. The House Committee on Un-American Activities will have shirked its duty to the people if it does not conduct these investigations. This is where communism is.

I pray that this body has not reached a point where the Federal Bureau of Investigation can tell us that an organization is Communist and we sit on our hands and do nothing about it.

I think the time has come, instead, that any Member who has any reservation about the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the FBI, or Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, subordinate them all and put the safety, security, and welfare of this Nation first.

I would not have any idea how to tell the people of the Fourth District of Louisiana that I was opposed to an investigation of a known Communist organization dedicated to corrupting the youth of America. I pray that you would have the same difficulty and join me in urging passage of this resolution.

THE 100TH CUBAN REFUGEE FLIGHT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Cuban refugee program, which President Johnson inaugurated in a speech at the foot of the Statue of Liberty on October 3, 1965, has passed an important milestone.

With the completion of the 100th flight on Monday, February 14, 1966, more than 8,700 Cubans, including hundreds of families, have been given a haven from Communist tyranny through the help and generosity of the American people.

While Dictator Castro is bent on the destruction of the family as the foundation of Cuban society, the people of this country have extended a helping hand to these Cuban refugees by uniting their families so that they can return to their homeland when that country is again free.

Of the 8,700 Cubans arriving in the United States since the new exodus began on December 1, 1965, approximately 5,300 or 61 percent of the refugees have been resettled in communities throughout the United States, while an estimated 3,400 or 39 percent have been reunited with families and relatives in the Miami area.

A preliminary survey of the operations of the program by the legislative assistant of the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality reveals that the refugees are being forced to leave Cuba with only 44 pounds of luggage.

Castro is stripping these refugees of all their worldly possessions. By seizing their belongings, Castro is banking hundreds of millions of dollars in an effort to bolster his shaky economy.

Because of the national and internal significance of the Cuban refugee program, the House Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality, of which I am chairman, is making a full-scale study of the program—its benefits and problems.

From time to time, as the study progresses, I will make regular reports—both formal and informal—to the Congress outlining the information gathered by the subcommittee.

NATIONAL TRAFFIC SAFETY ACT

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker 2 weeks ago today the National Traffic Safety Act was introduced in this House and in the Senate. The bill would establish a National Traffic Safety Agency.

Thirty-eight Members of the House and Senate from 27 States have already joined as sponsors of this important legislation. These sponsors come from Hawaii to Maine and from Washington and California to Florida. There has been a significant national response to this mounting national problem.

I call upon Members of the House and Senate to join with us in an effective attack on what has been called the national problem second only to national defense.

The urgency for public hearings, enactment of the bill, and swift executive action has been pointed up by recent development.

On February 11, the National Safety Council released casualty figures for 1965. These statistics show that 4,940 American citizens were killed last December—the worst single month on record. They report 49,000 men, women, and children killed during 1965. An estimated 1,800,000 individuals suffered disabling injuries.

Economic losses continue to mount. The council says direct financial loss totaled $8.5 billion, of which $3 billion came from damaged and destroyed property. The remainder of the cost resulted from wage loss, medical expense, and overhead cost of insurance.

Second, the inadequacy and ineffectiveness of present public and private efforts is apparent. Existing Federal activities are fragmented and incomplete and all other proposals introduced or rumored are fragmented and incomplete. State legislatures and local legislative bodies are floundering and failing because there is no national leadership in our Government to which well-intentioned legislators and local officials can turn to find accurate answers as to what constitutes "uniform" legislation in the field of traffic safety and to many other questions. A National Traffic Safety Agency offers our best hope for vigorous and effective leadership.

The declared purpose of our bill is to reduce the extent of death, injury, and loss of property resulting from traffic accidents by providing the means for a concerted attack on the problem through the establishment of a National Traffic Safety Agency headed by a highly qualified Administrator; the establishment of a National Traffic Safety Center which would bring together public and private information and research; and a national program for traffic safety which shall seek to achieve a uniform national traffic safety environment by means of vigorous application of knowledge as to the principal causes of traffic accidents, death, and injuries.

The following 23 Members of the House are sponsors of the bill: JAMES A. MACKAY, Democrat, of Georgia; JOHN E. MOSS, Democrat, of California; JOHN HANSEN, Democrat, of Iowa; RODNEY M. LOVE, Democrat, of Ohio; WILLIAM ST. ONGE, Democrat, of Connecticut; ROBERT T. ASHMORE, Democrat, of South Carolina; WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY, Democrat, of Maine; RUSSELL TUTEN, Democrat, of Georgia; HAROLD D. DONOHUE, Democrat, of Massachusetts; GEORGE W. GRIDER, Democrat, of Tennessee; JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, Democrat, of Washington, HERVEY G. MACHEN, Democrat, of Maryland; SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, Democrat, of Hawaii; EDWIN REINECKE, Republican, of California; CHARLES L. WELTNER, Democrat, of Georgia; SAM M. GIBBONS, Demo-

crat, of Florida; FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN, Democrat, of Rhode Island; JOHN C. CULVER, Democrat, of Iowa; JAMES C. CORMAN, Democrat, of California; J. IRVING WHALLEY, Republican, of Pennsylvania; ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Democrat, of New York; RICHARD D. MCCARTHY, Democrat, of New York; and CHARLES P. FARNSLEY, Democrat, of Kentucky.

Senator HARTKE, who introduced the bill in the Senate, has been joined by 14 of his colleagues. They are: GORDON ALLOTT, Republican, of Colorado; E. L. BARTLETT, Democrat, of Alaska; BIRCH BAYH, Democrat, of Indiana; ALAN BIBLE, Democrat, of Nevada; JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania; PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois; ERNEST GRUENING, Democrat, of Alaska; DANIEL K. INOUYE, Democrat, of Hawaii; GALE W. MCGEE, Democrat, of Wyoming; LEE METCALF, Democrat, of Montana; A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma; JOSEPH M. MONTOYA, Democrat, of New Mexico; FRANK E. MOSS, Democrat, of Utah; and CLAIBORNE PELL, Democrat, of Rhode Island.

THE SPECTER OF A NUCLEAR HOLOCAUST

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, in the press of our routine duties, I fear we are sometimes prone to give only perfunctory attention to the transcendent issues over which we can exert little individual influence.

It is entirely proper that we should concern ourselves with the affairs of our own constituents, our district, our State, and our country. But we must not overlook what is today the paramount concern of all mankind—the specter of a nuclear holocaust which could destroy in one searing moment all of the accomplishments of man since the dawn of civilization.

That is the dread prospect which we must live with day by day. There is not much that any one of us can do to dispell it. But we must each do what we can. It is for that reason that I wish to associate myself with numerous of my colleagues in submitting the accompanying resolution, supporting the President in his continuing efforts to halt the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

It goes without saying that the malignant nuclear growth is only a symptom of a deep-rooted disease that has afflicted mankind since its primeval beginnings—a deadly fear that is nurtured by distrust, suspicion, and hatred. In the long run we can only eliminate the symptom by wiping out the sickness.

As the most powerful Nation in the world it is up to us to reassure our neighbors that they need not join in the nuclear scramble; that the road to peace and security leads through the valley of understanding. Let us point the way.

WILL THERE BE A SUBWAY STATION TO SERVE LOW- AND MODERATE-INCOME FAMILIES AT THE JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS SUCH AS THE ADMINISTRATION PROVIDED AT THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA STADIUM?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report to the Congress by the National Capital Transportation Agency concerning the feasibility of providing a subway station at the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. The report states, among other things, that:

> Increased construction costs would result from the longer subway construction (1,360 feet), the additional Cultural Center station, and more difficult engineering problems relating to curves, grades, and geological conditions. The increased cost of this realinement is estimated at $12.3 million, but this added cost will be even greater if:
>
> 1. The George Washington University and others insist upon compensation for easements on a "highest and best use" or other expensive basis;
>
> 2. Buildings in the Columbia Plaza development currently under construction must be underpinned;
>
> 3. Detailed soils investigation of the difficult geological site of a Cultural Center station disclose further problems in addition to those currently assumed.

This NCTA report makes clear that in addition to a minimum cost of $12.3 million, major problems and difficulties will be encountered in placing a subway station at the Kennedy Center. The trustees of the Kennedy Center, as well as Roger L. Stevens, chairman of the Board of Trustees, have repeatedly declared that a subway station will be provided at the Kennedy Center but have not lifted a finger to provide one. Rather, the strategy of the Center's chairman, Roger L. Stevens, and its Board of Trustees, is to have the Kennedy Center "constructed and completed," and thus foreclose forever any reconsideration of its manifold problems, "by the time the NCTA commences design of the line to Rosslyn." This plan of battle was first outlined October 15, 1965, by Roger L. Stevens in a 14-page memorandum he privately circulated to 144 signers of a petition relating to the location of the Kennedy Center.

In this memorandum Roger Stevens said:

> We hope that by the time the NCTA commences design of the line to Rosslyn, the Center will have been constructed and completed. There is every reason to believe that NCTA and its engineers and experts will take into consideration the Center and the adjacent housing facilities and locate the station as near the Center as feasible. With these facts in mind, there is no merit to the statement that there will be "no station near the Center."

In my statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on October 1, 1965, I said, with regard to locating a subway station at the Kennedy Center, such as the administration has provided at the District of Columbia Stadium, that:

> The rapid transit route recently approved by Congress will not serve the riverfront site now designated by the Kennedy Center.
>
> I am sending this information to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. Yesterday, recognizing the need for accessibility, he recommended that the subway route be altered to provide a station at the Center. This should have been brought up at the time the subway bill was voted a couple of weeks ago. The route of the subway, which does not serve the Center, is part and parcel of the act as passed by the Senate and House and signed by President Johnson. If the Senator's solution is a practical one, that too would require immediate hearings on an amendment of the Rapid Transit Act. Certainly Senator CLARK, who was once the mayor of the great city of Philadelphia, should know that many thousands of Philadelphia Orchestra subscribers travel to the centrally located Academy of Music via the municipal subway which conveniently serves it.

Many competent and concerned observers have repeatedly questioned whether the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, and the trustees of the Kennedy Center have really given the same quality of sustained thought and planning to the many problems of the Kennedy Center including a subway, jet plane noise, and its location, which the Smithsonian Regents have given to the location of the other art branches of the Smithsonian Institution such as the National Gallery of Art, the National Portrait Gallery, and the National Collection of Fine Arts—not to mention the National Air and Space Museum—which, significantly, are all located in the very heart of Washington for easy and ready access by constituents from all over the Nation. The very same logic which justifies the location of these great institutions in the heart of the Nation's Capital rather than at its periphery, calls for the location of the Kennedy Center in the heart of the city also for it must have public patronage if it is not to become a white elephant and be a continuing financial drain on the public purse in the years ahead.

It is most significant that growing criticism is at last being made of Kennedy Center planning. Both of the trustees from the District of Columbia, where the Center is located, Walter N. Tobriner, President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and William H. Waters, Jr., chairman of the District of Columbia Recreation Board, have joined in supporting Dr. S. Dillon Ripley, in his justified criticism of the planning that has been carried on at the Kennedy Center under Roger L. Stevens. In a letter to Roger L. Stevens under date of November 22, 1965, Dr. Ripley pointed to the views of President Kennedy regarding the role of the Center, a

reminder that was certainly long overdue:

Writing of the Center, President Kennedy said: "It was not conceived as a group of halls and theaters to benefit Washington audiences alone * * *. The Center will, I hope, become in the broadest sense an educational as well as a cultural institution." It was in the spirit of this mandate and of this hope that the Regents of the Smithsonian welcomed the decision to establish the Center as a bureau of the Institution. They stood ready, as they do today, to offer all possible assistance to the Board and officers of the Center in the furtherance of these high objectives. I am writing now in the conviction that, unless positive steps are taken immediately, we will fail to take full advantage of the magnificent opportunities implicit in the Center.

Recently Dr. S. Dillon Ripley advised me that he had brought my bill, H.R. 11785, to provide a subway station at the Kennedy Center, to the attention of Chairman Roger L. Stevens "for any comment he may have on H.R. 11785." Perhaps, now that the report of the National Capital Transportation Agency on the excessive cost of such a subway station has been made public, Mr. Stevens may wish to make his views publicly known on this matter.

President Johnson on February 14, 1966, sent Congress the annual report of the National Capital Transportation Agency, but he did not mention the little matter of a subway station at the Kennedy Center which is essential if it is to be readily accessible to the millions of Americans from all parts of the Nation, and their families, who will wish to attend the Kennedy Center when they visit the Nation's Capital—and 7 million Americans do visit the Nation's Capital each year. Obviously, Chairman Roger L. Stevens has not mentioned the matter of a subway station to the President, for, in his letter transmitting to Congress the annual report of the National Capital Transportation Agency, President Johnson said:

> The Congress can be assured, however, that all of these problems are being given the fullest and most diligent consideration, and that none of them will be allowed to stand in the way of an uninterrupted schedule of construction.

I feel that my own concern about the location of the Kennedy Center is fully supported by the report of Walter J. McCarter, Administrator, National Capital Transportation Agency, and by the letter Dr. S. Dillon Ripley sent to Roger L. Stevens last November.

The Congress and the trustees of the Kennedy Center should review the present plans. We are told it would be costly to do so—yes, it would be at some cost, but it would save millions of dollars in an effort to bail out an economically infeasible location as experience dictates.

I include as part of my remarks the following items:

NATIONAL CAPITAL
TRANSPORTATION AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., February 16, 1966.

Hon. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WIDNALL: Because of the questions which you and others have raised concerning the nature of rail rapid transit service to the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, and more particularly concerning the feasibility of including in rapid transit plans a station within or contiguous to the Center, this Agency has again considered the matter and we are now able to report on the results of our efforts.

The transit system authorized by Congress will provide the Center with service from the station authorized by Congress at 23d and H Streets NW. Service to the Center will be in keeping with the objective standards by which the Agency designed the downtown distribution pattern which appears in the Agency's report of November 1, 1962. Then and now we feel it would be inconsistent to design the system to render specialized service.

Rapid transit serves best when it serves the greatest number of people daily and in the usual course of community affairs. To obtain maximum revenues for the heavy investment required for the system—and to render maximum service to the community—a system was designed primarily to serve commuters and shoppers having downtown as their destinations. These will be constantly recurring trips; on an annual basis the time saved by the public will be immense.

Certain anchor points for the system were selected; one of them the Capitol. Another anchor point is Rosslyn, Va., an impressive center of employment and development only 4 minutes from downtown Washington by transit and an ideal base point for transit lines to be extended ultimately throughout northern Virginia. It is the line from downtown to Rosslyn which will serve the Cultural Center and provide service according to the standards adopted for the entire system.

In the 1962 plan the station locations in the center city were selected on the basis of circumstances expected to obtain in the year 1980, using National Capital Regional Planning Council, Washington Metropolitan Area Transportation Study and local planning agency projections concerning the extent and location of employment. Upon reference to the 1962 report it will be seen that 68 percent of downtown jobs in 1980 would be within a 5-minute walk (1,250 feet) of a transit station, and 92 percent of those jobs within an 8-minute walk (2,000 feet). We find a walk of approximately 6 minutes required for a distance of somewhat under 1,500 feet from our 23d and H Street station to the Cultural Center. Thus, although not situated immediately adjacent to a station of the system, the Center will be well within the normal service area of a station already authorized by Congress. The distance of the Center from the nearest station is consistent with the distance of various other attractions in the city from other center city stations.

In their own interests, the Center may wish to enhance the relationship to the station by constructing a pleasant above-ground walkway from the station to the Center along the principal avenue of approach. Such a walk would afford patrons arriving by transit a stimulating view of the building and its riverside setting. It may be worth mention that a very handsome approach for pedestrians has been planned by the staff of the National Capital Planning Commission.

In contrast, if the station were adjacent to or under the Center, the approach for patrons would be through the basement of the building with no opportunity for them to experience and to respond to the beauty of the Center and to the meaning of the Center as a memorial to President Kennedy.

In the planning activities of the agency it has been contemplated—and it remains so—that the Rosslyn line is to be placed in operation in 1972, with construction to begin in 1970. Design of the Rosslyn line and its stations will be initiated about 2 years before construction begins. As with stations on other lines, the exact location of the station proposed at 23d and H Streets has not been finally determined upon and location will be fixed as engineering and other details affecting location are more precisely determined.

The determination of these details is, of course, a continuing process and decisions thus far have been based upon matters already ascertained. Present station locations and system alinement have been selected on the basis of objective standards as to service, prudence in investment, and feasibility and efficiency of engineering and operations. Any change in the proposals must take into account the effect upon investment, the effect upon operating costs, and the nature of the service which might be accomplished by the change. To provide specialized transportation service to the center would be very costly in terms of initial construction and would increase operating and maintenance costs throughout the years.

In our reexamination of the alinement of the Rosslyn line and its stations we continue to feel that the physical task and the costs which would be involved in rerouting the authorized system to serve a station in the basement of the Cultural Center would be of formidable dimension. It would be necessary to reroute the line to proceed southwesterly from the presently authorized station at 18th and H Streets NW., under approximately 41 parcels of property (including 20 parcels owned by the George Washington University) and to enter the alinement of F Street at 21st Street. A new station would be required in the vicinity of 22d Street and F Street to replace the station lost at 23d and H Streets. The route would then continue underground to the Cultural Center station and thence under the Potomac River to the presently authorized station beneath Rosslyn.

This change in the system would increase construction, operating, maintenance, and land acquisition costs. Revenues would not be increased to compensate for those added costs. The quality of service rendered to 30 million riders each year on the presently authorized line would be impaired to serve the modest additional number of Cultural Center patrons who might ride rail transit if a station were in the basement of the center instead of at nearby 23d and H Streets.

Increased construction costs would result from the longer subway construction (1,360 feet), the additional Cultural Center station, and more difficult engineering problems relating to curves, grades, and geological conditions. The increased cost of this realinement is estimated at $12.3 million, but this added cost will be even greater if:

1. The George Washington University and others insist upon compensation for easements on a "highest and best use" or other expensive basis;

2. Buildings in the Columbia Plaza development currently under construction must be underpinned;

3. Detailed soils investigation of the difficult geological site of a Cultural Center station disclose further problems in addition to those currently assumed.

Increased operating and maintenance costs would result from the added stop and the longer run. Service would be slowed approximately 1¾ minutes between the 18th and H Streets station and northern Virginia due to the increased running time and additional stopping time. Slower service invariably decreases patronage and hence decreases revenues, all other factors being equal.

In our view, no increase in transit patronage can be expected for realinement. The number of new passengers picked up on the realined route would be offset by an approximately equal number of passengers lost from the 23d and H Streets community and those lost due to slower travel times, while the intermittent rail transit volume from Cul-

tural Center patrons would be speculative since attendance at the center would vary with the box office success of the various attractions. And, whatever degree of success the Center might enjoy, with rail transit available at the 23d and H Streets station within reasonable walking distance of the Center, rail patrons will be assured of service without the expense which realinement would entail.

It is my sincere hope that this discussion provides you with helpful information. The Agency is at your disposal for any additional information or assistance you may require.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER J. MCCARTER, *Administrator.*

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION,
Washington, D.C., November 22, 1965.

Mr. ROGER L. STEVENS,
Chairman of the Board, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, Washington, D.C.

DEAR ROGER: I am writing to raise with you once again issues of the most fundamental importance for the John F. Kennedy Center.

Public Law 85–874, which established the National Cultural Center, instructs the Board to: (1) present classical and contemporary music, opera, drama, dance, and poetry from this and other countries; (2) present lectures and other programs; (3) develop programs for children and youth and the elderly (and for other age groups as well) in such arts designed specifically for their participation, education, and recreation; and (4) provide facilities for other civil activities at the Cultural Center.

Writing of the Center, President Kennedy said: "It was not conceived as a group of halls and theaters to benefit Washington audiences alone * * *. The Center will, I hope, become in the broadest sense an educational as well as a cultural institution." It was in the spirit of this mandate and of this hope that the Regents of the Smithsonian welcomed the decision to establish the Center as a bureau of the Institution. They stood ready, as they do today, to offer all possible assistance to the Board and officers of the Center in the furtherance of these high objectives. I am writing now in the conviction that, unless positive steps are taken immediately, we will fail to take full advantage of the magnificent opportunities implicit in the Center.

In March 1964, I wrote to you as President of the Board to call attention to some of the educational possibilities of the Center and to record the Smithsonian's special interest in assisting in the realization of these possibilities. In the intervening months I have continued my efforts to focus attention on this aspect of planning for the Center. In April of this year, for example, I wrote to you:

I would like to reemphasize at this time the interest which we at the Smithsonian have in plans for the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

The Smithsonian is particularly interested in cooperating with the Kennedy Center in "off-hour" and "off-season" programing of an educational nature to supplement the normal programing at the Center.

At that time I forwarded an eight-page memorandum outlining possible educational activities.

Again in May I wrote, "As you know, the Smithsonian Institution is much interested in the possibilities of the Center's educational potential." At that time I suggested the possibilities of the appointment of an assistant or associate director responsible "for educational programs, for lectures, and similar public events providing for contact with the visitors." Now that we seem to be nearing the time for the appointment of the Center's artistic director, and now that physical construction of the Center is about to begin, I feel that I must once again raise the general question of the objectives and programs of the Center.

I cannot emphasize too strongly my conviction that what is at stake here is not the question of whether some educational activities will be included here and there in the Center's program, but rather the question of what the Center itself is all about. Unless all of our actions—the formulation of the program, the choice of director, the design of the physical facilities—are informed by an imaginative regard for creativity and a deep sense of social responsibility, I very much fear that all our energies and expenditures will produce nothing but a lifeless marble shell.

An examination of the plans for the building and of the program committee's guidelines suggests very strongly that the Center is now coming to be viewed primarily as a showcase for works created somewhere else and brought here briefly for the pleasure or edification of local audiences. Only the most limited provision has been made for rehearsal rooms, workshops, studios, and the other facilities required for the creation of works of art, rather than simply for their performance. This impression that the Center is thought of as a passive receptacle for shows from elsewhere, rather than as an active generator of new works and new productions, is confirmed by the guidelines:

The Center * * * should seek out and sponsor the best in American music, theater, opera, dance, and film; it should provide a sendoff for American performing groups sent abroad * * * it should open its facilities to foreign governments * * * etc.

None of these is in any way an unworthy or inappropriate activity, but what is striking is that the guidelines leave so little room for anything more positive or creative.

Accepting for the moment the notion that the Center should be devoted to the display rather than the creation of works of performing art, we may ask to whom these works will be displayed. Do the guidelines offer any clues as to the nature of the proposed audience? The seventh guideline states, in rather equivocal language, that the Center: Should make available a fair amount of seats in the performing halls at low prices for students, young people, and those in straitened circumstances.

Does fair mean equitable, and, if so, what is an equitable amount of seats? Or, does fair mean just passable? And do we propose to administer a means test at our ticket windows? Taken together, the architecture and the guidelines give the impression of a grudging acceptance of the necessity of doing something for some of those who cannot or do not normally frequent our centers of culture. What is totally absent is an emphatic statement of a determination to do something for this, the great majority of our city and our country. And something in this context must mean more than merely reducing prices.

What, then, of the legislative mandate to develop programs "designed specifically for participation, education, and recreation"? Here again the guidelines are almost completely silent. Apart from passing references to "exhibits relating to the performing arts," and "educational programs in the arts," nothing is said of any of the possible programs that might be used to involve large numbers of people in the Center's activities. On the contrary, the guidelines explicitly state that:

The Center, while recognizing its responsibility to welcome and encourage Washington-based performing groups, should not give these groups permanent prerogatives or facilities.

Although the precise meaning of these words is unclear, the tone again is one of acceptance of a minimal responsibility. This refusal to make any commitment to local performing groups seems virtually to eliminate all possibility of repertory companies and of wide popular participation in the artistic work of the Center.

Taken together, the impression of the proposed activities of the Center deviates widely from objectives of the Smithsonian Institution in its concern for all the people. The concept of providing a splendid showcase for the very best performances is certainly not a contemptible one. By all means let some of the 52 weeks of the year be devoted to this objective. But if all we are doing is creating a more lavish setting for what already goes on in Washington, of saving people the trouble of traveling to New York to go to the theater or the opera, surely we are neglecting the great opportunity that has been given us to do something that will really make a difference in the life of the Capital and of the Nation.

It is possible here only to suggest a few of the things that might be done to meet the responsibilities implicit in the direction of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

One thinks, for example, of the imaginative Theater National Populaire of Jean Vilar. Here, in a single weekend, at a cost of about $4, one may attend a concert, have a cold dinner and see a play on Saturday, and on Sunday take part in a discussion involving actors and audience, attend a matinee, an evening performance and a dance. Here special school matinees, including discussions of the play to be performed, are regularly held; here the building and snackbar are opened at 6:30 and there is an early curtain so that theatergoers may get home on public transportation, and in time to work the next day; here ordinary performances cost from 20 cents to $1. Here, in short, a deliberate and imaginative effort has been made to involve the poor, and the rest of the nontheatergoing population. Now a similar Theater Lyrique Populaire, also under Vilar's direction, is being built for opera performances.

While Vilar's scheme is not something to be slavishly imitated, it does show an awareness of public needs and an imaginative determination to meet these needs which would be welcome in the current planning for the Kennedy Center.

Surely some program of this kind could be developed for the people of Washington and, particularly in the summertime, for the hundreds of thousands of tourists who come here to visit—often from parts of the country in which performances of high quality are simply not available. Attractive "packages" of artistic performances, educational events and recreation could be devised; tickets could be made readily available throughout the country—perhaps at post offices—at modest prices; other cultural, educational and recreational attractions of the Washington area could be included in these "packages."

As another example, one thinks of the extraordinary success of New York City's Shakespeare in the Park and Philharmonic in the Park programs, which have attracted huge audiences by making free performances available. Should not the magnificent facilities of the Kennedy Center be used, at least occasionally, in the same way?

The French-American Festival under the direction of Lukas Foss at the Lincoln Center last summer attracted a new kind of audience to Philharmonic Hall. Washington is surely a natural setting for events of this sort.

Again, one thinks of the almost unlimited educational opportunities at all levels that might be offered by the Center. Playwrights and composers-in-residence, performances by and for children, exhibits, classes, lectures, apprenticeships—all these should be viewed not as ancillary activities to be reluctantly fitted in among the "important" events of

the year, but rather as the very heart of the Center's program.

The direction of a center for the performing arts raises choices strikingly similar to those that are faced by every museum director: choices between passive display and active education, between mere curatorship and creative scholarship, between stylish exclusiveness and broad inclusiveness. It is vitally important, I repeat, that the Kennedy Center, like the Smithsonian itself, should make its choices in a mood of imaginative creativity and with a deep sense of its responsibility to the local community and to the Nation.

Sincerely yours,

S. DILLON RIPLEY, *Secretary.*

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 19, 1965]

BROADER AUDIENCE ASKED OF PLANNERS FOR KENNEDY CENTER

S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, has urged planners of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts to give greater consideration to the educational and recreational needs of tourists and Washington residents.

In a letter to Roger L. Stevens, Chairman of the Center's Board of Trustees, Ripley, an ex officio member of the Board, expressed concern that in planning the Center more attention be given to creation of works of art, providing low prices for students and poor people, and making use of the hall for educational and recreational events.

Ripley said yesterday the letter was intended as a guide to the Trustees in choosing an artistic director for the Center, which is expected to occur within the next month. Copies of the letter, dated November 22, were distributed to the press by Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Republican, of New Jersey, who obtained it from one of the Trustees. WIDNALL has been a vocal critic of both the Center's plans and location.

The Kennedy Center is technically a branch of the Smithsonian.

Ripley's letter said that "unless all of our actions—the formulation of the program, the choice of director, the design of the physical facilities—are informed by an imaginative regard for creativity and a deep sense of social responsibility, I very much fear that all our energies and expenditures will produce nothing but a lifeless marble shell."

Ripley said yesterday he wrote Stevens after seeing the building plans and a set of preliminary guidelines circulated among the Trustees by the Center's Program Committee, the body that is now sifting names for an artistic director.

"I got the feeling that it was being planned for a snappy kind of people coming up in mink coats," he said. "With a 12-month situation there are going to be plenty of everyday occasions when something can be done for the rest of the population."

Ripley made these points in his letter:

An examination of building plans and the guidelines "suggests very strongly that the Center is now coming to be viewed primarily as a showcase for works created somewhere else and brought here briefly for the pleasure and edification of local audiences. Only the most limited provision has been made for rehearsal rooms, workshops, studios."

Not enough attention is being given to encourage a broad range of audience for Center activities. "What is totally absent is an emphatic statement of a determination to do something for this, the great majority of our city and country."

Ripley offered as model the Theater National Populaire in France which offers weekend "packages" for a minimal rate. These include, at a cost of about $4, several performances, meals, and discussions involving actors and audience.

"But if all we are doing is creating a more lavish setting for what already goes on in Washington * * * surely we are neglecting the great opportunity that has been given to us" he said.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 22, 1966]

NATIONAL COMMUNITY USE URGED FOR KENNEDY CENTER

(By Leroy F. Aarons)

Commissioner Walter N. Tobriner said yesterday the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts cannot be allowed to become "a marble palace," but must be a "national community house for all the people in the city and the country."

Tobriner thus joined the growing argument over how "democratic" the Center should be, lending his strong endorsement to a November 22 letter from S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, to Roger L. Stevens, Chairman of the Center's Board of Trustees.

FEARS EXCLUSION

Ripley in his letter expressed a fear that the Kennedy Center would cater exclusively to those who can afford high-priced artistic events at the expense of students and the poor. He urged that provision be made for low-priced tickets and off-season cultural and recreational activities involving local residents and tourists.

Tobriner, who with Ripley is an ex officio member of the Center Board, said he is concerned that the Center's planners may be going off in the wrong direction. In a letter this week to George Frain, legislative aid to Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Tobriner said he envisions the Center "as a settlement house for the arts."

Tobriner told a reporter yesterday he intends to bring the matter up at the Board's next meeting on February 7.

Support for Ripley's position also came yesterday from William H. Waters, president of the District of Columbia Recreation Board. Waters, too, is an ex officio member of the Center Board.

AMEND GUIDELINES

In a letter to Stevens, Waters proposed that the Center amend its guidelines to provide time and space for present Recreation Board-sponsored activities, such as the Children's Theater, the Shakespeare Summer Festival, the Washington Ballet, and others.

He also suggested that "at an appropriate time" the Center seek funds to build an annex to house rehearsal, storage, and workshop facilities for Washington-based performing groups.

Waters cited Congress' decision to make the President of the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners and the Recreation Board chief members of the Center Board in the basic legislation as evidence that "Washington does have a special interest in and a special claim upon the Center's facilities, perhaps even a priority in access to them and in arrangements, financial and other, under which these facilities are made available."

Waters noted that many Recreation Board-sponsored activities are off season "and can be scheduled at a time when there would be a minimum conflict in bookings with the high budget, imported attractions which the Center will quite properly accommodate."

He added that with the Center's limited funds, additional appropriation or endowment money would be needed to accommodate the local program, and urged that steps be taken in that direction "at the earliest appropriate time."

Stevens, reached in New York, said he had not read the Waters letter and could not comment.

Ripley's letter to Stevens was a private communication, but a copy was obtained by Representative WIDNALL. WIDNALL has been a vocal critic of the Center's site and program plans.

Ripley later said that the strongly worded letter was designed as a guideline to the Center's trustees in choosing an artistic director. It was learned this week that selection of a director is still distant.

[From the Washington Sunday Star, Dec. 19, 1965]

KENNEDY CENTER OUTLOOK CALLED "LIFELESS" BY RIPLEY

(By Betty James)

The John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts is in danger of becoming "a lifeless marble shell" and "a passive receptacle for shows from elsewhere," Dr. S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, believes.

Dr. Ripley sounded his warning in a letter to Roger L. Stevens, Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Center.

The letter was made public yesterday by the office of Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Republican, of New Jersey. WIDNALL'S office said it was made available to the Congressman by a member of the Board of the Center, who told WIDNALL the letter is being circulated by Ripley to the trustees for comment.

WIDNALL has introduced a bill to relocate the Center, scheduled to be built along the Potomac River, to near Pennsylvania Avenue, which he says has "a vital and identifiable relationship to President Kennedy. Such a location also would be readily accessible to several million more citizens a year," he said.

RECALLS KENNEDY'S WISH

Ripley addressed himself to the way in which the Center would be used. President Kennedy himself, he noted, said it should become an educational as well as a cultural institution. And it was in the spirit of this mandate that the regents of the Smithsonian welcomed the decision to establish the Center as a bureau of the Institution, Ripley wrote Stevens.

Ripley is an ex officio member of the Center Board.

"I am writing now in the conviction that, unless positive steps are taken immediately, we will fail to take full advantage of the magnificent opportunities implicit in the Center," he said.

An examination of the plans for the building and of the program committee's guidelines suggests very strongly that the Center now is coming to be viewed primarily "as a showcase for works created somewhere else and brought here briefly for the pleasure or edification of local audiences," Ripley said.

SEES PROVISIONS LIMITED

"Only the most limited provision has been made for rehearsal rooms, workshops, studios, and the other facilities required for the creation of works of art, rather than simply for their performance," he added.

The guidelines are almost completely silent on any of the possible programs that might be used to involve large numbers of people in the Center's activities, although the legislative mandate calls for developing programs "designed specifically for * * * participation, education, and recreation," he said.

Ripley also complained about references in the guidelines to providing "a fair amount of seats * * * at low prices for students, young people, and those in straitened circumstances."

He asked, "Does 'fair' mean 'equitable'? and if so, what is an equitable amount of seats? Or, does fair mean just 'passable'? And do we propose to administer a means test at our ticket windows?"

Ripley declared, "Taken together, the impression of the proposed activities of the Center deviates widely from objectives of the Smithsonian Institution in its concern for all the people.

"The concept of providing a splendid showcase for the very best performances is certainly not a contemptible one. By all means let some of the 52 weeks of the year be devoted to this objective.

NEGLECTING OPPORTUNITY

"But if all we are doing is creating a more lavish setting for what already goes on in Washington, or saving people the trouble of traveling to New York to go to the theater or the opera, surely we are neglecting the great opportunity that has been given us to do something that will really make a difference in the life of the Capital and of the Nation."

As an example of the kind of thing the Center should be considering, Ripley cited the Theater National Populaire of Jean Vilar.

"Here, in a single weekend, at a cost of about $4, one may attend a concert, have a cold dinner, and see a play on Saturday, and on Sunday take part in a discussion involving actors and audience, attend a matinee, and evening performance and a dance," he said.

The building and snack bar are opened at 6:30 and there is an early curtain so theater goers may get home on public transportation, and in time to work the next day; ordinary performances cost from 20 cents to $1, he said.

"Here, in short, a deliberate and imaginative effort has been made to involve the poor, and the rest of the nontheatergoing population," Ripley said.

FAVORS WIDE SALE

This kind of program could be developed by the Center, and the hundreds of thousands of tourists planning visits to Washington could be given a chance to buy tickets at home, perhaps at post offices, at modest prices, he said.

Playwrights and composers in residence, performances by and for children, lectures, apprenticeships, all should be viewed "not as ancillary activities to be reluctantly fitted in among the 'important' events of the year, but rather as the very hearts of the Center's program," Ripley said.

HOUSE FOLDING ROOM

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SKUBITZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, someone needs to update the old saying that "haste makes waste." With the situation facing the House folding room, a more appropriate statement would be that "waiting is a worse waste." Of what use is it to a Member of Congress to mail an end of the session report, if it is not mailed until mid-February?

This is no laughing matter. Yesterday on a visit to the folding room I found just this very situation. For myself I was checking to see how the folding and inserting of my annual questionnaire was proceeding. These operations are no small concern. Let me stress that this was not a taxpayer's expense. But it is a waste of the taxpayer's time and a Congressman's money if this correspondence is not mailed until it becomes outdated.

Let me hasten to stress that this is not the fault of the hard-working employees in the folding room or their chief, Mr. Eli Bjellos. These people are working 12- and 14-hour shifts with no extra pay for overtime. Instead of providing funds for extra shifts and overtime as our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol do, Members of the House are frugal with their appropriations and lavish with their demands.

To meet this need it has been necessary to resort to forcing crews to work overtime without pay and to even impose on the already overburdened Government Printing Office to help fold, stuff, and seal correspondence from Members of Congress.

For lack of storage space the folding room has been forced to store thousands upon thousands of envelopes, newsletters, questionnaires and other correspondence in the halls adjoining the House folding room, thus creating a fire and health hazard.

I want to compliment the folding room and suggest a more realistic appropriation be considered next year.

ARMENIAN REVOLT AGAINST THE SOVIETS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow Armenians and their friends throughout the world will commemorate the 45th anniversary of the Armenian people's revolt against the Soviet Union. Unfortunately, despite their heroism, the brave Armenians were overcome by force of arms and remain to this day captives of communism. Of course, they are forbidden to celebrate this great day in their history by their present Red tyrants.

We must rededicate ourselves to our efforts to see that freedom is restored to the brave Armenian people and all the other captives of communism. One effective method of calling the world's attention to the captivity of millions of Armenians and other peoples would be for the House to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations. The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] and I have been urging the establishment of such a committee for years, but so far have met with the resistance of the administration and Democrat congressional leaders to this proposal.

The uprising of the Armenian people in 1921 was especially tragic since the Soviets had seized their land only 2 months earlier under the guise of protecting it. Freedom-loving people everywhere share the desire of the Armenians to be free and independent, and we must take practical steps to keep up their courage and determination.

The Voice of America should provide lengthier and more effective broadcasts to pierce the wall of Communist propaganda and deliver the truth to the people of Armenia. As we know, Mr. Speaker, in recent years the Voice of America has been cutting back both its hours of broadcast in the Armenian language and in the nature of these broadcasts. The Voice of America gives daily straight news and is fearful of offending the Soviet Union under present administration policy. However, the brave people of Armenia deserve the truth. The Voice of America should be a vehicle for delivering the message of truth to them so that they would not be brainwashed and their resistance weakened by the constant propaganda from their tyrannical Moscow oppressors.

CONCENTRATION CAMP FOR DOGS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the devotion of a dog to his master is scarcely greater than the average American's devotion to the family dog or cat. It is certainly evident in the volume of mail I am receiving in the wake of Life magazine's February 4 article, "Concentration Camp for Dogs." Like so many of my constituents I am saddened and outraged by the inhumanity exposed in this excellent picture story.

The Minshall family has always had household pets, the usual gamut of dogs, cats, rabbits, and the like. We currently are the proud owners of Chessie, a Chesapeake Bay Retriever, and of Fritz, a cat of dubious ancestry. We would not want to part with either of them.

None of the conditions exposed in the Life article is new. Ever since I first came to Congress in 1955 we have had legislation pending to enact strong penalties for the theft and inhumane treatment of animals. I have answered literally thousands of letters from concerned pet owners over the years, assuring them of my interest in seeing such laws enacted. Yet the bills have stayed in committee.

I am today introducing identical legislation and urge other interested colleagues to do likewise, in the hope that this will spur remedial action by the Congress this year.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a program under which States may be assisted in developing programs for the detection of the illegal use of drugs by students.

The best way to get to the problem of narcotics addiction is to get to the root

of the problem. The legislation I am introducing would provide for Federal grants to States in order that the States may set up programs for the examination of schoolchildren for narcotics addiction. The State programs would have two facets—they would concentrate on periodic examinations of those schoolchildren who voluntarily submitted to examination and they would underwrite educational work in the schools in connection with narcotics addiction and what it can do.

The question of compulsory examination of students is complicated by possible constitutional difficulties, although that is clearly the best way to catch addiction or keep it from ever starting. The next best thing to this would be State programs which would be compulsory except on production of a note from the student's parents. This would satisfy any constitutional problems and it would expose any student in high schools and elementary schools to a choice between examination or a note from his parents. This two-sided pressure would, I am sure, cut down on narcotics addiction.

I am hopeful that Congress will view these proposed programs favorably. I think that they would make inroads on our Nation's growing dope addiction problem.

HOUSE REPUBLICAN TASK FORCE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week, the House Republican Task Force on Agriculture recommended two steps aimed at simplifying and streamlining the present maze of farm laws and regulations.

The first part of our recommendation is that titles 7 and 16 of the United States Code should be codified into permanent law. In the process, various obsolete provisions should be dropped, confusing verbiage should be clarified, and a logical streamlining of this statutory material should be made.

Second, the Office of the General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture should prepare and distribute a concise and accurate digest of agricultural laws, explaining how and to whom they apply, the functions of the appropriate agency in the Government which administers each law, the procedures for appearance and appeal within the Department, together with other pertinent information which would be useful to farmers, the general public, the press, the legal profession, the universities, and Members of Congress.

The task force report on this subject lists several examples of confusing, illogical, and obsolete provisions that now appear in the agricultural law books.

One curious provision of agricultural law mentions "corn" eight separate times—then a footnote explains that the word "corn" really means "wheat."

It is no wonder, Mr. Speaker, that many farmers—as well as city people—get lost in this jungle of legal mumbo-jumbo. Certainly the law can speak plainer than that.

With a 4-year farm program presently in effect, now would be an ideal time for Congress to act promptly to get our farm laws in order. Clarity is a prime requisite to an understanding of any law. With the complexities and great economic significance of farm laws these days, it is essential that they be clearly understood by everyone.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the full text of the minority agriculture task force report be included in the RECORD at this point.

A HOUSE REPUBLICAN TASK FORCE REPORT: LET'S SIMPLIFY OUR FARM LAWS

An indignant farmer reportedly wrote to his Congressman recently and said: "I just visited the ASC committee and some ninny down there told me that oats wasn't a feed grain, would you please explain that to my mule, I sure can't."

Of course, oats are a feed grain in the everyday world that farmers live in, but under the Government's farm program "feed grains" are defined as follows:

"The term 'feed grains' means corn, grain sorghums, and if designated by the Secretary, barley, and if for any crop the producer so requests for purposes of having acreage devoted to the production of wheat considered as devoted to the production of feed grains, pursuant to the provisions of section 328 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, the term 'feed grains' shall include oats and rye and barley if not designated by the Secretary as provided above: *Provided*, That acreages of corn, grain sorghums, and if designated by the Secretary, barley, shall not be planted in lieu of acreages of oats and rye and barley if not designated by the Secretary as provided above: *Provided further*, That the acreage devoted to the production of wheat shall not be considered as an acreage of feed grains for purposes of establishing the feed grain base acreage for the farm for subsequent crops."[1]

It's no wonder that the farmer and his mule were confused. They aren't alone. Other farmers as well as lawyers, Members of Congress, college professors, lobbyists, Department of Agriculture employees, and the public often have a great deal of difficulty in trying to understand and interpret our maze of farm laws and regulations.

The noted public opinion analyst and writer, Mr. Samuel Lubell, has commented on this lack of understanding as follows:

"For most of the urban population the farm problem doesn't come into focus. It's just one blurred image after another. Mainly, I believe, this can be traced to two things—a general feeling of futility that anything effective can be done about the farm problem and second, that urban people find it extremely difficult to identify personally with the farm problem. * * * Today it is relatively rare to meet someone who even knows anyone who does any farming. Many agricultural phrases sound like a foreign language."[2]

We recognize, of course, that our whole way of life is becoming more complex and intricate and that those good old simple days are gone forever. But that doesn't mean we should allow our agricultural programs to become so confusing that their terminology sounds like a foreign language.

Certainly we must have some degree of complexity and technicality in a body of law as large and far-reaching as is that which is administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Complexity cannot be avoided, but our laws and programs can and should be logically organized, simplified, and where possible streamlined.

The need for better understanding and clearer communication is obvious. If farmers specifically and the public generally do not understand the programs which are in effect, these programs are simply going to be ineffective.

While there are many examples of confusing and inarticulate provisions in our various farm laws, the most flagrant and repeated offenders are obsolete provisions, confusing verbiage, and illogical organization.

OBSOLETE PROVISIONS

Our farm laws are full of obsolete provisions that not only occupy space and require unnecessary printing but also cause avoidable confusion.

In the latest edition of the United States Code (1964) there are some six pages of text dealing with the 1961 through 1965 feed grain programs. While some of these provisions are still of legal significance, most of this material is now obsolete and is only of historical interest at best.[3]

Normally one would expect to find the statutory reference to feed grains somewhere in title 7 of the United States Code (which is devoted to agriculture). Not so, however, in this case. The feed grain program, for some inexplicable reason, is carried in title 16—Conservation. Other commodity programs, however, appear in title 7.

CONFUSING VERBIAGE

A classic example of a provision containing confusing verbiage is found in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. When one reads section 326 of that statute, he gets the distinct impression that it has something to do with corn. It reads as follows.

"SEC. 326. (a) Whenever in any county or other area the Secretary finds that the actual production of corn plus the amount of corn stored under seal in such county or other area is less than the normal production of the marketing percentage of the farm acreage allotments in such county or other area the Secretary shall terminate farm marketing quotas for corn in such county or other area.

"(b) Whenever, upon any farm, the actual production of the acreage of corn is less than the normal production of the marketing percentage of the farm acreage allotment, there may be marketed, without penalty, from such farm an amount of corn from the corn stored under seal pursuant to section 324 which, together with the actual production of the then current crop, will equal the normal production of the marketing percentage of the farm acreage allotment.

"(c) Whenever, in any marketing year, marketing quotas are not in effect with respect to the crop of corn produced in the calendar year in which such marketing year begins, all marketing quotas applicable to previous crops of corn shall be terminated."

As things turn out, however, this section has nothing whatsoever to do with corn. The Agricultural Act of 1954 repealed its application to corn, but still another farm bill came along to make paragraphs (b) and (c) applicable to wheat.

Thus in a section of law which mentions the word "corn" eight separate times, the reader is advised by a footnote that "corn"

[1] Sec. 16(i) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended by Public Law 89-321, approved Nov. 3, 1965.

[2] Remarks of Samuel Lubell, "Third Annual Farm Policy Review Conference, December 1962," Ames, Iowa, CAEA report 16, p. 138.

[3] 16 U.S.C. 590(p)(c), 590(p)(d), 590(p)(e), 590(p)(f), 590(p)(g), 590(p)(h).

for the purposes of this section really means "wheat." [4]

ILLOGICAL ORGANIZATION

If you are really interested in decoding puzzles, take a look at section 8C(2) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, reenacted and supplemented by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended. Then try to decide whether or not this section, which lists the commodities that are covered by marketing orders, really applies to apples produced in Minnesota for canning or freezing. (No cheating now, only 10 readings allowed.)

Here is what it says:

COMMODITIES TO WHICH APPLICABLE

"(2) Orders issued pursuant to this section shall be applicable only to (A) the following agricultural commodities and the products thereof (except canned or frozen grapefruit, cherries, apples, or cranberries, the products of naval stores, and the products of honeybees), or to any regional, or market classification of any such commodity or product: Milk, fruits (including filberts, almonds, pecans and walnuts but not including apples, other than apples produced in the States of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, New York, Michigan, Maryland, New Jersey, Indiana, California, Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and Connecticut, and not including fruits for canning or freezing other than olives, grapefruit, cherries, cranberries, and apples produced in the States named above except Washington, Oregon, and Idaho), tobacco, vegetables (not including vegetables, other than asparagus, for canning or freezing), hops, honeybees and naval stores as included in the Naval Stores Act and standards established thereunder (including refined or partially refined oleoresin): *Provided*, That no order issued pursuant to this section shall be effective as to any grapefruit for canning or freezing unless the Secretary of Agriculture determines, in addition to other findings and determinations required by this Act, that the issuance of such order is approved or favored by the processors who, during a representative period determined by the Secretary, have been engaged in canning or freezing such commodity for market and have canned or frozen for market more than 50 per centum of the total volume of such commodity canned or frozen for market during such representative period; and (B) any agricultural commodity (except honey, cotton, rice, wheat, corn, grain sorghums, oats, barley, rye, sugarcane, sugarbeets, wool, mohair, livestock, soybeans, cottonseed, flaxseed, poultry (but not excepting turkeys), eggs (but not excepting turkey hatching eggs), fruits and vegetables for canning or freezing, and apples), or any regional or market classification thereof, not subject to orders under (A) of this paragraph, but not the products (including canned or frozen commodities or products) thereof. No order issued pursuant to this section shall be effective as to cherries, apples, or cranberries for canning or freezing unless the Secretary of Agriculture determines, in addition to other required findings and determinations, that the issuance of such order is approved or favored by processors who, during a representative period determined by the Secretary, have engaged in canning or freezing such commodity for market and have frozen or canned more than 50 per centum of the total volume of the commodity to be regulated which was canned or frozen within the production area, or marketed within the marketing area, defined in such order, during such representative period. No order issued pursuant to this section shall be applicable to peanuts produced in more than one of the following production areas: the Virginia-Carolina production area, the Southeast production area, and the Southwest production area. If the Secretary determines that the declared policy of the title will be better achieved, thereby (i) the commodities of the same general class and used wholly or in part for the same purposes may be combined and treated as a single commodity and (ii) the portion of an agricultural commodity devoted to or marketed for a particular use or combination of uses, may be treated as a separate agricultural commodity. All agricultural commodities and products covered hereby shall be deemed specified herein for the purposes of section 8c(6) and (7) of this title." [5]

Now you know, apples produced in Minnesota for canning or freezing are not covered by marketing orders.

Wouldn't this section be improved if it were rewritten? Wouldn't it be more clear and logical to say:

Orders shall apply only to the following agricultural commodities and the products thereof:

1. Milk.
2. Fruits (except certain ones).
3. Turkeys.
4. Etc.

WHAT TO DO

While we could belabor other plentiful examples of poor legislative language and delve into all the reasons why our various farm laws got into their present sad state of affairs, we feel this would be of little benefit in correcting the problem. The time has come to do something about the situation.

We therefore make two recommendations.

First, we recommend that titles 7 and 16 be codified into permanent law during this session of the 89th Congress. As every lawyer knows, most titles of the United States Code are only prima facie evidence of the positive law. Only those titles which have been specifically enacted by Congress into positive law are really the law of the land. At present 17 of the 50 titles of the United States Code have been enacted into positive law. [6]

In addition, bills relating to other titles are also being prepared for introduction. When the whole code is finally codified, it will be legal evidence of the general and permanent law and recourse to the numerous volumes of the Statutes at Large, and various public laws will no longer be necessary. [7]

With the passage of a 4-year omnibus farm bill and a 5-year sugar act during the past session, we recommend that Congress deem it both convenient and timely to consider the codification, simplification, and streamlining of all the laws applying to agriculture.

Second, we recommend that the Office of General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture prepare and distribute to the public a digest of our major agricultural laws. This booklet should not be a definitive and precise legal instrument, but, rather, a general description in plain and nonlegalistic language describing the various statutes, how and to whom they apply, the functions of the appropriate agency in the Government which administers each law, the procedures for appearance and appeal within the Department of Agriculture, and other pertinent information which would be of use to practicing attorneys who are not specialized in agricultural law and to interested Members of Congress and the general public.

These two actions—codifying and streamlining titles 7 and 16, together with publishing a concise and accurate digest of agricultural laws, would go a long way toward dispelling the feeling of many people that Mr. Lubell described when he said: "The writing of farm legislation has become a conspiracy against public understanding." [8]

[4] 7 U.S.C. 1326(a), 1326(b), 1326(c), and footnote.

[5] 7 U.S.C. 608(c)(2).

[6] Vol. 1, U.S.C. (1964) p. V (these are: Title 1—General Provisions: Title 3—The President; Title 4—The Flag, The Government, etc.; Title 6—Official and Penal Bonds; Title 9—Arbitration; Title 10—Armed Forces; Title 13—Census; Title 14—Coast Guard; Title 17—Copyrights; Title 18—Crimes and Criminal Procedure; Title 23—Highways; Title 28—Judiciary and Judicial Power: Title 32—National Guard; Title 35—Patents; Title 37—Pay and Allowances of the Uniformed Services; Title 38—Veterans Benefits; and Title 39—The Postal Service).

[7] Ibid. 6, p. IX.

[8] Ibid. 2, p. 140.

TIME TO STOP OUR ALLIES FROM AIDING OUR ENEMIES

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to prohibit any vessel or shipping line doing business with the Communists in North Vietnam from carrying U.S. cargoes. The shocking fact that in 1965 there were more free world ships than Communist ships engaging in trade with North Vietnam, makes the legislation which I propose today of vital concern to every American.

The bill I propose today amends the Merchant Marine Act by providing that no article shall be transported aboard vessels of any shipping interest which allows vessels under its control to be used in trade with North Vietnam.

The exact figures for free world shipping into Haiphong are classified information which the State Department will not release to the American people. Ho Chi Minh, Mao Tse-tung, and Kosygin all know, but it is top secret information to be kept from the American people. But through the fog that surrounds the issue, it is clear that our allies are giving invaluable aid to the Vietcong—107 of the 119 allied ships known to have entered the port of Haiphong in 1965 flew flags of NATO countries.

The State Department claims that because much of the material traded is not strategic, this doubledealing by our allies is somehow all right. It seems to me that one does not have to be a trained diplomat to see beyond that argument. The more nonwar goods that are carried on free world ships, the more Communist ships are freed for war materials. It seems equally obvious that to a war economy such as North Vietnam's, the provision of any goods, whether they are war supplies or domestic necessities, is giving them aid and comfort.

Those shipping lines which pick up cargoes in American ports would either have to give up their Vietcong business or ours. Great Britain, probably the worst offender, claims that it has no control over its private shipping lines except in wartime. They have made no move to comply with the official requests of our Government that they cease their

North Vietnam trade. My bill would take the problem out of the hands of the diplomats and the British Government and let us deal directly with the offending shippers.

It is no wonder that Hanoi thinks it can scare the United States out of Vietnam. Although we fight on land, we make no effort to blockade or otherwise prevent our own allies from loading and unloading merchandise in Haiphong. If this would not convince Ho Chi Minh that our involvement there is a half-hearted one, nothing would.

We already have a similar cargo ban on those ships trading with Cuba, and we are not at war with them. Why should we not operate such a blacklist against ships aiding a regime that is daily killing our American boys?

I call upon the Johnson administration for immediate passage of this bill. We are engaged in a major war. We should take the necessary actions to conclude this war. This action is simple, easy, and long overdue. Let us do it.

THE REASON WHY THE UNITED STATES IS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President of the United States addressed the school administrators convention in Atlantic City and put into its proper perspective the whole question of why the United States is in Vietnam. He also stated unequivocally that the United States will not be driven out of Vietnam.

It is my hope that those who have been carrying on the vendetta against America's participation in the struggle for freedom in Vietnam will heed what the President said yesterday and will study carefully the testimony presented by General Taylor today before the other body.

The President quite properly pointed out that the issue in Vietnam is not a struggle over a piece of real estate known as South Vietnam but, rather, a struggle in support of a fundamental question as to whether we will give the Communists an opportunity to develop this entirely new type of warfare all over the world.

In order to understand our involvement in Vietnam we must understand several other things. This country has built up an awesome Defense Establishment, so awesome that it has made major war totally unthinkable for the world. There is no question that our fleet of Polaris submarines and our Strategic Air Command with its B–52's and our guided missiles, which are capable of sending nuclear warheads across continents and oceans, have certainly helped us finally to reach that point in the world's crossroad when the major powers realize that any major military confrontation will be too costly and too devastating for all sides involved. We have made world holocaust too costly for anyone to seriously consider a major nuclear third world war. There can be no question that our vast Military Establishment is today proving itself the very deterrent it was designed to be against a third world war. The fact that neither the Soviet Union nor China have joined Hanoi on a major scale proves conclusively that major war would appear to be out of the question at this time.

So the Communists have now gone the other way. They have developed a new technique, a technique which they call wars of liberation but which are nothing more than wars of subversion and terrorism against the established order in nation after nation; small, dirty wars, but no less devastating to the institutions of freedom where they are not stopped.

Two weeks ago I described here on this floor—and my remarks appear in the RECORD of January 20, on page 869—the blueprint that the Communists have spelled out for similar wars such as they are waging in Vietnam today to be waged on three major continents of the world, that is, in Asia, in Africa, and in South America. The Communists spelled out their blueprint for world conquest through terrorism and subversion during their Tricontinental Congress which was held in Havana, Cuba, from January 1 through January 15.

Now, how foolish could we be to walk away from South Vietnam today when the Communists have publicly announced that they intend to proliferate this new concept of terror and subversion in every single nation on three continents if they get away with such subversion in South Vietnam?

How can anyone fail to see what devastating plans the Communists have for a whole series of "Vietnams," when they have boldly, brazenly, and arrogantly told us—in public—of their new attacks on the institutions of freedom on three continents?

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I merely want to compliment the gentleman on the floor for the fine statement he is making.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in the commendation of the gentleman from Illinois with just this one additional comment. We are getting quite a bit of mail now about pulling out of Vietnam and saying it is a grave mistake that we are there, because they want peace.

If I may contribute this much to the gentleman's remarks, I would say that I always write back and say, "Yes, we are yearning for peace, and I do not think that there is a Member of this body that does not want peace as much as you do, but we have to ask ourselves immediately two questions: The first is what kind of peace? And the second question is, for how long?"

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Illinois for the fine statement he is making to the House here today. The President is eminently correct when he brings forcibly to the attention of the educators, the administrators of education in this country, the fact that there is more than a piece of real estate at stake in Vietnam; that there is a principle involved and that this issue is a phony one with the Communists. These so-called wars of liberation must not be allowed to succeed because they are subversive in nature and they do not serve the best interests of mankind either in this land of freedom or anywhere else on the face of the earth. Therefore, I congratulate the President and I commend him for his steadfast attitude. In turn, I congratulate the gentleman from Illinois for reminding the House again of a position from which we cannot depart.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague. I think every single American and every single person in this world who wants peace and freedom ought to offer a prayer of thanksgiving that we have a President who has the courage and the wisdom to understand the global aspects of Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I belong to that school which sincerely believes that the Communists are in more trouble in Vietnam today than we are. We are winning in Vietnam. Our American troops are scoring impressive victories every day. Those who have been imploring the President to pull out, to give in, to walk away are obviously blind completely to the fact that while we have had difficulty in fighting this very unusual war, we are still winning. We have never had a war like this to fight before. Here you do not know who the enemy is. You cannot find them. They work in the fields during the day and then engage in their terrorism and subversion at night. You cannot identify whose forces they are. So, admittedly, there are serious problems for our side in meeting this enemy, but our troops and the Korean troops and the Australian and South Vietnamese and other troops of all our other allies—and we do have allies in Vietnam—have finally found the winning combination.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is the Communists who are in trouble in Vietnam. I believe one has the right to believe, without arousing too much optimism, that China is losing its effort to set itself up as the great spokesman of all of the Communists of the world.

I believe that the psychological and the diplomatic defeats which China has suffered in Africa and in Asia—and is now suffering in South America—gives all of us hope that perhaps the war situation could change very suddenly.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would say that we can be proud of the American people. The American people want to see this war ended. But, I am certain, they want it ended with victory for freedom.

Earlier today we heard testimony before one of our committees by General Hershey, discussing the draft and what it is doing to the young people of this country. Of course, all of us are concerned about this. We all pray fervently that we can bring the entire Vietnam situation to the negotiating table, but pulling away some from North Vietnam, would only whet the appetite of the Communists and would only open the door for more Communist aggression, as the President so eloquently stated yesterday.

Retreat from South Vietnam would represent an open invitation to Communists over all this world to engage in similar subversion, and similar terrorism, in every country into which they can get.

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe that standing with the President is the only way to proceed. I believe Mr. Johnson has charted a sound course.

The President has held out the olive twig in one hand, but has not abandoned our responsibilities, from a military standpoint, on the other hand.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope and honest belief that with the victories which our troops are scoring in Vietnam today we have at least more reason to hope today than ever before that the war in Vietnam can take a very sudden turn and victory could be ours.

I should like to include at this point an editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times which points out China's setbacks. I believe this is an extremely important editorial and fortifies my belief that with all of her setbacks, China might very well stop coercing Hanoi to continue its aggression in Vietnam. We pray to God this might be so and the conflict in Vietnam terminated soon.

The Chicago Sun-Times editorial follows:

PAPER DRAGON?

Red Chinese plots for subversion and revolt have recently been uncovered in the Middle East and in Africa, where a number of nations have broken off diplomatic relations with Peiping. Similar plots have been uncovered or smashed in other areas.

In Indonesia, a Red Chinese attempt to take over that government was met with force and destroyed. In Cuba, Premier Fidel Castro denounced Peiping as an aggressor after uncovering a Chinese Communist plot to subvert his army.

Russia is moving toward an open break with Chinese communism and even Albania, long Peiping stalwart in Eastern Europe, is now reported to be turning to Moscow.

It adds up to acute embarrassment for Peiping diplomats—and it raises a doubt that Red China's dragon is as fierce as it has been advertised.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman speaks of the help we are receiving in Vietnam, and the draft call upon Americans.

I want to say that outside of South Vietnam, the Australians—a token force of Australians—and a very few New Zealanders, as well as the South Koreans and the United States, who else is shedding any blood? Who else is getting killed in Vietnam?

Mr. PUCINSKI. May I say to my very distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], who is a member on the Committee on Foreign Affairs—and I respect him for his good and sound judgment—I know that the gentleman knows perhaps better than most Members of Congress, by virtue of the fact that he is on the Committee on Foreign Affairs and is privy to many things that perhaps the rest of us do not have—that this is a troubled world. There are many trouble spots. Our allies are making their contributions in various parts of the world. Perhaps they cannot be with us in Vietnam to the extent we would like to have them participate. Take the British, for instance. They are holding Malaysia. Also there are other places around the world in similar situations.

Mr. GROSS. I did not know there was a war going on in Malaysia.

Mr. PUCINSKI. There is not, but there certainly would be war if we did not have the forces over there to maintain peace. Take, for instance, the Middle East, and take many other parts of the world. We have a peacekeeping force now in the Middle East. The gentleman from Iowa knows the situation is not that simple. One cannot say that we have a problem in Vietnam and, therefore, that we must concentrate every effort there on the part of our allies, because that in itself would be an invitation to other aggressors, other aggressions, and other upheavals which would only confront us to a greater degree at other places.

Mr. Speaker, the pattern is very clear. I certainly would like to see more of our allies assist us in Vietnam. I join the gentleman from Iowa in that expression, if that is what the gentleman is suggesting. I join him in that hope.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman well knows that from 139 nations in the world we are receiving no assistance, no help at all with reference to the war which is going on in North Vietnam. This is what requires the drafting of the youth of this country. I do not like it a bit.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Illinois will come to my office I will show the gentleman a complete rundown compiled by the Department of State in the last few days, showing just how little the rest of the world is helping us in North Vietnam.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I agree with the gentleman from Iowa, and the gentleman knows that I have taken the floor many times urging that our allies give us greater support. But, having said this, I am sure the gentleman is not suggesting that because we are not receiving any help we should walk away from North Vietnam?

Mr. GROSS. Not at all.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Of course not.

Mr. GROSS. Of course not. But I certainly think that the rest of the world, the so-called free world friends of ours, should be making some contribution in the form of manpower to the effort in North Vietnam, and I hope that the gentleman believes that, far more than they are making today.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I should like to assure the gentleman I share his views. It is my hope that sooner or later many of our allies are going to understand the global aspect of Vietnam. But I hope the Vietnam conflict does not last that long. It is my firm and honest conviction that by standing firmly behind our President and behind the people of this country who today are overwhelmingly supporting the President in his determination to stand firm in Vietnam, we can look forward to victory with confidence. There was some doubt some time ago about our ability to win in Vietnam, but I think today there is no doubt. As the President yesterday quite properly pointed out, they are not going to drive us out of Vietnam. With the victories our soldiers have scored in the last few weeks, the Vietcong, Hanoi, and Peiping itself is going to understand finally that we are in Vietnam to stay until victory is ours. It is the Communists who now must make the decision, and I have every hope they will realize victory can no longer be theirs—and let us intelligently and peacefully negotiate a settlement.

DR. RALPH S. LLOYD RETIRES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KREBS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House the retirement on February 1 of Dr. Ralph S. Lloyd, Chief Dental Officer of the Public Health Service.

Dr. Lloyd has devoted the whole of his professional life to the Public Health Service. His distinguished career, spanning more than 30 years, has left an indelible stamp on the quality and vitality of the Dental Corps.

As Chief Dental Officer, a post that he held for the past 4 years, Dr. Lloyd strengthened recruitment procedures and formalized a dental career development program. In this position of leadership, he gave full expression to the concern for career development that had occupied him since an early date.

Always interested in enriching the professional experiences of those with whom he served, Dr. Lloyd made it possible for young officers to draw on his exceptional knowledge and clinical skills, particularly in the field of maxillofacial prosthetics in which he is an acknowledged authority. As Chief of the Dental Department of the U.S. Public Health Service Hospital in Baltimore during 1948–53, he established a prototype dental internship program. This program has been used since not only in the Service but also in many civilian hospitals.

Dr. Lloyd was the first dentist assigned to the Clinical Center of the National Institutes of Health. During the 9 years that he served as Chief of the Dental Department, he introduced many innovations, contributing to improved research techniques and patient care.

Never content with current procedures in dental materials and equipment, Dr. Lloyd developed ingenious solutions to technical problems in clinical dentistry. For example, he recognized at an early date the potential advantages of the use of the water spray technique, experimented with several spray devices first available, and made recommendations for improvement of the equipment. In addition, by the modification of thermocouples, he studied the heat production of cutting instruments in relation to pulpal trauma.

Recognizing the tremendous advances that could be made in dental materials and technology, Dr. Lloyd in 1963 established the intramural Dental Materials Committee of the Service. Under his leadership, the research effort of the Service in this field has been greatly expanded.

In 1964, Dr. Lloyd served as adviser to the Expert Committee on Health Statistics of the World Health Organization on the Review of the International Classification of Dental Diseases. That same year, he helped to successfully resolve the problem of Cuban refugee dentists in the Miami area by arranging for the assignment of a Public Health Service dental officer to supervise the refugee clinic, by encouraging the development of short-term refresher for the Cuban dentists, and by coordinating these activities with those of the American Dental Association.

There are few areas in dentistry in the Public Health Service that have not felt the impact of Dr. Lloyd's able leadership and contributions. The Public Health Service is richer not only for the 30-odd years that Dr. Lloyd has devoted to it but also for his many innovations that will remain a lasting heritage. We all wish him well in his retirement.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION ACT OF 1966

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce, for appropriate reference, the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1966, a bill to encourage greater cooperation and coordination among Federal, State, and local governments and to improve their effectiveness in dealing with the many problems which face our Nation. This bill would, I believe, go far toward establishing a full partnership among these levels of government, and strengthening our great federal system of government. The challenges which face this Nation will demand that duplication and friction among these levels be minimized and that cooperative efforts be exploited to the fullest. This bill is a part of the President's program to develop a "creative federalism." To quote his budget message delivered to the Congress on January 24:

> Favorable action should be taken on the proposed Intergovernmental Cooperation Act, already before the Congress. This act would improve the administration and facilitate congressional review of Federal grants-in-aid. It would also provide a means for coordinating intergovernmental policy in the administration of grants for urban development.

Mr. Speaker, we have responded to a host of pressing national problems, each of which needed the efforts of all levels of government for their solution. Neither the executive nor the legislative branch has had an opportunity until now to develop a comprehensive framework for Federal-State-local relationships, especially as they arise in grant-in-aid programs. The number of such programs has been rapidly increasing in the last decade and there are now more than 120 grants on the books. The 1st session of the 89th Congress alone enacted approximately 25 new Federal grant programs or major expansions of existing programs.

To demonstrate the many ways in which this bill would make a positive contribution to our federal system, let me briefly outline its provisions. It consists of six major substantive titles: Improved administration of grants-in-aid to the States; congressional review of Federal grants-in-aid to States and to local units of government; permitting Federal departments and agencies to provide specialized or technical services to State and local units of government; coordinated intergovernmental policy and administration of grants for urban development; acquisition, use, and disposition of land within urban areas by Federal agencies in conformity with land utilization programs of affected local government; and establishing uniform Federal relocation practices.

The impact of these titles on present relationships can be summarized as follows:

First, assure that Governors could obtain full information on grant programs in their States for budgetary purposes. This title, prepared by Bureau of the Budget staff, also provides a uniform method of handling grant funds and scheduling Federal transfers to the States; and allows the waiving of the single State agency provision and use of other suitable administrative arrangements, subject to Federal approval.

Second, establish a congressional policy to study new grant programs after 5 years.

Third, authorize Federal departments and agencies to render technical assistance and training services to State and local governments on a reimbursable basis. This will enable State and local governments to avoid the expense of unnecessary duplication of specialized or technical services, and permit more economical use of Federal facilities.

Fourth, establish a coordinated intergovernmental urban assistance policy. It grants priority to general local governments in eligibility for Federal aids, and requires that applications for Federal loans or grants affecting urban development be reviewed by general local governments and metropolitan area planning agencies for consistency with existing plans and objectives.

Fifth, prescribe a uniform policy and procedure for urban land use transactions undertaken by the General Services Administration. Acquisition, use, disposal of land in urban areas by this agency shall be consistent, to the extent possible, with local zoning regulations and development objectives.

Finally, the bill would establish a uniform Federal policy of relocation payments and assistance for all persons, businesses, and farm operations displaced by direct Federal programs and programs conducted through Federal grants-in-aid. It requires that all such grant-in-aid programs assure that standard housing is provided or being provided to those displaced and authorizes Federal participation in the cost of relocation payments.

Intergovernmental relations, especially in Federal grant-in-aid programs, has been the subject of considerable attention in both Houses of the Congress. During the last session, the Senate passed the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act by a unanimous vote. It was cosponsored by 43 Senators from both sides of the aisle, from all parts of the country and including those representing predominantly rural as well as predominantly urban States.

Also during the last session, a number of my colleagues in the House sponsored companion measures including the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN], the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. MACKAY], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOW]. These measures are currently before the House Committee on Government Operations along with the Senate-passed bill, S. 561.

I think it is important to call attention to the fact that this proposal has not only the full support of President Johnson, but also that of a number of bodies and organizations whose primary concern is improving intergovernmental relations. For example, it is based on the findings and recommendations of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, established by Congress to provide for a continuing study of ways to improve our Federal partnership. Representatives of all levels of government, including three Members each from the House and the Senate, sit on that Commission. The proposed act also has the backing of the four organizations which represent State and local officials—the Council of State Governments, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National League of Cities, and the National Association of Counties. Last fall, these four groups wrote a joint letter to the President, the Vice President, and other officials of the executive branch formally indicating their support for the measure and urging the President to make it a part of his program. I would suggest that a bill which represents the consensus of all levels of government can

only lead to the improvement of the system within which they operate.

This review of the provisions of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1966 makes clear why it has been passed by the Senate, supported by the President, and why this body should act without delay. The enactment of this legislation will be an important step toward achieving that "more perfect union" which we all seek.

SAVINGS BONDS

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the millions of Americans who help finance about $50 billion of the public debt by investment in U.S. savings bonds were gratified by the announcement by President Johnson yesterday of the raising of the interest rate from 3¾ to 4.15 percent.

Although the increased rate was announced yesterday, it is retroactive to December 1, 1965, and applies not only to new buyers of bonds but also to bonds in existence as of December 1, 1965. On Series E bonds the increased rate is made effective by reducing the maturity time to 7 years, from 7 years and 9 months, so that a buyer who now pays $18.75 for the lowest denomination of Series E bonds will be entitled to receive $25 at the end of 7 years.

The interest increase provides a real opportunity for Americans to help themselves by embarking on a guaranteed savings program while at the same time helping their country. The benefits of the safety and security of savings bonds are well known. The safety of the investment is guaranteed, and if savings bonds are lost or stolen they are freely replaced.

For those buyers who may wish to defer their income taxes on investments until some later time, such as their retirement, the purchase of bonds provides them with an effective investment yield which is often difficult to obtain any place else.

The President, in making the savings bonds more attractive from the investment standpoint, fulfilled an earlier commitment to do so. The President has noted that a successful savings bonds program is of particular urgency in the face of our defense of freedom in Vietnam and as a deterrent to inflation.

The operations of the U.S. savings bonds program have been of interest to me as chairman of the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations for some time, and particularly in the light of the increasing rates available on private investment opportunities.

I am delighted that the assurances which Secretary of the Treasury Fowler had given me that the matter of changing the return rate on savings bonds was under constant Treasury scrutiny, have been proven to be accurate. I commend the President and the Secretary of the Treasury for this action in the interest of the American people.

I urge all those who already are participating in the savings bonds program to give consideration to increasing their participations, and all those who do not buy U.S. savings bonds to embark on a worthwhile savings plan which will be helpful to them individually, and their country.

DISCRIMINATION IN ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a proposed Civil Rights Protection Act of 1966 dealing with discrimination in the administration of justice. This bill was drafted by the Civil Rights Leadership Conference, a coordinating committee of religious, civic, and labor organizations dedicated to elimination of discrimination under law. Through the years the leadership conference has proved itself to be a careful, responsible organization that has sponsored or endorsed legislation only after careful evaluation of its legal and social validity. This current proposal reveals that same degree of care and skill.

The need for Federal legislation to protect Negroes and civil rights workers from intimidation and violence was dramatically shown last year by a disgraceful series of acquittals in southern State courts. In November, I pointed to the need for Federal legislation which would:

First. Make a Federal crime of violence and threats of violence against civil rights workers and Negroes who seek to assert their federally guaranteed rights; and

Second. Establish a procedure for transfer of such cases from State courts to Federal courts where the Attorney General concludes that a fair trial cannot be held in the State court.

Title II of the leadership conference bill covers both these points in what appears to me to be exemplary fashion.

I trust that under the leadership of its great chairman, the dean of the House [Mr. CELLER], the Judiciary Committee will soon hold hearings on this and other bills that may be introduced to deal with racial discrimination in the administration of justice. In the course of such study, the present bill could be perfected to make it more effective and to resolve any legal problems it presents. I offer it for the consideration of our colleagues with the hope that it may stimulate creative thinking in an area of vital need.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S SPEECH AT ATLANTIC CITY

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MCGRATH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to note that last night, President Johnson came to Atlantic City, in New Jersey's Second District, which I have the honor to represent, to deliver an important address concerning the Vietnamese war and topics of domestic urgency before the convention of the American Association of School Administrators.

Accompanying President Johnson on his trip to Atlantic City were New Jersey Senators CASE and WILLIAMS, New Jersey Congressmen RODINO, CAHILL, FRELINGHUYSEN, GALLAGHER, HELSTOSKI, HOWARD, JOELSON, KREBS, MINISH, PATTEN, and myself, and the Reverend Billy Graham.

The fervor with which the President was greeted at the Atlantic City airport, despite darkness and heavy fog, was, I feel, an indication of the support which his southeast Asian policies find throughout the Nation and certainly in New Jersey's Second District.

Because of the importance of the message he delivered to the school administrators, Mr. Speaker, I believe my colleagues would find his remarks make worthwhile reading and, therefore, I am placing them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. President Johnson's text follows:

I am honored to accept your award and happy to be here with the big brass of American education. I might have been with you tonight under other auspices—except that 30 years ago I left teaching for a different pursuit.

Tonight, our professions differ, but we have the same task: to build a society worthy of freemen. Two hundred years ago, our fathers laid the foundations. Two years ago, I challenged my fellow citizens to get on with the job. I said that we must build the Great Society in our cities, in our countryside—and in our classrooms.

Tonight our work is underway. Much of the needed legislation has been enacted: more than a score of landmark measures in the field of education alone.

It is a thrill to me to read the rollcall of these historic acts: the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the civil rights laws of 1964 and 1965, medicare, the Natural Beauty Act, the Higher Education Act of 1965, and—not last and not least—the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Laws are only designs for achievement. The barriers we must overcome do not yield merely because Congress takes a vote or the President signs a bill. Two barriers are the most unyielding, each reinforcing the other in blocking our progress.

The first is poverty. We who have worked in schools know what it means for someone who starts life as a victim of poverty. It is hard to teach a hungry child. Poverty breeds handicaps of mind and body which cripple him before he has a chance to get ahead. And we have learned all too well that

poverty passes on its curse generation to generation.

The second barrier is racial discrimination. Because of it, children grow up aliens in their native land. For a ghetto—whether white or black or brown—is less than half a world. No child can be fully educated unless his life is opened up to the wonderful variety this world affords.

Two weeks ago, I called for the International Education Act of 1966 to promote the worldwide commerce of knowledge, to declare that learning is not a commodity which can be confined at the water's edge. Yet within our own country there are still racial walls against hope and opportunity. Between the slums of the inner cities and their spreading suburbs, there are gulfs as deep and wide as any ocean.

If education is to be worthy of its good name, we must find ways to span these gulfs. I pledge to you that the Federal Government will not be a silent partner in this enterprise.

I am sending Congress five top priority requests:

To enlarge each one of the programs in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—and to make them run through 1970;

To double funds for our imaginative and precedent-breaking Operation Head Start which will next year help more than 700,000 youngsters from poor homes get ready for the rigors of learning;

To fund the new National Teachers Corps so that our best college graduates can be recruited to work in our worst schools;

To pass the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to help pay for school lunches for those who really need them, without subsidizing those who can afford to buy their own. We also want school breakfasts for children who would otherwise start the day with empty stomachs.

Finally—and this summarizes reams of recommendations in a single sentence—my budget this year proposes a $10 billion Federal investment in education and training. In 1960 the Government was spending only a third this much. The Office of Education alone will spend on programs six times as much as it did 6 years ago. And I promise you that this is only the beginning.

Almost 200 years ago, James Madison declared that Federal and State governments "are in fact but different agents and trustees of the people, constituted with different powers, and designed for different purposes." They are not "mutual rivals and enemies." They are partners. Madison's definition has not changed, though the partnership grows closer and more creative.

If education is to achieve its promise in America, it cannot be done in Washington alone. Each State and each community must fashion its own design and shape its own institutions. But we will need a common vision to build schools to match our common hopes for the future.

Every school will be different, but the differences will not range as they do today between satisfactory and shocking. We will have instead a diversity of excellence.

Tomorrow's school will be a school without walls—a school built of doors which open to the entire community.

Tomorrow's school will reach out to the places that enrich the human spirit: to the museums, the theaters, the art galleries, to the parks and rivers and mountains.

It will ally itself with the city—its busy streets and factories, its assembly lines and laboratories—so that the world of work does not seem an alien place for the student.

It will be the center of community life, for grownups as well as children: "a shopping center of human services." It might have a community health clinic, a public library, a theater and recreation facilities.

It will provide formal education for all citizens—and it will not close its doors at 3 o'clock. It will employ its buildings round the clock and its teachers round the year. We cannot afford to have an $85 billion plant in this country open less than 30 percent of the time.

In every past age, leisure has been a privilege enjoyed by the few at the expense of the many. But in the age waiting to be born, leisure will belong to the many at the expense of none. Our people must learn to use this gift of time, and that means one more challenge for tomorrow's schools.

I am not describing a distant Utopia, but the kind of education which must be the great and urgent work of our time. By the end of this decade, unless the work is well along, our opportunity will have slipped away.

Many people, as William James once said, shed tears for justice, generosity, and beauty—but never recognize those virtues when they meet them in the street. Some people are this way about rebuilding our society. They love the idea. But in the heat and grime, somehow they lose their zeal. They discover that progress is a battle, not a parade, and they fall away from the line of march.

You know that the job of building a better school and a better Nation is hard, often thankless work. Someone must take on the perilous task of leadership. Someone in shirtsleeves must turn ideas into actions, dollars into programs. Someone must fight the lonely battles in each community—make the accommodations, win the supporters, get the results.

Many of you have endured this hard journey from hope to reality—when the applause died, the crowd thinned out, and you were alone with the dull administrative details still to be done.

But this is how a Great Society must be built: brick by brick, and in the toil and noise of each day.

We have so little reason to be discouraged. Others face tasks so much more difficult than ours. Only last week I sat across the table from the very young leader of South Vietnam and heard him say of his country: "We were deluding ourselves with the idea that our weaknesses could not be remedied while we were fighting a war. * * * We will not completely drive out the aggressor until we make a start at eliminating these political and social defects."

The work of his Government will not be easy. But these are not timid men. They have learned that Government must meet the outreach of its people's hopes. There at Honolulu, I pledged support to their plans for education in their country. This year alone we will help them build 2,800 classrooms, nearly three times the average for the last 10 years. We will help them train 13,400 teachers, eight times the yearly average of the last decade. We will help them distribute nearly 6 million textbooks. And we will help them educate almost a fourth as many doctors as the total number they now have.

This little country maintains 700,000 men in its armed forces, over two and a half times as many for its size as we have. Yet, these leaders voiced no weariness before the task of getting on with reforms in education and health and agriculture. If they keep their commitment, they will be the real revolutionaries of Asia. For the real revolution is to build schools, and through them, to build a nation.

What they are committed to do, with our help, must be done under the most brutal conditions imaginable. Their civilian population lives in constant danger of terror and death at the hands of the Vietcong.

Last year over 12,000 civilians were kidnaped or killed by Communist terrorists. There were more than 36,000 incidents of terror—an increase of 10,000 over 1964. Two days ago, the Vietcong killed 39 civilians and wounded 7 others as they rode on buses.

Terrorism—deliberately planned and coldly carried out—continues to be the chief instrument of Vietcong aggression in South Vietnam. It is not just a byproduct of their military action; it is the way they hope to win the war.

Who, and what, are their targets? Schoolteachers and school administrators, health officials, village leaders, schools, hospitals, research stations, medical clinics—all of those people and places essential to the growth of a healthy, free society.

This is the terrible scarred face of the war too seldom seen and too little understood. Often it is not even reported by our journals most concerned about the war in Vietnam. These incidents usually happen in rural areas remote from the camera's eye. Observers are not invited when the Vietcong murder the mother of an officer in the Army of Vietnam as reprisal against her son—or torture and dismember the master of a local school. But people who hate war ought not ignore this strategy of terror.

What is its purpose? It is through fear and death to force the people of South Vietnam into submission. It is as simple, and as grim, as that. And it must not succeed.

If these tactics prevail in Vietnam, they will prevail elsewhere. If the takeover of Vietnam can be achieved by a highly organized Communist force employing violence against a civilian population, it can be achieved in another country, at another time, with an even greater cost to freedom.

If this war of liberation triumphs, who will be liberated next? There is a job of liberation in South Vietnam. It is liberation from terror, liberation from disease, liberation from hunger, and liberation from ignorance.

Unless this job is done, a military victory in South Vietnam would be no victory at all—only a brief delay until the aggressor returns to feed on the continuing misery of the people.

We have the military strength to convince the Communists they cannot achieve the conquest of South Vietnam by force.

But the building of a better society is the main test of our strength—our basic purpose. Until the people of the villages and farms of that unhappy country know that they personally count, that they are cared about, that their future is their own, only then will we know that real victory is possible.

I came away from Honolulu filled with new hope and energy. I came away convinced that we cannot raise a double standard to the world. We cannot hold freedom less dear in Asia than in Europe or be less willing to sacrifice for men whose skin is a different color.

If this young nation—ridden with danger can show such determination, we, with all our wealth and promise, must be no less determined.

Our time is filled with peril. So it has been every time freedom has been tested.

Our tasks are enormous. But so are our resources.

Our burdens are heavy and will grow heavier. But the Bible counsels that we "be no weary in well-doing." The house of freedom may never be completed, but it will never fall so long as you and I and those who share our commitment keep this vision of what we seek to build.

NATIONAL TRAFFIC SAFETY AGENCY TO FIGHT DEATH AND MAYHEM ON OUR HIGHWAYS

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today joined my colleague, the honorable gentleman from Georgia, Congressman JAMES A. MACKAY, in his effort to establish a National Traffic Safety Agency by introducing a bill identical to the one introduced by him for this purpose.

The number of deaths on our highways amounts to a national scandal; 47,000 of our fellow Americans met their deaths in 1965 on the highways, a new record for 1 year and 13,000 more than the battlefield total in 3 years of the Korean war. This carnage on our highways must be brought under control.

We recognize the need for such control in the case of air travel but continue to view highway travel myopically. We have a Federal Aviation Agency which employs 47,000 people to regulate air travel when only 12 percent of our people fly each year and only 40 percent have ever been in an airplane. It just does not make sense for us to ignore the problems of highway travel at the national level.

My bill would establish a National Traffic Safety Agency in the Department of Commerce. Its purpose would be to provide national leadership to reduce the death, injury, and loss of property on our highways by intensive research into the problem and vigorous application of remedies. It would provide the means for a concerted attack on the problem of death and mayhem on our highways.

The National Traffic Safety Agency would be headed by an Administrator appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate and would contain a National Traffic Safety Center that would engage in research and issue its findings on the problem. Such findings will be used to establish national traffic safety standards.

A national traffic safety program would be established that would conduct research and engineering studies, establish national traffic safety standards, collect and publish statistics, maintain library references and public information services, publish consumer traffic safety bulletins, promote uniform State traffic and driver-licensing laws, employ experts and consultants, negotiate contracts and make grants to outside firms to assist in the center's research and to act in concert with the States, local governments and nonpublic organizations.

Under my bill, motor vehicle manufacturers would be permitted to certify for labeling or advertising purposes that their products meet U.S. safety standards, if they submit adequate proof of compliance to the Secretary of Commerce. Grants could be made to the States under the bill up to 30 percent of the cost of traffic safety programs established by them, provided the programs meet certain standards. State programs eligible for aid would include improvement of driver education and licensing, motor vehicle inspection, accident reporting, highway design and construction, and highway signs, signals and controls.

The need for national leadership in this area is apparent. Individual States cannot legislate safety features into automobiles without creating chaos in the industry. Nor can States be sure that their highways are part of a uniform system of highways unless we establish national standards. It is not the purpose of my bill to supplant existing public and private agencies in this field, rather it seeks to provide aggressive leadership at the national level so that uniformity of action can be achieved by all the agencies of State and local governments, members of industry, and other public or private organizations that are properly concerned with the problem.

We must either travel together in safety on the highway through national leadership and common effort or we must travel separately on the highway, each in his own way to face, as best he can, the death and mayhem that lurks on the highway.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, JR., WORKS FOR EQUAL OPPORTUNITY FOR ALL AMERICANS

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, America was born in the fierce struggle of men determined to be free—free of tyranny, free to practice their religion according to their conscience, free to live decent and industrious lives, free to retain and enjoy the fruits of their labor, free to assemble, and to speak out on the issues of the day, and free to share in the opportunities of our land and its promise of the good life.

In 1964 America took a giant step forward toward fulfilling the dream of its heritage. In that year the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was born. The dream that all Americans could share in the opportunities of our land and its promise of the good life was written into title VII of the act.

It sets up the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission which is charged with responsibility to insure that all Americans will be considered for hiring, firing, and promotion on the basis of their ability without regard to race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.

When the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission began operations last July it was predicted that 1,500 complaints of employment discrimination might be received by it during its first year. The fact is that after only 6 months of operation, 3,263 complaints were received by the Commission—many more than all State antidiscrimination complaints combined. That is some measure of the interest and confidence our people have in the Commission.

I am happy to learn that the Commission under its able Chairman, the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., despite severe limitation of funds accomplished much through conciliation and voluntary compliance and often obtained benefits for the cause of equal opportunity over and above the resolution of individual complaints.

The story of the Commission's success and of its problems deserves wide circulation and should be known in every part of our country. It is a heartening story that should make us all happy to be Americans. It is the story of an agency that embarked on the unchartered and stormy sea of controversy involving equal opportunity. It soon demonstrated its seaworthiness by steering a true course through the dangerous waters.

The Commission has received complaints charging employers, labor unions and employment agencies with discrimination in employment practices. In spite of shortage of staff and funds the Commission has completed the long process of investigation in 704 cases—and the even longer process of conciliation has been brought to a successful conclusion in 20 cases.

Mr. Roosevelt reports that the Commission's efforts at conciliation has tapped a reservoir of good will, cooperation, and willingness by all interested parties to comply with the law. Significantly, of the 700 complaints investigated to date, all but 2 of the companies involved were willing to cooperate. In addition other employers who were not involved in complaints have voluntarily sat down with the Commission staff to work out problems encountered by them under the law.

Mr. Roosevelt tells us that in all instances the Commission's investigators have been received courteously and in a spirit of cooperation—whether the investigator was colored or white.

In many instances employers have initiated positive action to achieve equal opportunity, even though a specific complaint made against them proved to be without merit. The Commission files contain many instances where its conciliation effort resulted in voluntary action on the part of the employer above and beyond the complaints under consideration. Those were purely voluntary acts on the part of the employer and demonstrate the spirit of the American employer to comply with the law. I am sure that this spirit of cooperation on the part of industry is in large part engendered in response to the reasonable and courteous manner in which Mr. Roosevelt is carrying out his task.

I commend the fine work of the Commission and its Chairman to the attention of our colleagues and to all people of good will. It is a living example of democracy in action and serves as a shining beacon of hope to all of us that reasonable men, working honestly, diligently, and in good faith can solve the corrupting problems of bias and prejudice in a democracy.

THE 48TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATION OF LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from New York [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday last, at the Washington Hotel here in the District of Columbia, I had the privilege of attending a luncheon and ceremony of the American Lithuanian Society commemorating the 48th anniversary of the Declaration of Lithuania's Independence.

The following is the program on that occasion, as well as my remarks:

PROGRAM ON COMMEMORATION OF THE 48TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATION OF LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE, FEBRUARY 18, 1966

American National Anthem.
Invocation: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Peter Silvinskas.
Introduction of guests.

LUNCHEON

Introductory remarks by the vice president of the American Lithuanian Society, Mr. Joseph Zamites.

Address by Hon. Joseph Kajeckas, Chargé d'Affaires, Lithuanian Legation.

Address by Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY, Democrat, 14th District, Brooklyn, N.Y., House of Representatives.

Lithuanian songs: Miss Elena Jurgela.

Poems: Miss Vakare Aistis.

Greetings by the presidents of the Latvian and Estonian Societies.

Reading of resolution.

Benediction: Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain, U.S. Senate.

Lithuanian National Anthem.

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN J. ROONEY

Chairman Zamites, Right Reverend Monsignor Silvinskas, Reverend Dr. Harris, Chargé d'Affaires Kajeckas, Mrs. Darlys, president of your organization, Commissioner Farrell, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Cieplinski, the officers and members of the American Lithuanian Society, ladies, and gentlemen, one of the great traditions of American colleges and universities is the annual homecoming which allows old friends to get together and relive the events of previous years. I feel today as if I am attending a homecoming because I am meeting many warm friends again—friends whose patriotism I admire and friends whose devotion to the cause of their still enslaved kinsmen and friends in Lithuania I applaud.

I am deeply gratified to be invited to share with you the celebration of the 48th anniversary of Lithuania's independence. To you of Lithuanian birth or parentage this day is almost sacred. It is not an event that calls for parades and noise and funmaking such as an independence day normally entails; rather it is a day filled with sadness and regrets. For on this day our hearts turn to those who now live in the shadows of a foreign oppression.

How wonderful it would be if we here today could be celebrating this occasion with joy and mirth. How wonderful it would be to join the reverend fathers here today in prayers and songs of thanksgiving that at long last the shackles of Soivet domination have been removed and the liberty-loving peoples of Lithuania, of Estonia, and of Latvia once more free and independent.

My friends, this is a goal for the attainment of which many of my colleagues in the Congress are deeply devoted. It is a goal which I shall personally pursue with vigor, for I am convinced that the freedom of all of us here and in fact the independence of the free world cannot be assured as long as these valiant people are denied the right of self-determination.

We as Americans must never become complacent and ignore the brutal act of Communist Russia when it illegally incorporated Lithuania into the Soviet Union as its 14th republic. We must remember always the joy we shared with the Lithuanian people when they gained their independence in February 1918. We must remember how we shared the pride of the young nation's achievements and gloried in its progress and growth. We must never forget that this golden era lasted but a brief score of years; then these fine people, our relatives and our friends, became the unwilling subjects of a larger and more powerful atheistic nation.

But it is not enough just to remember no matter how vivid and disconcerting those memories are. It is the responsibility of all who enjoy freedom and the bountiful blessings of liberty to do their utmost to restore independence to those from whom it has been stolen. This responsibility demands that we strive without ceasing to summon adequate international unity to force the Soviet Union to revise its own ruthless colonial policy instead of condemning the more benign policies of other governments. It is our responsibility, too, to see that the Communists are prevented from following the same course of illegal annexation with respect to other countries whether it be in Vietnam, in Africa, or in any part of the world.

Today as we look back with pride to the creation of Lithuanian independence and to the truly remarkable progress of that young nation, I am reminded that this country of ours was indeed blessed in being permitted to grow and expand. We can be thankful that our strength was such even by the year 1812 that we could successfully defend our shores. We can be grateful that our strong national interest was sufficient to weather the storm-tossed years of war between our own States. In succeeding years as we sent our men into action at San Juan, at Belleau Wood, at "the Bulge," at Corregidor, in Korea and now in Vietnam we can be thankful that our strength has matched the awful demands which have been made upon us. If only little Lithuania could have had a few more years of freedom, I am sure that the courage, the wisdom, and the outstanding ability of its people would have developed a strength kindred to our own. Given even a measure of such strength the Soviets might find their inhuman acts of 1940 much more difficult to duplicate today.

My friends, I realize that with each passing year in which your loved ones are still held in virtual bondage, it becomes increasingly difficult to generate enthusiasm and maintain interest in the great cause to which you are so deeply dedicated. I, too, become discouraged at times in that we are not making discernible progress in finding answers to this sad and frustrating problem. But sad as is the situation and discouraging as have been the results of our efforts thus far, we cannot lessen our devotion to this all-important cause.

All of us here must dedicate ourselves anew to the task of trying to find a solution to the grim problems our loved ones in Lithuania still face.

Each of us must seek to enlist more and more Americans in this cause. Each of us must do his utmost privately and through Government channels to have this issue raised and considered by the United Nations. Each of us must help to increase the gifts of food, clothing, and medicines to those for whom such gifts mean life itself.

Finally, my friends, we must constantly consider all these efforts as a part of the broader responsibilities which we must assume to obtain a reasonable assurance of world peace, a task to which His Holiness Pope Paul is devoting so much of his time and energy. This task to which our own great President, Lyndon B. Johnson, has demonstrated such passion and leadership in recent months includes such problems as the freedom of captive nations. So, as Americans of whatever birth or lineage, we must unite with our leaders to obtain and preserve a peace which recognizes the individual rights of men and of nations for self-determination and the four freedoms.

This country has long demonstrated its dedication to these principles. Our men have fought and bled that these freedoms could be preserved and hopefully extended to all mankind. Today, as we celebrate the Independent Day of Lithuania, may we do so by rededicating ourselves to the task of not only bringing those freedoms to the stouthearted people in your ancestral homeland, but preserving those freedoms for mankind universally.

Mr. Speaker, following is the translation of the Lithuanian address delivered on this occasion by Mr. J. Kajeckas, Chargé d'Affaires ad interim of Lithuania:

ADDRESS BY MR. KAJECKAS

Although Lithuania is a very ancient nation, her true place in contemporary history begins on February 16, 1918, for it was on that date that our homeland, after 123 years of Russian czarist oppression, declared her independence and joined the family of free nations. Because, however, of the genocidal agression which the Soviet Union perpetrated against Lithuania and the Baltic States in 1940, and which continues to this day, any commemoration of February 16 behind the Iron Curtain is considered by the Soviets to be a criminal act.

But whether the Lithuanian sky is sunny or dark, February 16 remains our great day, whether in the wilds of Siberia, or in our beloved homeland, but especially in the free world. If all the Lithuanian heroes and martyrs and partisans could speak forth from their cold tombs, they would declare also that "today is our day. Our sacrifices have been made in order that Lithuania might remain forever alive, free, and independent."

This day is formally observed only in the free world. In occupied Lithuania, this day is one of solemn and secret reflection and remembrance of lost blessings. February 16 is, in the homeland, a day of secret tears.

After 123 years of night without a dawn, Lithuania rose again on February 16, because the occupant had not been able to shackel the free soul of our country. According to Schiller, "man is created free, and he remains free even in chains." On the first possible opportunity, those chains of slavery were shattered.

Today we remember with pride the participants in the battle for independence, and we remember their sacrifices. It is from their sacrifices that we receive the strength and inspiration to continue our struggle for our national inheritance, and we vow to continue that struggle until the second resurrection of Lithuania.

Since the criminal aggression of the Soviet Union in the Baltic States, the whole world has had the opportunity to realize the hypocritical nature of Kremlin policies. The whole world knows that the Soviets are the alltime champions of deception and greed. Today, the Red claws extend even into Vietnam. We sympathize with the people of Vietnam in their struggle for true freedom and independence. A month ago, in the Disarmament Conference at Geneva, the Soviet delegate attacked the United States for what he called a shameful and criminal attack upon the small and heroic nation of Vietnam. The Baltic nations are small countries also, but this did not keep the Soviets from shamefully and criminally crushing the freedom of these heroic na-

tions. The Baltic countries are not threatened by nazism or fascism. The only thing that threatens them is bolshevism and Soviet imperialistic colonialism.

The Soviets are very fond of paying lip-service to freedom, independence, and coexistence for the purpose of waging so-called wars of liberation against other states, but the right of nations to self-determination is not practiced by the Kremlin in its own sphere of influence. For the Soviet Union, the principle of the dictatorship of the proletariat is higher than the right of any nation to self-determination. All the oppressive tactics of Russia against Lithuania in czarist times pale almost into insignificance before the nefarious and inhuman methods used by the Soviets. They are trying to destroy the Lithuanian nation as an ethnic group by the cruelest means available. This purpose was clearly expressed in the Communist Party program of 1962, in which one clear objective is the Russification of non-Russian countries within the Soviet sphere. This is, within that program, considered one of the indispensable conditions for the fulfilling of Communist objectives. In this same program, Communists are encouraged not to tolerate any kind of nationalistic motivations or expressions, and to struggle firmly against such expression and any kind of national self-consciousness. They are encouraged to fight against the idealization of a country's past, and against national customs which disturb the process of Sovietization. This objective of Sovietization is one which is to be fulfilled by the end of the next few decades, with the entire governmental machinery enlisted in the propagation of this cause. The first attacks, according to the program, must be made against the sense of national identity and culture of nations such as Lithuania.

Thus is a spiritual destruction being carried on against the whole Lithuanian nation. Scholarship, art, and literature are strictly governed by Moscow principles and according to strictly Communist practice. In this kind of pattern, there is no room left for the Lithuanian nation. She is sacrificed completely to the Muscovite, to the outsider, to the Russian. And Lithuanians are forced to participate in the destruction of their country. They are forced to deny history, to praise and exalt the Russian nation, the Russian language, to praise Russian leaders, and finally, to thank Russia for the slavery it has wrought upon Lithuania.

It is with especial sharpness that Soviet activity in Lithuania has been directed against all religions. In the Soviet sphere of belief, freedom is expressed in the propagation of atheism. Anatole Lunarcharsky, the former Russian commissar of education, recently said: "We hate Christianity and Christians; even the best of them must be regarded as our worst enemies. They preach love of one's neighbor and mercy, which is contrary to our principles. Christian love is an obstacle to the development of the revolution. Down with love of one's neighbor's. What we need is hatred. We must know how to hate; only thus shall we conquer the universe." I need not comment on that statement; it speaks for itself.

The Lithuanian language is more and more excluded from public affairs, in spite of the fact that it is still regarded formally as the official language of the territory. Since increasingly great numbers of Russians are introduced into the country on various pretexts, the citizenry are also forced to adapt increasingly to the Russian language. An American Lithuanian visiting Vilnius is in many places unable to communicate in the language of his fathers. The absolute control of Moscow in non-Russian republics through the party and centralized government institutions assures Russian domination and the rapid growth of the Russian population.

The Lithuanian youth are encouraged in various ways to go to Russia and the wilds of Siberia for scholastic and professional advantage. This creates the further opportunity for outsiders to be introduced into Lithuania.

In the face of this kind of sad situation, we must cry our sorrow aloud, in order to turn world public opinion against the process of Russification in our country. At the same time we must make certain that the true colonialistic and imperialistic purpose of our Soviet oppressors is made perfectly clear to the world. That is (1) that Lithuania was forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union; (2) that the Soviet occupants of Lithuania have forcibly inflicted their will upon the inhabitants of that territory; (3) that the Russians are systematically carrying out the colonization of the Lithuanian territory; and (4) that the Russians are exploiting the land, its inhabitants, and its resources. The Lithuanian resources and land are run according to Moscow's agricultural and technological principles, and the people of the country are turned into slaves.

That is a summary of the sadness that we have borne for over 20 years. But there is a brighter side that we must remember on this occasion.

You had the opportunity today to hear the statement by Secretary of State Dean Rusk on the occasion of February 16. Over a number of years now, his similar statements on these occasions have helped to revive anew the hope and determination of Lithuanians everywhere. We are greatly appreciative of the Secretary's encouragement and his words of hope, as we are grateful to the Government and people of the United States for refusing to recognize the illegal absorption of our homeland by the Red hydra. One particular example of American support of the Lithuanian cause is to be seen each year in the numerous proclamations issued on February 16 by the Governors of States and the mayors of principal cities. Also, this year, as in previous years, we will be gladdened by the speeches and statements of support by U.S. Senators and Congressmen. In their remarks on the floor of the Congress, the crime committed against Lithuania will again become clear in the public mind, together with the justice of Lithuanian aspirations to her rightful freedom and independence. We are very privileged to have in our midst today Congressman JOHN J. ROONEY, just as, last November, we were greatly pleased to hear his talk delivered at the great Baltic Freedom Rally in New York's Madison Square Garden.

Last year, when Lithuanians in the homeland were forced by their Soviet captors to commemorate the 25th anniversary of Soviet occupation of Lithuania, we Lithuanians living in freedom made certain that the world knew how we felt about those same Soviet captors. In numerous demonstrations throughout the free world, especially in such vast demonstrations as took place in New York, the true face of the Soviet barbarians was uncovered. It is a sign of hope that on such a sad anniversary as has taken place during the past year, the free world saw a renewal of Lithuanian determination to be free again. As long as our commitment to freedom remains strong, the Soviet criminals who have enslaved Lithuania are bound to learn that freedom always buries its own undertakers.

Mr. Speaker, I should also like to include a letter written under date February 11, 1966, by the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, to Mr. Kajeckas:

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., February 11, 1966.

Mr. JOSEPH KAJECKAS,
Chargé d'Affaires ad interim of Lithuania.

DEAR MR. CHARGÉ D'AFFAIRES: On the occasion of the 48th anniversary of Lithuania's independence, it is my pleasure to extend to you the good wishes of the Government and people of the United States.

Our country has consistently espoused the principle that all peoples have the right to determine the form of their national existence. In Lithuania's case, we have applied this principle by refusing to recognize the forcible incorporation of that country into the Soviet Union. We fully support your continuing efforts to marshal world public opinion and to bring it to bear on the issue of self-determination for the people of Lithuania.

In view of the courage and fortitude shown by the Lithuanian people during these years of foreign domination, I am confident that their just aspirations for freedom and national independence will ultimately be realized.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the following resolution was unanimously adopted on this occasion:

RESOLUTION BY LITHUANIAN AMERICAN SOCIETY

Citizens of the Metropolitan Washington area gathered February 13, 1966, under the auspices of the Lithuanian American Society at the Washington Hotel, extend their friendly greetings to the people of Lithuania on the occasion of the 48th anniversary of the restitution of independence of their country. They urge the President of the United States to concern himself, in dealing with the Soviet Government, with the urgent problem of removing the major obstacle to peace in Europe by counseling and promoting the restoration of sovereignty of the people of Lithuania and other similarly situated peoples. They also urge that conditions be created enabling those peoples to choose their own governments without the presence of the occupying troops which, in the instance of the Baltic States, had entered those countries in consequence of the Hitler-Stalin connivance at aggression, in violation of the treaties of peace and nonaggression freely negotiated by the Government of the Soviet Union and Governments of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

The assembled citizens also vote their gratification at the steadfast adherence of every administration since 1940 to the policy of nonrecognition of the fruits of Nazi-Soviet aggression, and their thanks to Members of Congress of the United States for their faithful dedication to the principles of freedom and self-determination so often urged by them to be offered to the people of the Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

Officers of this gathering are directed to transmit copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, Members of Congress, and to the press.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked our annual observance of Lithuanian Independence Day. The tragic irony of this event has been with us for more than a quarter of a century, for since 1939 there has been no independence in Lithuania. Fortunately, owing to the courage and determination

of this great nation's leaders in exile the celebration of the historic establishment of the Republic of Lithuania does not go unnoticed in the free world in spite of the fact that Lithuania's Communist captors have suppressed any observance of this great day in that country. The dedication of this spirited people to regain their hard won and deeply cherished freedom has won them countless friends and admirers here in the United States and the rest of the free world, and we may take great pride in joining with them in their commemoration of this event.

With each passing year, as we encourage the continuing efforts of our Lithuanian friends, we can derive great hope from the realization that the tyrannical Soviet regime which dominates Lithuania will ever be reminded of the Lithuanian's implacable resolution never to succumb to Communist enslavement. Although their country has been stripped of its national identity, their properties have been confiscated, and their fundamental freedoms abolished, the will of this people has not been broken. In the past we have shown the people of Lithuania and their Soviet tormentors that we are vitally concerned with the restoration of Lithuania's autonomy, and today on the 48th anniversary of this country's independence, we may state with pride and confidence that we intend to remain a part of this critical movement until independence day can mean to Lithuanians what the Fourth of July means to all Americans.

FAA ADMITS MAJOR PROBLEMS WITH THE BOEING 727

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday, February 15, I made a speech in which I stated that the Boeing 727 jet should be grounded pending a full investigation into its airworthiness and crashworthiness. The events and revelations that have transpired since I made that speech have deepened my conviction that the Boeing 727 should be ordered grounded now, while the CAB and other investigations are in progress.

Within a few hours of the speech I made Tuesday the FAA vigorously denied that it knew of any reason to ground the airplane "at this time." But later, on the same day, the FAA summoned every airline that uses the 727, domestic and foreign, as well as CAB Bureau of Safety representatives, to a meeting in Washington, D.C., to "discuss service and operating experience and exchange views" on the airliner. Most significant in FAA's announcement was the revelation that it is concerned with "the high sink rate" of the 727.

The sink rate of an airplane is the rate at which it descends as it approaches to land. The characteristic high sink rate of the 727 apparently causes it to sink rapidly, at a more than average rate, in the final stages of its approach. I would like to point out two things with respect to the high sink rate of the 727:

First. In my Tuesday's speech I stated that each of the four crashes of the 727 in the past 6 months, in which 264 persons were killed, occurred under similar circumstances—as the planes prepared to land. The FAA admission of the high sink rate of this plane completely substantiates my statement.

Second. The admission of the high sink rate gives even greater urgency to the need for grounding the 727.

We know that several other deficiencies have already been identified in this plane. For example, defects have been noted in the fuel lines, generator electrical leads, and landing gear. In fact, the Boeing Co. has produced three modification kits to correct these deficiencies. But, the modifications are not scheduled to be made until May and June.

I find this fact alone to be amazing and deplorable. When a commercial passenger airliner is defective by the admission of the manufacturer and the Government, how is it that several months are allowed to go by before the defects are corrected? In other words, this plane is admittedly defective, yet it is allowed to continue flying and carrying passengers for 3 or 4 months before corrective measures are scheduled to be taken.

We also know that the FAA has not yet agreed to the strong recommendation of the CAB that the materials used in the cabins of the 727's have greater fire resistance than those presently installed.

Thus, the Boeing 727 now is flying with a number of deficiencies which the FAA has instructed the manufacturer to correct—in 3 or 4 months—and with one deficiency which it has not yet agreed to correct.

On top of all this, we now learn by virtue of a very hastily called meeting of 14 domestic and foreign airlines that the 727 has a high sink rate. The attitude of the FAA, the Federal Agency responsible for air safety, is reflected in the statement attributed by the New York Times yesterday to a Washington spokesman:

> Our exhaustive analysis has uncovered nothing that would indicate this aircraft is not airworthy.

Mr. Speaker, the CAB, which is responsible for investigating air collisions, has already uncovered what the FAA has failed to uncover, namely, numerous deficiencies in the construction of the Boeing 727. In addition, the FAA admits that this plane has a higher than average sink rate.

Characteristically, the FAA has implied in its releases to the press since my Tuesday speech that "pilot technique" may be the common factor in all four crashes. It is very easy to blame the pilots for airplane mishaps because the pilot is usually killed and he cannot speak for himself. But the FAA is now indicating that new training procedures may need to be adopted in order to assure proper adjustment to the high sink rate. The question to be asked is, if this plane has an abnormally high sink rate, why did the FAA certify it as airworthy before pilots and other personnel were completely trained to adjust to this characteristic?

Mr. Speaker, investigations into the four crashes of the 727's have only begun. Before they are completed additional defects in this plane may be found. The flying public should be protected from aircraft about which so many doubts and questions have been raised. If this plane can be modified and made airworthy it should be done so at the earliest possible time. But the public should not be exposed to whatever dangers exist in flying the Boeing 727 until the investigations have been completed and all modifications made.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON AGAIN URGED TO VETO THE BANK MERGER ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, on February 10 I sent a letter to President Lyndon B. Johnson urging him to veto the Bank Merger Act Amendments, S. 1698. Today, I have written a second letter to the President again urging him to veto this abominable bill.

With unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD copies of each of my letters urging the President to veto S. 1698.

I also ask unanimous consent at this time to insert in the RECORD a copy of an article entitled "Lobbying by Bankers," from the Congressional Quarterly, February 11, 1966.

FEBRUARY 10, 1966.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This letter is to request that you veto the Bank Merger Act amendments, S. 1698, cleared by Congress for Presidential action yesterday.

My opposition to this bill today rests on the same grounds on which I based my dissenting views to the House report accompanying the bill and the statements I made while the bill was being debated on the floor. Briefly, these grounds are as follows:

First. The language of the bill with respect to the antitrust laws and the guidelines for evaluating proposed mergers is vague and uncertain and will result in confusion within the banking industry. Several of the proponents of the bill themselves agreed that these provisions were vague and that the courts will probably have to make a determination as to what they mean. Such uncertainty is bad for the public and bad for the banks.

Second. Under this bill the banking industry will be less subject to the antitrust laws than any other industry. I oppose the weakening of the antitrust laws in principle.

Third. The "forgiveness" provisions of the bill constitute favored treatment for a few large banks whose mergers have already been held to be in violation of the antitrust laws

by the Supreme Court. The Federal Government should not play favorites. This aspect of the bill smacks of special legislation and should not be allowed to become law under the guise of a general bill.

Fourth. The bill permits any Federal banking agency approving a merger to intervene, as a matter of right, in a suit instituted by the Attorney General. This will result in the unique situation of Federal Government attorneys appearing on both sides of a suit involving a bank merger. We thus regress into the 19th century when the legal business of the Government instead of being handled by the Department of Justice was scattered among different public officers, departments and branches. Under this bill the Attorney General is demoted to the rank of lieutenant with no more legal authority to represent the interests of the Federal Government than any of the other attorneys employed by several Federal agencies.

For all of these reasons, I again urge you to veto the Bank Merger Act amendments.

With every good wish, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

HENRY B. GONZALEZ,
Member of Congress.

FEBRUARY 17, 1966.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On February 10 I wrote to urge you to veto the Bank Merger Act amendments, S. 1968. This letter is to again urge you to veto this bill.

I remain opposed to S. 1698 for the same basic reasons stated in my dissenting views to the House report and in the statements I made during the floor debate. However, I would like at this time to emphasize one aspect of the bill which is particularly objectionable and which, in my opinion, will ultimately detract from the authority of the President of the United States. I refer to section 7(D) of the bill.

As you know 7(D) provides that any Federal banking agency approving a merger may intervene, as a matter of right, as a party and as an attorney of record, in a suit brought under the antitrust laws by the Attorney General. In my earlier letter to you I stated my objection to this section. I am sure you are aware that I do not stand alone with regard to this matter. For example, during the floor debate in the House, February 8, Chairman EMANUEL CELLER, who otherwise supported the bill, said of section 7(D):

"I do not know why that was put in except I think it was one of the pet projects of my good friend Jim Saxon. * * * But why do you permit the dragging in of the U.S. agencies is beyond my comprehension because it is going to prove as irritating as a hangnail.

"This is very much like putting a second story on a ranch house. You simply do not do that. For that reason I again say I do not understand why it was put in. I am not going to offer an amendment, but I do hope, Mr. Chairman, you will take that out in conference, because it has no place in this legislation. I believe there is very little justification for anything like this. It is going to create confusion."

The following day, during the floor debate of the bill on the Senate floor, Senator HART said with respect to this same provision, section 7(D):

"Whatever the attitude is with respect to what we shall do with the bill, I think it will be agreed by all of us as a unique way to 'run a railroad' intelligently. Visualize, if you will, the scramble on court of representatives of the Department of Justice, the State banking commissioners, and the Comptroller of the Currency. The court would have to have a program with names and numbers to figure out who is representing the public with respect to the principal issues in litigation.

* * * * *

"No indepenent expert witness has ever had an opportunity to comment on the bill which passed the House on February 2."

Mr. President, these statements by two of the foremost authorities in Congress on the subject of antitrust legislation express well-founded and well-informed doubts and fears as to section 7(D).

I would like to add to the arguments of Chairman CELLER and Senator HART the following points:

First. The income of the office of the Comptroller of the Currency is derived from assessments levied on the national banks and from examination fees paid by the national banks. Any appearance, therefore, of the Comptroller of the Currency as a party or attorney of record in a bank merger suit brought under the antitrust laws would be actually financed by the national banks and in part by the defendant banks in the suit. Thus, the Comptroller of the Currency on one hand would appear as a representative of the U.S. Government, while on the other hand his appearance would in fact be financed by the very banks whom the United States, through the Attorney General, has brought an action against.

Second. In all antitrust suits the Attorney General appears and brings the suit on behalf of the United States and as counsel for the President. If one of the Federal agencies intervenes under 7(D), who represents the United States and who represents the President?

Third. Section 7(D) will have the effect of fracturing the authority of the Attorney General and scattering among several other agencies. As I stated in my first letter, it reduces the Attorney General to the rank of lieutenant. This result tends toward proliferation in the Federal Government, contrary to the stated goals of this administration, and is a regression to the 19th century.

Once again, I urge you to veto S. 1698.

With every good wish, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

HENRY B. GONZALEZ,
Member of Congress.

[From the Congressional Quarterly, Feb. 11, 1966]

LOBBYING BY BANKERS

The American Bankers Association, representing 98.5 percent of the 14,000 main offices of U.S. banks and most of their branches, conducted a mass campaign for S. 1698. Three of the merged banks affected by the bill directly or indirectly engaged lobbyists in 1965 to work for passage of the bill. One of the banks' registered lobbyists was ex-Representative Albert Rains, Democrat, of Alabama, 1945–65, who had been the second-ranking Democrat on the House Banking and Currency Committee until 1965.

American Bankers Association President Reno Odlin, in answer to a query by Representative PATMAN, wrote August 31, 1965, that the ABA had made a mass effort for passage of S. 1698 by the House. Odlin said it was the first piece of legislation since the 1962 Revenue Act on which ABA used a mass communication technique asking all its member banks "to get in touch with their Member of the House of Representatives on S. 1698." Odlin added, "Passage of S. 1698 was deemed to be so important to the future of banking that the broadest possible indication of banking's views was sought."

ABA is not registered under the 1964 Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act but it employed in 1965 six individuals who did register with Congress.

Law firms representing two of the merged banks exempted from antitrust prosecution under S. 1698 hired lobbyists to work for the bill. Manufacturers-Hanover Trust of New York employed the New York law firm of Simpson, Thatcher & Bartlett and Continental-Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago employed the Chicago firm of Mayer, Friedlich, Spiess, Tierney, Brown & Platt of Chicago. The two law firms jointly hired two lobbyists to work for them on the bill—ex-Representative Rains and Laurence G. Henderson, a Senate committee aid in 1952–54.

The Mercantile Trust Co. of St. Louis, which S. 1698 would permit to be tried under the new bank merger standards set forth in the bill, hired the Washington, D.C., law firm of Miller & Chevalier to work for the legislation.

The St. Louis bank and its law firm, as well as Rains and Henderson, registered as lobbyists in 1965.

APPLAUDING RECENT ACTIONS BY BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed timely and fitting that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Hon. Charles Schultze, and his Deputy, Hon. Elmer Staats, be complimented on recent manpower management improvement actions by these able administrators.

I have been advised by Mr. Staats that the budget for the Department of Defense provides for 58,000 additional civilian spaces for the military services to replace able-bodied military men now in such support jobs as: chauffeurs, carpenters, painters, office equipment operators, and budget analysts with civil service personnel. These military-trained men, by returning to their combat units, will not only bolster our defense posture but also in time this program will save the Government several million dollars annually. This action by Bureau of the Budget officials is in accord with a request of the Manpower Subcommittee last August to the Secretary of Defense and to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. Staats also indicated that the Bureau's personnel ceiling control policy has been revised so that temporary, part-time, and intermittent employment are no longer under a specific numerical ceiling. This change will give the Government's managers some greater flexibility in handling their personnel problems. In a request to the Director of the Budget last April, I indicated that a change in personnel ceiling controls would also save the Government money. Several departments and agencies have so indicated this to the Manpower Subcommittee.

The Deputy Director of the Budget stated that action has also been taken in Defense, Post Office, and the General Services Administration to use Federal employees in lieu of contracting out for personal services. The subcommittee has determined from the experience of several Government activities that the

use of contractors to perform work normally handled by civil service workers is often more costly than in-house operations, but also the Government loses a definite control over the work. Frequently the subcommittee has been told by management officials of departments and agencies that limited civilian personnel ceilings have in the past been a major reason for contracting for work normally done by Government employees.

I applaud these progressive and realistic manpower moves by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

THE 37TH ANNIVERSARY OF LULAC

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WHITE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today, the organization popularly known as LULAC, the League of United Latin American Citizens, observes its 37th anniversary. Organized in Corpus Christi, Tex., February 17, 1929, the league has become one of the outstanding groups of our Nation for the fostering of good citizenship.

Because the national headquarters of the League of United Latin American Citizens is located in my city, El Paso, Tex.; because five of its past national presidents have been residents of my district; and because I have personally seen the results of this organization's many contributions toward good citizenship, I would like to call the attention of the House to LULAC's outstanding record.

The league carries on a constant program of citizenship classes, to aid prospective citizens of Latin American birth to become well grounded in fundamental principles of our Government before becoming naturalized. It conducts annual campaigns of voter registration and voter qualification.

In the field of education, the League of United Latin American Citizens did some important pioneering from which the whole Nation is today reaping rewards. In 1956, the LULAC's initiated what was called "The Little School of the 400"—to teach a basic 400 English words to 5-year-old children whose native language was other than English. The Texas State Legislature made the program statewide and appropriated funds for its financing. Today, a similar program, nationwide in its scope, is known as Project Headstart.

In the 1950's, the LULAC's also launched their nationwide campaign against the high school dropout problem. Coupled with this, they initiated an impressive program of college scholarships for promising youth of Latin American ancestry. The roll of young men and women who have completed college under this program is long and growing.

The LULAC's, through their many cultural events, fiestas, concerts, and folk dances, have taught all of us the graceful charm of Spanish America; and in doing so, have enriched our own culture to the benefit of all.

Mr. Speaker, the League of United Latin American Citizens, through its actions, has proved that racial prejudice disappears as education and good citizenship advance. For 37 years of solid progress in promoting these worthy aims, the League of United Latin American Citizens deserves the gratitude and respect of this great Nation.

HOWARD K. SMITH'S COMMENTARY ON THE WAR IN VITENAM

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent commentary on the war in Vietnam and the role of the United States in this war. Howard K. Smith, internationally noted news commentator, reporter, and author, substituted for ABC Commentator Edward P. Morgan on February 11, 1966, and gave one of the finest interpretations I have yet to read in cogent form of the role of our country in Vietnam—why we are there, and why we must be there for our own good and that of the free world. It is truly a superb presentation, and I am pleased to offer it to my colleagues.

Mr. Smith, a native of my State of Louisiana and a fellow student at Tulane University 30 years ago, takes up the oft-quoted cliches of the opponent's of our policy and actions in Vietnam, and refutes them with logical clear analysis—analysis based on the experience of history.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert into the RECORD this fine news commentary by my good friend, Howard K. Smith. The commentary, broadcast on February 11, 1966, follows:

EDWARD P. MORGAN AND THE NEWS,
FEBRUARY 11, 1966

(Howard K. Smith substituting for Edward P. Morgan)

The chief event in Washington this week has been the hearings on Vietnam in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The committee, and the public, have heard two witnesses fairly critical of what we are actually doing in Vietnam. Next week, Secretary of State Rusk and Gen. Maxwell Taylor will appear before the committee and refute some of the points made this week by Gavin and Kennan. But a long weekend will have passed. The North Vietnamese will have time to nourish a little more the only belief sustaining them—that America is seriously split; and the administration has no answers to critics' points. As many of the points made by critics are extremely doubtful, I beg to suggest the case against them.

One statement, made so often in the hearings, that it is becoming an accepted cliche is: America is trying to police the whole world, and we can't do it. The truth is, America's actions have been highly selective. There was for some years a war in the Congo. We took no part. There was a severe crisis in Cyprus that nearly sent our allies Greece and Turkey, to war. We took no leading part in it. The Rhodesian crisis is being left to Britain, though as a loyal ally we give moral support. There is a threatened crisis between Israel and Jordan over use of Jordan river waters. We have said no word and are in no way planning to intercede. The list could be lengthened. There is simply no evidence whatever for the cliche that we are being the universal policeman.

Another proposition stated so often that people are tired questioning it is—It was a tragic blunder to get committed in South Vietnam in the first place. Well, take your mind back to when we did, 1954, and think about it. A war by a minority of Communist guerrillas was raging in Malaya, south of Vietnam. Nearby in Burma guerrilla raids from China were being made. Had we refused to intercede and give South Vietnam help, Malaya might might well have gone Communist, Burma as well—and the small, weaker countries in Asia. India would be in much greater peril and the world situation much more unstable and dangerous than it is. And, incidentally, an American administration that refused to face up to a responsibility that important would have had a hard time from the American voters.

Both General Gavin and Mr. Kennan questioned that South Vietnam is an important commitment at all. They are certainly right that it does not rank with, say, Japan, or with Berlin. The loss of either of those would truly carry the cold war to dangerous new dimensions. But South Vietnam remains very important indeed. The struggle going on is actually for all the southeast Asian peninsula, which is of great importance.

Next to South Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia are both riddled with guerrilla bands, passive, waiting for victory in South Vietnam before they take over those countries. In Thailand, south of them, the Vietcong are not hiding their preparation. Peiping radio announces once a week its plans to secure the takeover of Thailand. If we were not resisting in Vietnam, we would certainly soon have to fight in those other places, deep inland, with long supply routes, and at every disadvantage. By resisting where we are we have the 7th U.S. Fleet, the world's strongest, able to give constant artillery and air support to troops—which it could not do inland—and we have short and well-protected supply routes from the coast. There is no doubt that we have chosen the, for us, most advantageous, least costly, place to make the stand. So, Vietnam is a very important commitment indeed.

Both witnesses have vigorously disagreed with the domino theory—the idea that if one nation falls, the others topple in a long line. But nobody has refuted the facts of political life: Success at conquest is infectious among greedy dictators. They need foreign success to divert attention from the fact that they do very badly at home. There is no doubt that a triumph in one place stimulates the urge to try it elsewhere, and if we leave Vietnam to them, it can lead to setbacks nearly as great as China turning Communist in the first place.

One of the strongest myths of the time is—Let South Vietnam go to the Communists. It will not be China's puppet. It will be as independent of China as Russia's satellites are of Russia. The answer to that is—do not overestimate the independence of Russia's satellites. Hardly one of them can fire 10 rounds without ammunition from Russia, or fix a tank or plane without parts from Russia. What independence they have is very modest and very limited.

In the one important case where a satellite flouted Russia outright—Tito—the prime condition for success was—America was near-

by, dominating the Mediterranean and would equip Tito for a mountain war of infinite duration. Those who assure us if we let Vietnam go it will be independent, also insist that we eliminate the one condition that makes a degree of independence possible—American resistance.

Senator FULBRIGHT'S office announced today he had received 5,000 letters due to last week's hearings. He interpreted that to mean a vote of confidence in him. In a nation of 195 million, there is a different way of interpreting that. It may mean there are 194 million plus votes that he isn't getting.

This is Howard K. Smith in Washington.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PATMAN, for 1 hour, on February 23; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATMAN, for 1 hour, on February 24; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. VANIK (at the request of Mr. PATMAN), for 1 hour, on February 23; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter, immediately following Mr. PATMAN.

Mr. VANIK (at the request of Mr. PATMAN), for 1 hour, on February 24; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter immediately following Mr. PATMAN.

Mr. WAGGONNER, for 20 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. GROSS, for 30 minutes, on Monday, February 21.

Mr. FEIGHAN, for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. QUIE (at the request of Mr. GROSS) for 5 minutes, February 21; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. FOGARTY (at the request of Mr. DE LA GARZA), for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. HOWARD.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. GROSS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RUMSFELD.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. DE LA GARZA) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MORRISON in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 21, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2053. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the annual report showing quantities of commodities on hand, sales and disposition methods used, and quantities of CCC commodities moved into consumption channels, pursuant to section 201(b), Public Law 540, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2054. A letter from the Assistant Chief of Navy Material (Procurement), transmitting the semiannual report of research and development procurement actions of $50,000 and over, for the period July 1 through December 31, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2357; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2055. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of proposed amendments extending the concession contracts of several applicants, pursuant to section 5, Public Law 89–249; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2056. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved, according certain beneficiaries of such petitions third preference and sixth preference classification, pursuant to the provisions of section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2057. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove the restrictions on charges for certain narcotic order forms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER: Committee on Science and Astronautics. S. 774. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to make a study to determine the advantages and disadvantages of increased use of the metric system in the United States; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1291). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 736. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 12752, a bill to provide for graduated withholding of income tax from wages, to require declarations of estimated tax with respect to self-employment income, to accelerate current payments of estimated income tax by corporations, to postpone certain excise tax rate reductions, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1292). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 12888. A bill to assist city demonstration programs for rebuilding slum and blighted areas and for providing the public facilities and services necessary to improve the general welfare of the people who live in these areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 12889. A bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 12890. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 12891. A bill designed to prevent crimes of intimidation, violence, and murder against Negroes and civil rights workers lawfully seeking to enforce the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 12892. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 12893. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to establish a national system of minimum retirement payments for all aged, blind, and disabled individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 12894. A bill to provide a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DYAL:

H.R. 12895. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 12896. A bill to strengthen intergovernmental relations by improving cooperation and the coordination of federally aided activities between the Federal, State, and local levels of government; to provide for uniform and equitable relocation procedures under Federal and Federal grant-in-aid programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 12897. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a program under which States may be assisted in developing programs for the detection of the illegal use of drugs by students; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 12898. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 in order to provide for a National Community Senior Service Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 12899. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 12900. A bill to amend Public Law 660, 86th Congress, to establish a National Traffic Safety Agency to provide national leadership to reduce traffic accident losses by means of intensive research and vigorous application of findings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 12901. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a deduction from gross income for certain nonreimbursable expenses incurred by volunteer firemen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER:

H.R. 12902. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 12903. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs and cats intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 12904. A bill to provide that the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation shall consist of three appointive members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 12905. A bill to amend Pulbic Law 660, 86th Congress, to establish a National Traffic Safety Agency to provide national leadership to reduce traffic accident losses by means of intensive research and vigorous application of findings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 12906. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide interest on certain amounts withheld from wages and certain estimated payments of tax for purposes of the Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 12907. A bill to provide a permanent special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RACE:

H.R. 12908. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.R. 12909. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to prohibit the purchase by the United States of arms and ammunition from foreign firms which have used slave labor, unless compensation has been made to the individuals involved or their heirs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 12910. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 in order to provide for a National Community Senior Service Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 12911. A bill creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 12912. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall acquire additional land for the Beverly National Cemetery, N.J.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 12913. A bill to require mailing list brokers to register with the Postmaster General, and suppliers and buyers of mailing lists to furnish information to the Postmaster General with respect to their identity and transactions involving the sale or exchange of mailing lists, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H.R. 12914. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from exercising jurisdiction over the reception of radio signals, communications, and transmissions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 12915. A bill to amend the Housing Act of 1949 to remove the 12.5 percentage limit on the amount of assistance which may be provided thereunder for urban renewal in any one State; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 12916. A bill to amend section 208(c) of the Interstate Commerce Act to provide that certificates issued in the future to motor common carriers of passengers shall not confer, as an incident to the grant of regular route authority, the right to engage in special or charter operations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEPHENS:

H.R. 12917. A bill to extend the period within which certain consolidated corporate income tax returns may be filed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 12918. A bill to authorize grants under section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 to encourage regional solutions to transportation problems which transcend State boundaries, to authorize grants under the Mass Transportation Act of 1964 on a temporary basis to help defray operating deficits incurred in commuter service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McVICKER:

H. Res. 737. Resolution relating to nonproliferation of nuclear weapons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WAGGONNER:

H. Res. 738. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Un-American Activities to conduct certain investigations; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. POLANCO-ABREU:

H.R. 12919. A bill for the relief of Daniel Pernas Beceiro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELTNER:

H.R. 12920. A bill for the relief of Alexander Francis Saker, M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

327. By the SPEAKER: Petition of chairman, Young Democratic Southeastern Alaska District Committee, box 1125, Ketchikan, Alaska, relative to salmon canneries in Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

328. Also, petition of Fak, Chom Sun, No. 7–78 Yongchon-dong, Sodaemun Ku, Seoul, Korea, relative to compensation for the death of her husband; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

329. Also, petition of Charles E. Murphy, 5128½ North Muscatel Avenue, San Gabriel, Calif., and others, relative to awarding a pension to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1966

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

Rev. Haskell R. Deal, D.D., minister, Eldbrooke Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and eternal God, we come before Thee with humility and gratitude, as we look to Thee from this dedicated memorial of Thy great mercy and guidance; Thy power, guidance, and grace have sustained us in all our history.

Make us sensitive to Thy great providence upon our great land, and to our sacred trust in entering the great tradition of those before us, into whose labors we are entered. Let the light of the honor and sacredness of this place shine throughout our land, keeping alive, in all our people, faith in our dedication to the honor and dignity of human life everywhere.

Great God of wisdom and truth, bless the memory of those who have given themselves in service and honor at this altar of service to our Nation, and have made these walls sacred by their patriotism and devotions. Give to us, we beseech Thee, in these challenging days, that same wisdom and strength manifested in those who have gone before us. Sustain us by Thy wisdom, grace, and truth, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. METCALF, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 16, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States, submitting a nomination, was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Rear Adm. Willard J. Smith, U.S. Coast Guard, to be Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard with the rank of admiral, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution of the Senate, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 251. An act to provide for the establishment of the Cape Lookout National Seashore in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes;

S. 577. An act for the relief of Mary F. Morse;

S. 851. An act for the relief of M. Sgt. Bernard L. LaMountain, U.S. Air Force (retired);

S. 1520. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Earl Harwell Hogan; and

S.J. Res. 9. Joint resolution to cancel any unpaid reimbursable construction costs of the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, chargeable against certain non-Indian lands.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in

which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1903. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sadie Y. Simmons and James R. Simmons;

H.R. 5007. An act for the relief of Arley L. Beem, aviation electrician's mate chief, U.S. Navy;

H.R. 5552. An act for the relief of David B. Glidden;

H.R. 6663. An act for the relief of Dean P. Bartelt;

H.R. 8937. An act for the relief of Charles A. Turner;

H.R. 10674. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Otoe and Missouria Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes;

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

H.R. 11271. An act for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of Defense at the Granite City Defense Depot, Granite City, Ill.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1903. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sadie Y. Simmons and James R. Simmons;

H.R. 5007. An act for the relief of Arley L. Beem, aviation electrician's mate chief, U.S. Navy;

H.R. 5552. An act for the relief of David B. Glidden;

H.R. 6663. An act for the relief of Dean P. Bartelt;

H.R. 8937. An act for the relief of Charles A. Turner;

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

H.R. 11271. An act for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of Defense at the Granite City Defense Depot, Granite City, Ill.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10674. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Otoe and Missouria Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. METCALF, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE AND SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. METCALF, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today. This request has been cleared with the minority.

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

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on today, February 17, 1966, he had signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 1407. An act for the relief of Frank E. Lipp; and

H.J. Res. 403. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation to enable the United States to extend an invitation to the World Health Organization to hold the 22d World Health Assembly in Boston, Mass., in 1969.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

H.R. 4599. An act to provide for the free entry of certain stained glass for the Congregation Emanuel of Denver, Colo. (Rept. No. 1005).

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

S. 265. A bill to confirm in the State of Utah title to lands lying below the meander line of the Great Salt Lake in such State (Rept. No. 1006).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Nathan M. Koffsky, of Maryland, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 2931. A bill for the relief of Nicolae Calinescu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 2932. A bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to establish and maintain reserves of agricultural commodities to protect consumers and for other purposes; and

S. 2933. A bill to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. ELLENDER (for himself, Mr. BASS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina):

S. 2934. A bill to provide needed additional means for the residents of rural America to achieve equality of opportunity by authorizing the making of grants for comprehensive planning for public services and development in Community Development Districts designated by the Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 2935. A bill to authorize grants under section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 to encourage regional solutions to transportation problems which transcend State boundaries, to authorize grants under the Mass Transportation Act of 1964 on a temporary basis to help defray operating deficits incurred in commuter service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. MCGEE:

S. 2936. A bill for the relief of Maria Becerra Gestal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 2937. A bill for the relief of Norman A. Sargent; and

S. 2938. A bill for the relief of Mary Louise Pierce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BASS:

S. 2939. A bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 to prohibit State and local taxation of electric power produced by the Tennessee Valley Authority; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 2940. A bill to coordinate and improve the waste management activities of the Federal Government and of other Government and private organizations; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

RESERVE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES TO PROTECT CONSUMERS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to establish and maintain reserves of agricultural commodities to protect consumers, and for other purposes. I also send to the desk a short analysis of the bill, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

I wish to announce that hearings on this bill will be held at the same time as those on the bill for food for freedom.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCGEE in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2932) to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to establish and maintain reserves of agricultural commodities to protect consumers and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ELLENDER, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The analysis presented by Mr. ELLENDER is as follows:

SHORT ANALYSIS OF BILL AUTHORIZING COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION TO ESTABLISH AND MAINTAIN RESERVES OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES TO PROTECT CONSUMERS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Section 201(a) of the Agricultural Act of 1956 requires the Commodity Credit Corporation to dispose of all stocks of agricultural commodities held by it, as rapidly as possible consistent with its existing authority, the operation of the price support program, and orderly marketing.

The attached bill would authorize the establishment and maintenance of reserves of agricultural commodities primarily to assure a continuous, adequate, and stable

supply to meet domestic requirements at fair and reasonable prices, and also to meet the requirements of commercial exports, the food for freedom program, and domestic feeding.

The Commodity Credit Corporation would be authorized to reserve such commodities acquired under price support operations and to procure such commodities for the purpose of the reserve as the Secretary may direct.

The commodities to be reserved and the reserve quantities for each marketing year would be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture after consultation with other interested agencies and would be announced in advance of the marketing year.

The Secretary would be authorized to adjust support prices, acreage allotments and marketing quotas to achieve the production necessary to establish and maintain reserves.

Commodities in the reserve would be available for disposal through sales, barter, donations, and redemption of payment-in-kind certificates. Sales would be made under the price restrictions of existing law. Sales for foreign currencies or upon long-term conditions would be made subject to provisions of the Food for Freedom Act of 1966.

The domestic donations which may be made are those in which can be made under current authority. Foreign donations would be made pursuant to the provisions of other law with respect to such donations. Disposal through barter would be pursuant to other authority available to the Commodity Credit Corporation with respect to such transactions.

FOOD FOR FREEDOM

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, and for other purposes.

I wish to give notice that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which will have this bill, will begin hearings on the bill on March 1, 1966. I send to the desk a short explanation of the purposes of the bill, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2933) to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ELLENDER, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The explanation presented by Mr. ELLENDER is as follows:

SHORT EXPLANATION OF BILL

The bill authorizes a 5-year program for furnishing food aid abroad to replace Public Law 480 when it expires on December 31, 1966.

It eliminates the surplus requirement, providing that commodities to be furnished would be those determined to be available by the Secretary of Agriculture, taking into account productive capacity, domestic requirements, farm and consumer price levels, commercial exports, and adequate carryover.

Programs of assistance undertaken pursuant to the new legislation would be directed toward attaining self-help on the part of the recipient countries particularly with respect to meeting needs for food.

Emphasis is placed on the development of markets for American farm products.

The program would continue to be financed under the Commodity Credit Corporation.

TITLE I

This title authorizes the sale of agricultural commodities both for foreign currencies and for dollars on credit terms. The bill enunciates a policy of shifting from foreign currency sales to dollar credit sales at a progressive rate in order that the transition to dollar sales can be completed by December 31, 1971, except for U.S. requirements.

The bill limits agreements under this title during any year to $2.5 billion plus unused authorizations from prior years.

TITLE II

This title authorizes the donation of agricultural commodities for such purposes as to meet emergency food needs for victims of disasters, to provide food-for-work community development programs, and to carry out the U.S. pledge to the world food program.

The policy of furnishing this type of aid through nonprofit voluntary relief agencies to the maximum extent practicable is reemphasized.

Programs of assistance under this title during any year are limited to $800 million plus unused authorizations from prior years.

TITLE III

This title provides that currencies which accrue from foreign currency sales shall be deposited to the credit of the United States and shall be used for specified purposes. Among the purposes authorized are: to finance U.S. expenses abroad, to develop new markets for U.S. agricultural commodities, to procure military equipment for common defense, to promote economic development, to finance educational exchange programs, to make loans to U.S. firms for business development and trade expansion, and to finance research.

RURAL POVERTY PROGRAM

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, in behalf of myself, Mr. BASS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina, a bill to provide needed additional means for the residents of rural America to achieve equality of opportunity, by authorizing the making of grants for comprehensive planning for public services and development in community development districts designated by the Secretary of Agriculture. Hearings on this bill will begin on March 9 of this year.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill remain at the desk for a period of 1 week, so that others who may desire to join as cosponsors may do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2934) to provide needed additional means for the residents of rural America to achieve equality of opportunity by authorizing the making of grants for comprehensive planning for public services and development in community development districts designated by the Secretary of Agriculture, introduced by Mr. ELLENDER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. ELLENDER. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the President's message on the subject, as well as a staff explanation, and an analysis of the bill.

There being no objection, the message from the President, explanation and analysis presented by Mr. ELLENDER are as follows:

RURAL POVERTY PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TRANSMITTING THE RURAL POVERTY PROGRAM

To the Congress of the United States:

Last year in my message on agriculture I described poverty's grip on rural America:

Nearly half of the poor in the United States live in rural areas.

Almost one in every two rural families has a cash income under $3,000.

One-fourth of rural nonfarm homes are without running water.

Rural people lag almost 2 years behind urban residents in educational attainment.

Health facilities in rural areas are so inadequate that rural children receive one-third less medical attention than urban children.

These deficiencies persist in 1966. Their effect is grievous on urban America—the recipient of millions of unskilled migrants from rural areas in the past two decades. It is tragic on the rundown farms and impoverished communities that still house 4.4 million poor rural families.

ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS

Last year I directed—

Each department and agency administering a program that could benefit rural people, to assure that its benefits were distributed equitably between urban and rural areas.

The Secretary of Agriculture and the Director of the Budget to review the administrative obstacles that might stand in the way of such a distribution.

The Secretary of Agriculture to put his field offices to the task of assisting other Federal agencies in making their programs effective in rural areas.

As a result, the Rural Community Development Service was created and charged with assuring that the Department made that assistance available.

This mission of the Department is now firmly established in practice. Its field personnel are active in informing rural people of their eligibility for medicare, and of its requirements. They work with the Economic Development Administration in planning and encouraging new rural industrial developments. In several pilot counties, concerted projects are underway. The Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Agriculture are joined in a common effort to bring social services to poor rural communities. The water and sewer facilities program has been simplified. They have been made more responsive to the needs of small towns and communities.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has increased its efforts in rural areas. Community action programs are underway in a number of rural counties—supporting community action planning; providing remedial reading courses, vocational instruction, and adult education; and assisting small cooperatives to acquire farm machinery.

These programs have inspired a new sense of hope among the rural Americans who have experienced them.

More—much more—needs to be done if their effects are to reach the dispersed but very real pockets of rural poverty throughout America.

THE NEED FOR PLANNING

Legislation enacted by the first session of this Congress, and in prior years, provides the means for a massive attack on poverty in America.

But—even with the help of these great new programs—too few rural communities are able to marshal sufficient physical, human, and financial resources to achieve a satisfac-

tory level of social and economic development.

The central advantage of the city has been a large and concentrated population to provide the leadership and technical capability. This leadership can achieve economies of scale in operations, to provide adequate public services and facilities for its people.

On the other hand, it is difficult, if not impossible, for every small hamlet to offer its own complete set of public services. Nor is it economic for the small city to try to achieve metropolitan standards of service, opportunity, and culture, without relation to its rural environs.

The related interests of each need to be taken into account in planning for the public services and economic development of the wider community. In this way the benefits of creative federalism can be brought to our rural citizens—in small cities as well as its rural neighbors.

WHAT MIGHT BE DONE

The base exists for such coordinated planning.

New communities are coming into being—stimulated by advanced means of travel and communications. Because of these it is possible to extend to people in the outlying rural areas a richer variety of public services, and of economic and cultural opportunities.

Resources must be combined—in larger areas, as well as rural and small urban communities. In a population base large enough to support a full range of efficient and high-quality public services and facilities, we can achieve the conditions necessary for economic and social advance.

THE DIMENSIONS OF THE COMMUNITIES

The dimensions of an area within which residents should join to carry out integrated planning are likely to be already marked by the trading or commuting patterns.

In most such communities, the total population will be large enough, with enough potential users of each essential service, to justify employing competent full-time resident specialists in medical services, schools, and the like. In some such communities, where towns of even 10,000 are scarce, it may be more practical to provide major services to people at the outer limits through mobile facilities.

BENEFITS OF PLANNING

Coordinated planning can stimulate economic growth.

It can provide the economies of efficient public services—which attract business and industry.

It can make possible adequate vocational training. Rural workers who lack present job opportunities can become qualified for work in new and expanding industries within reach of their homes or farms.

It can provide the schools to spare young children the fate of their fathers. Seventy-two percent of all poor rural families today are headed by persons who have finished only 8 years of schooling or less.

It can greatly enlarge the effectiveness of public and private resources.

It can insure that programs will comprise a logical and comprehensive effort to solve the community's interrelated problems at minimum cost.

It can bring us closer to achieve a more beautiful, more livable rural America. An increasing combination of local, State, and Federal resources is already beginning to transform the countryside. This cooperation is making multiple uses possible—for production, for outdoor recreation, and for the restoration of natural beauty. Planning can help make this beneficence a part of the lives of millions of urban Americans.

Above all, planning is an affirmative act. It signifies the willingness of rural men and women to make their part of America a place of hope. Rural America need not be a wasteland from which the young, however ill prepared, flee to the cities. It does not have to be a place where live only those too old, too poor, too defeated to seek other horizons.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICTS

I propose that we show how broad-based planning can inspire the people of rural America to unite the resources of their rural governments and small cities.

I propose this union to improve the quality of life for the citizens of both.

I propose that we assist in the establishment of a number of community development districts to carry out, under local initiative, such comprehensive planning.

The boundaries of community development districts will correspond to the normal commuting or trading patterns of the rural and city residents.

Planning activities for the district will be performed under the direction of representatives selected by each of the participating county or municipal governments. They will be responsible for planning the coordination of all governmental development and service functions within the district.

Federal grants would be provided:

(1) For districtwide planning of public services and governmental functions where other Federal planning assistance is not available; and

(2) For districtwide coordination of local planning activities with Federal programs and private initiatives, in a comprehensive attack on rural community problems.

The Secretary of Agriculture will certify that the area has met the requirements for designation as a community development district. Selection of the pilot districts will be made to afford experience in a representative variety of geographic, economic, and social conditions. Funds will be requested to augment those presently available for planning grants.

Federal assistance would help to support coordinated and comprehensive planning for all public services, development programs, and governmental functions within the district; a continuing liaison with Federal and State agencies; and a comprehensive survey of resources and needs within the district, such as labor skills, industrial sites, land and water resources, health care, education, cultural opportunities, and public services.

Thus the scope of planning to be supported would extend beyond physical development. It would encompass as well the social and economic needs of the area, and its potential for growth.

Each agency of the Government charged with administering a program relevant to these needs will be requested to cooperate with the community development districts. For example, a comprehensive survey of medical conditions in the area would be undertaken by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Teacher Corps—which I again urge the Congress to support at a level commensurate with its promise—would be asked to make teams available for the districts. The Department of Agriculture will offer a concerted emphasis in its resource development programs within the pilot districts.

The purpose of the planning effort I recommend is to assist these districts to achieve significant economies of scale and rational use of resources. This achievement can lift them, and their peoples, above their present level of development.

Our purpose is to demonstrate how a common effort can provide the needed district vocational school in one county, the hospital in another, the police training in a third, industry or an adequate library in a fourth. This effort can avoid the waste of duplication—or worse still, the total lack of such facilities or services because of a failure to pool common resources.

Our purpose is not to supplant present efforts of local, State, or Federal governments. Our purpose is to supplement them. Then we do not forsake the small community, but help to avoid underrepresentation in decisions that affect its life.

MEDICAL NEEDS

Rural families share with the urban poor a greater need for modern medical services. Infant mortality and infectious-disease rates are higher, life expectancy is lower, and the need for chronic-illness care is just as prevalent. Yet rural families have had less access to physicians, with rural States averaging only a third the number of physicians per person as the heavily populated urban States. The continuing decline in the per capita number of physicians, therefore, strikes harder at rural families.

The beneficial effects of recent legislation, providing for more extensive professional relationship between rural hospitals and urban medical centers; the improved schooling that will soon be available in rural areas; improved roads and transportation—all will reduce the difficulty in recruiting physicians for rural areas by increasing the professional and educational opportunities available to them.

Nevertheless, we are not recruiting sufficient numbers of medical students from the families of the urban poor and rural areas. We need a financial incentive that will make it possible for children of these families to undertake a medical career. At the same time we need to draw upon medical students from other areas to settle in rural medical practice.

I shall soon propose, therefore, that a loan forgiveness program modeled upon the National Defense Education Act Amendments of 1965 be applied to medical students who choose to practice in poor rural areas.

RURAL POVERTY

The efforts of five administrations have provided some relief for hundreds of thousands of poor families who remain on small farms and in rural communities. Yet the old task remains undone: to end the travail of unemployed and underemployed men; to teach their children the skills they must have to prosper in a competitive society; to provide enough food, adequate shelter, and decent medical care for their families; and to help them achieve freedom from want and fear in their later years.

I do not believe we should stand idly by and permit our rural citizens to be ground into poverty—exposing them, unassisted and unencouraged, to the neglect of a changing society. Few other elements of our population are so treated by our humane and progressive people.

Yet I believe we need the counsel of those best qualified by experience and understanding of rural America's problems, to help us chart our course of assistance to her poor.

Consequently, I shall soon appoint a Commission on Rural Poverty, whose task it will be to make recommendations to me, within 1 year of its appointment, on the most efficient and promising means of sharing America's abundance with those who have too often been her forgotten people.

Rural poverty has proved an almost intractable problem in past decades. Its abolition may require a journey of a thousand miles.

But the first step in that journey is the pooling of the common resources of rural Americans—joining them in a common planning effort that will magnify the resources of each.

In the program I propose, I ask the Congress to take that step with me today.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 25, 1966.*

S. 2934

A bill to provide needed additional means for the residents of rural America to achieve equality of opportunity by authorizing the making of grants for comprehensive planning for public services and development in designated community development districts designated by the Secretary of Agriculture

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Community Development District Act of 1966".

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this Act (1) to provide the means for more equitable participation by rural residents in coordinated planning activities and decisions; (2) to increase efficiency in the use of resources; (3) to provide full representation of smaller governmental units in the planning activities and decisions which affect their residents, so that existing and future programs can be made more effective in providing in rural America equality of opportunity; (4) to improve the relationships between and the welfare of both ubran and rural people; and (5) to facilitate the cooperation among all Federal, State, and local agencies in establishing multi-county community development districts to better coordinate the planning of programs to improve rural life.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Agriculture, after consulting with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, may designate as a community development district (hereafter called "district") any area that has been so delineated by the State agency specified by the Governor or legislature of the State, or any other area if such designation is not in conflict with the action of such State agency, where he finds that the area encompassed within the district includes a county or municipal government having jurisdiction over a commuting center, or two or more centers within convenient daily commuting distance of each other, and the surrounding territory within convenient daily commuting distance of such centers. The district may include such other territory beyond convenient daily commuting distance of such centers within which the residents are dependent upon such centers as their usual source of some or all of the goods and services generally secured by daily commuting. "Convenient daily commuting distance" means such distance and direction as residents normally commute for their day-to-day commercial, vocational, public service, social, and cultural pursuits.

SEC. 4. (a) Upon designation of a district by the Secretary of Agriculture, a community development district planning agency (hereafter called "agency") may be established in the district. The agency shall be established and governed by a board or commission (hereafter called "board") whose members are appointed by and responsible to the participating county or municipal governments having jurisdiction within the district. Representation on the board shall be reasonably related to the populations of the participating governmental jurisdictions, and the eligibility of county or municipal governments to participate shall be so established as to enable all citizens residing within the district to be represented on the board by the appointee of an elected government.

(b) "Participating" governments as used in this Act means those counties and municipalities which have authorized by official action of their governing bodies representation on the board and participation in the functions of the board.

SEC. 5. (a) Section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by adding thereto the following:

"(h) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section grants may be made by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to the planning agency of any community development district designated by the Secretary of Agriculture under the Community Development District Act of 1966 for comprehensive planning as defined in this section and in accordance with purposes of that Act. Such grants shall be in the amounts certified by the Secretary of Agriculture, as follows:

"(1) Not to exceed 75 per centum of the costs of salaries and expenses of the professional staff required for community development district program development planning, and for other planning of public services and other functions of the participating governments for which Federal planning grants are not otherwise available.

"(2) Planning incentive grants in an amount not to exceed 10 per centum of the amount of other Federal grants for planning purposes extended within the district.

"Grants provided under this subsection to the planning agency may be paid in whole or in part to participating governments for the use of the planning agency where this will facilitate the purposes of the Community Development District Act of 1966.

"For purposes of this subsection comprehensive planning may also include the undertaking of coordinated planning for public services and for all other governmental functions."

SEC. 6. The Administrator of any Federal assistance program having a requirement for planning as a condition of loan or grant assistance shall, before approval of such assistance, give consideration to the plans for the applicable district.

SEC. 7. The Secretary of Agriculture shall require, as a condition of extending planning assistance, that the board agree to give consideration to all other planning requirements under any other Federal program.

SEC. 8. Any agencies of the United States authorized to make grants, loans, or other assistance shall accord due and appropriate consideration to requests for assistance to carry out plans of districts. Upon request of a board, the Secretary of Agriculture may provide technical advice to applicants for such assistance in the development and implementation of plans provided for in this Act.

SEC. 9. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to delegate to the heads of other departments and agencies of the Federal Government such of his functions, powers, and duties under this Act as he may deem appropriate, and to authorize the redelegation of such functions, powers, and duties by the heads of such departments and agencies.

(b) Departments and agencies of the Federal Government shall exercise their powers, duties, and functions in such manner as will, to the maximum extent permitted by other applicable laws, assist in carrying out the objectives of this Act.

SEC. 10. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SHORT STAFF EXPLANATION OF RURAL POVERTY BILL

The bill requested by the President in his message transmitting the rural poverty program provides for planning assistance to local areas. It would be called the Community Development District Act of 1966. Under it the Secretary of Agriculture, after consulting with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, could designate community development districts (generally within daily commuting distance of a center), if such action did not conflict with State action. A planning agency would be established for each district by a board consisting of representatives of county and municipal governments in the district.

Grants could then be made by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to the planning agency in amounts certified by the Secretary of Agriculture for—

1. Up to 75 percent of the professional staff cost required for development planning and planning of public services and functions for which Federal planning grants are not otherwise available; and

2. Planning incentive grants in an amount up to 10 percent of the amount of other Federal planning grants made within the district.

An analysis prepared by the Department of Agriculture is attached.

ANALYSIS OF THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT ACT OF 1966

Sections 1 and 2: The purpose of this act is to help raise the quality of life and the level of opportunity in rural America to a par with our continually rising expectations of urban life by—

1. Providing the means for more equitable participation by rural residents in coordinated planning activities and decisions;

2. Increasing efficiency in the use of resources;

3. Providing full representation of smaller governmental units in the planning activities and decisions which affect their residents, so that existing and future programs can be made more effective in providing in rural America equality of opportunity;

4. Improving the relationships between and the welfare of both urban and rural people; and

5. Facilitating the cooperation among all Federal, State and local agencies in establishing multicounty community development districts to better coordinate the planning of programs to improve rural life.

Section 3: The Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized, after consulting with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, to designate community development districts. The boundaries of districts would be those delineated by the appropriate State planning agency, or not in conflict with action taken by such State agency.

This will have the important advantage of enabling the State planning agency to develop a pattern for planning organization within the State that can be followed uniformly in planning for all State, local, and Federal governmental programs.

The guidelines for determining the boundaries of districts, in accordance with the standards specified in this bill, are likely to be already marked with considerable precision by the commuting patterns that have been drawn by rural and urban residents together as they drive to work, to shop, to college, to visit, and to medical, educational, vocational training, recreational, and cultural facilities. The commuting center is likely to be within 1 hour's driving time of most or all residents.

In such districts the total population will be large enough to insure enough users of each essential service to justify employing competent, full-time resident specialists to provide concerted medical and educational services. In some regions where towns of even 10,000 people are scarce, it is more practical to provide major services to people at the outer limits through mobile facilities rather than for them to commute.

No two districts, of course, will be identical. But a typical district can be thought of as having a small- or medium-sized city at the center, together with a circle of primarily rural counties within commuting range around it. Some districts might contain two or more urban centers. The rural counties will invariably contain several county-seat towns and smaller settlements. The distinguishing feature is that residents of the district normally and spontaneously carry on most of their resident-type activities within its limits.

Section 4: Upon designation of a district by the Secretary of Agriculture, a community development district planning agency may be established. It shall be governed by a board or commission whose members are appointed by the participating county or municipal governments. Representation on the board is to be reasonably related to population of the governmental jurisdictions participating. The eligibility of participating governments is to be established so that all residents within the district can be represented on the board, if an elected government having jurisdiction over them takes the necessary official action to participate in the functions of the planning agency. A participating government is defined as one that has taken official action to appoint a representative on the board and to participate in its functions.

Section 5: Section 5 would amend section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended, relating to community planning, by adding an additional subsection "h". The grants' program would be administered by the Department of Agriculture, but the funds granted are to be disbursed by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development would make grants in the amounts and to district planning agencies certified by the Secretary of Agriculture, for funds authorized under the proposed legislation.

Grants would cover part of the cost of salaries and expenses of professional staffs needed to carry out comprehensive planning, as defined in section 701, as it would be amended by the Community Development District Act. Such grants would be available to cover—

1. Up to 75 percent of the professional staff cost for developing the district planning program, and for planning of other governmental functions and public services for which Federal planning grants are not otherwise available; and

2. Planning incentive grants in an amount up to 10 percent of other Federal planning grants made within the district.

Grants could be paid to the participating governments for use by the planning agency, if this would facilitate district planning. This would enable district planning agencies to function in some States which may not now have legislative authority for county municipal governments to undertake such planning jointly.

For the purposes of this new provision, the term "comprehensive planning" under section 701 is broadened to include the undertaking of coordinated planning for public services and for all other governmental functions.

The regular section 701 planning grants, and the special planning grants under the proposed Community Development District Act of 1966, would be distinct and separate, but related, planning grant programs.

The present urban planning assistance program authorized by section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended, provides Federal grants to supplement State and local funds for the purpose of financing comprehensive and coordinated urban planning activities. This main thrust is to develop plans that would more adequately deal with the problems of smaller communities and related metropolitan areas arising from the expansion of urban and urbanizing areas, which in many instances, transcend political boundaries. The planning purposes are concerned with the pattern and intensity of land use and the provision of public facilities, including transportation, open space and recreation, housing, health, educational facilities, community development and urban renewal, and long-range fiscal plans for such development. These grants require the intergovernmental coordination of all related planning activities among the State and local governmental agencies concerned.

The present urban planning assistance program provides a maximum grant of two-thirds of the total cost of the urban planning project. If the locality is situated in Economic Development Administration redevelopment areas, or in areas in which there has occurred a substantial reduction in employment as a result of a decline in government employment or purchases, grants may amount to as much as 75 percent of the project cost, which is the amount that would be authorized under the Community Development District Act for districts designated by the Secretary of Agriculture. In addition, community development districts may get up to a maximum of a 10-percent of the amount of other grants within the district as an additional incentive grant.

Under the present section 701 authorities, counties (without regard to population) and multicounty agencies may receive planning grants. However, such grants are limited to use for plans for the development of public facilities, including transportation, land use, open space, recreation, etc., in the population centers.

The planning and development of public facilities in the main population centers of metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas will contribute importantly to rural opportunities in the area. However, there is needed also an efficient means for the planning of programs for improved public services and governmental functions in predominantly rural areas. The broader scope of comprehensive planning for community development districts that would be provided by the proposed amendment to section 701 will permit predominantly rural local governments to participate in planning for the improvement and development of the natural resources, public facilities, and public services, with the commuting center cities upon which rural people must depend to an important extent.

Section 6: The bill would require the administrator of any Federal assistance program, having a requirement for planning as a condition of loan or grant assistance, to give consideration to the plans of the applicable district before approving such aid. This would help to insure that federally aided projects within a district will conform to the districtwide plan.

Section 7: Requires the Secretary of Agriculture to condition planning assistance to districts upon the boards agreement to give consideration to the planning requirements of other Federal programs.

Section 8: Any Federal agency making grants, loans, or other assistance would be required to give consideration to requests for assistance needed to carry out a district's plan. Upon request of a district board, the Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized to give technical advice to applicants for such assistance, in the development and carrying out of projects conforming to the district's plans.

Section 9: The Secretary of Agriculture would receive the conventional authority to delegate his functions under this act to other Federal agencies. All Federal agencies would be required to exercise their functions, to the maximum extent permitted by other law, in such a manner as to assist in carrying out the objectives of this act.

Section 10: The bill would authorize appropriations needed for administering the provisions of this act.

REGIONAL SOLUTIONS TO CERTAIN TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill to encourage regional solutions to mass transportation problems which transcend State boundaries, and to provide expanded Federal assistance to hard-pressed commuter services.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie on the desk for 1 week for additional cosponsors.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the bill seeks to encourage the regional approach in solving mass transit commuter problems, by doing the following:

First. Authorizing the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants of up to three-fourths of the estimated cost of surveys, studies, and development plans undertaken by regional transportation authorities. Only authorities duly created by individual States or through interstate compact and empowered to own or lease and to operate transportation facilities would qualify for these grants.

Second. Authorizing the Secretary to provide technical assistance with respect to the establishment of these transportation authorities.

The bill would also—

Third. Increasing the authorization under the Mass Transit Act to $300 million a year through fiscal 1970.

Fourth. Authorizing the Secretary, for a maximum of 3 years, to make grants of up to 50 percent of the operating deficits of any mass transportation company running commuter service in one or more urban areas.

Such grants would be conditioned on the submission to the secretary of a commuter service improvement plan providing for a more efficient and economical commuter service. This portion of the legislation differs from S. 2804, recently introduced by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], in that it limits the duration of such aid to any one company to 3 years—rather than 10 years—and sets a maximum grant at one-half—rather than two-thirds—of the actual operating deficit.

Fifth. Increase the limit of what any one State may receive under the capital grant program of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 from 12½ to 15 percent under certain conditions.

Mr. President, I firmly believe it is the role of the Federal Government to meet the operating costs of essential commuter service just as the Federal Government spends millions of dollars to give aid to other means of transportation such as the subsidies to airlines and the merchant marine and, of course, the enormous Federal highway program. Under present law, States may receive up to 90 percent of the cost for highway construction from the Federal Government for interstate highway systems. The intention of increased Federal aid in the case of commuter railroads is only to provide temporary assistance—the bill limits Federal grants to 50 percent of the annual net operating loss for a 3-year period. It is my hope that within that period of time, the commuter service either through private or State aid may no longer need Federal support.

I have previously introduced legislation to create an interstate rail authority to operate financially hard-pressed

commuter services. That legislation, S. 1234, was recently the subject of hearings by the Senate Commerce Committee. This present proposal would increase incentives for the establishment of such regional transportation authorities on a national basis.

Failure to maintain commuter service would bring about not only intolerable restrictions on the flow of commuter traffic in heavily urbanized areas, but also would result in increasing the burdens of already crowded highways and the need for added Federal and State expenditures for highway construction. The loss of 4 tracks of 1 commuter railroad would, according to a recent survey, require the construction of 80 highway lanes at prohibitive cost.

I have for a long time been aware of the necessity for regional solutions to the transportation needs of many areas of this Nation. I am hopeful that this legislation will stimulate establishment of new regional transportation authorities and, in addition, further strengthen those already in existence, such as the Tri-State Transportation Commission, and the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority.

It is time that we join together where necessary to devise a system of rapid transportation which will work efficiently, economically, comfortably, and safely. Each year we become more aware that although we are building spacecraft which may reach the moon, we are yet unable to provide the citizen with a modern rapid transit system.

I believe that in the development and improvement of commuter services, the Federal Government can help by increasing the amount of funds available to finance expenditures for capital equipment. President Johnson in his budget message requested legislation authorizing $150 million for the programs under the Mass Transit Act for fiscal 1968—this amounts to a 1-year extension of the program at the same figure authorized for fiscal 1966 and 1967. I believe that neither the amount to be authorized nor the 1-year extension requested is actually enough. I am informed that demand for funds has exceeded the amount available in each year since the program was begun. The 1-year extension does not give State and localities a long enough commitment of Federal support to enable them to make comprehensive plans for the future. Accordingly, my proposal would amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize appropriations through fiscal year 1970 and at the same time the amount authorized would be increased to $300 million through fiscal 1970. This amount would include the operating deficits program. A gradual increase to $50 million for fiscal 1969 is authorized for research, development, and demonstration projects.

I am informed that at least three States—New York, California, and Pennsylvania—are certain to make requests for funds amounting to more than the 12½-percent limitation which any one State may receive under the present law. I intend to increase the limitation to 15 percent in the case of any State in which more than two-thirds of the maximum grants have been made or obligated for projects and where the Secretary determines that there is a substantial need for such an increase in order to carry out existing programs. This language is similar to that used in the urban renewal section of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended—section 106(e).

Those who would see the transportation problem—in particular the commuter situation—as strictly a problem confronting the northeastern section of the Nation fail to see what I believe to be the significant national ramifications of this problem. For many, the commuter problem at this time is only a distant din, but as this Nation continues to grow, I can tell you most assuredly that the problem will reach all sections of the Nation. You may be sure this problem of urban transit will arise in Atlanta or in San Francisco or in other metropolitan areas in the future. This is the time for the legislators of all States to join with those of us who are presently immersed in this problem to enact legislation which will not only rid us of these recurrent urban transportation crises but will also prevent such problems from arising in the growing metropolitan areas.

We must stay ahead of the growth of our urban transit needs by developing a farsighted comprehensive plan for urban mass transit through the setting up of regional mass transportation authorities. I believe the Federal Government, with one hand, must temporarily help the commuter railroads to stay alive, while with the other hand, it must give long-term aid so that these railroads may establish a more secure economic position through a capitalization program designed to modernize their facilities.

I urge my colleagues to study the problem and to join with me in supporting this important legislation. I hope that this bill will be the subject of hearings along with a bill of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] (S. 2804) which is now before the Committee on Banking and Currency.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2935) to authorize grants under section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 to encourage regional solutions to transportation problems which transcend State boundaries, to authorize grants under the Mass Transportation Act of 1964 on a temporary basis to help defray operating deficits incurred in commuter service, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2935

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(h) In order to encourage regional solutions to those transportation needs and problems which transcend the boundaries of any one State or its political subdivisions, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development is authorized—

"(1) to make grants to regional transportation authorities, designated by the Governors of the States involved and acceptable to the Secretary, which are empowered under State laws or interstate compact to own or lease and to operate transportation facilities, and to perform planning functions with respect to transportation, on a regional basis; and

"(2) to provide technical assistance to States or political subdivisions of States with respect to the establishment of transportation authorities to meet regional transportation needs.

A grant under paragraph (1) of this subsection shall not exceed three-fourths of the estimated cost to any such authority for undertaking surveys and studies, and developing plans and programs, for meeting effectively regional transportation requirements. Assistance under paragraph (2) of this subsection shall include studies evaluating the need for the establishment of regional transportation authorities in meeting the transportation requirements of metropolitan or other areas in the United States, and such assistance may be provided by the Secretary through members of his staff, or by contract with public or private institutions or firms."

SEC. 2. (a) The Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 is amended by redesignating sections 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 as sections 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13, respectively, and by adding after section 5 a new section as follows:

"GRANTS TO MEET COMMUTER SERVICE DEFICITS

"SEC. 6. (a) The Secretary may make grants on a temporary basis to any State or local public body for the purpose of enabling such State or public body to assist any mass transportation company which maintains commuter service in one or more urban areas within the jurisdiction of such State or public body to defray operating deficits incurred as the result of providing such service. The amount of any grant made under this section to any State or local public body to assist any such company shall not exceed one-half of the annual net operating deficit of such company, as certified by such State or public body and approved by the Secretary. Any grant under this section to any State or local public body to assist any mass transportation company to defray operating deficits incurred as the result of providing commuter service in one or more urban areas within the jurisdiction of such State or public body shall be conditioned on the joint submission by such State or local public body and such company of a commuter service improvement plan, meeting criteria established by the Secretary and approved by him, for providing more efficient, economical, and convenient commuter service in such area or areas, and for placing the commuter operations of such company on a sound fiscal basis. No grant shall be made under this section to assist any such company unless (1) the Secretary is satisfied that such company has the requisite ability and authority to carry out an approved commuter service improvement plan, (2) the State or local public body and the company submitting such approved plan agree to provide such joint or separate reports to the Secretary as he may require, and (3) such company agrees to permit the Secretary and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, during any period in which it is receiving assistance under this section, to have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any of its books, documents, papers, and records

that are pertinent to the purposes for which such assistance is granted. No such company shall receive assistance provided under this section for a period in excess of three years, except that the Secretary may authorize such assistance for an additional period, not exceeding two years, if he determines that an extension is necessary in order to enable such company to carry out its commuter service improvement plan.

"(b) In providing assistance under this Act for the benefit of any mass transportation company, the Secretary shall, insofar as practicable, coordinate such assistance with any other assistance which is reasonably available to such company from public or private sources."

(b) Section 10(c) of such Act (as redesignated by subsection (a)) is amended—

(1) by striking out the semicolon at the end of clause (3) and inserting in lieu thereof ", and the term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development;";

(2) by striking out "and" at the end of clause (4);

(3) by striking out the period at the end of clause (5) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(4) by adding at the end there a new clause as follows:

"(6) the term 'annual net operating deficit' means that part of the annual operating costs of a mass transportation company which could reasonably have been avoided by the elimination of commuter service in an urban area, less the annual revenues derived by such company from the provision of such service."

SEC. 3. (a) The first sentence of section 4(b) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows: "In addition to amounts heretofore appropriated to finance grants under this Act, there is authorized to be appropriated for that purpose not to exceed $300,000,000 for fiscal year 1967; $300,000,000 for fiscal year 1968; $300,000,000 for fiscal year 1969; and $300,000,000 for fiscal year 1970."

(b) The first sentence of section 7(b) of such Act (as redesignated by section 2(a) of this Act) is amended to read as follows: "In addition to amounts heretofore made available to finance projects under this section, the Administrator may make available for that purpose from the mass transportation grant authorization provided in section 4(b) not to exceed $35,000,000, which limit shall be increased to $40,000,000 on July 1, 1967, to $45,000,000 on July 1, 1968, and to $50,000,000 on July 1, 1969."

SEC. 4. Section 13 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 (as redesignated by section 2(a) of this Act) is amended—

(1) by striking out "section 7(b)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 8(b)"; and

(2) by striking out the period and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ": *Provided*, That such limitation shall be increased to 15 per centum in the case of any State, if (1) more than two-thirds of the maximum grants permitted under the foregoing limitation have been made or obligated for projects in such State, and (2) the Secretary determines that there is a substantial need for such increase in order to carry out existing programs meeting the requirements of section 4(a)."

PROHIBITION OF STATES AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS FROM TAXING TVA PRODUCED ELECTRIC POWER

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 to prohibit State and local taxation of electric power produced by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

One of the principal motivating factors behind the enactment of the law creating the TVA was reasonably priced electric power for consumers. The success in this area is so remarkable that today the rates of TVA produced power are used as a guideline or a yardstick for the price of power throughout our Nation.

Yet, Mr. President, there are forces at work today that would undermine this economical concept. It is indeed ironic that, after the potential of a State has been developed to such a great degree by an agency, this same State would turn and attack one of the basic concepts of the developing agency. But this is what is being done to the consumer by applying sales taxes to the sale of electric power produced by TVA. The temptation to cash in at the expense of, not only the TVA, but the citizen-consumer proved too great.

Most States which have sales taxes provide exemptions for basic necessities. Certainly, after the recent experience of the blackout in New York City, no one can question that electric power is essential. In the TVA area this is doubly true. With the advent of reasonably priced electric power, the people of this region have utilized electricity on a much wider scale than other areas of the country. For instance, more people heat their homes electrically in this section than in any other area of our Nation.

However, certain State governments, and I must regretably report that my own is the chief transgressor, have seen fit to attempt to tap this source of blessing to their people by applying sales taxes.

This practice, Mr. President, is not only in obvious disregard of the State government's responsibility to insure the essentials of life to its own people, but is an attack on the principles and concepts of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

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

The bill (S. 2939) to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 to prohibit State and local taxation of electric power produced by the Tennessee Valley Authority, introduced by Mr. BASS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

WASTE MANAGEMENT RESEARCH ACT OF 1966

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I am introducing today the first in a series of bills which will comprise a comprehensive package of antipollution legislation for consideration by the U.S. Congress.

These bills will be a sharp departure from what we have done in the past. They will revolutionize America's approach to water pollution. They will involve considerable costs. They will undoubtedly be controversial.

But they also are inescapable. They accept the hard reality that pollution has all but destroyed our rivers, that it is on its way to destroying our lakes, and that it is threatening our supply of fresh water. They recognize that our cities, States, private industries and the Federal Government are presently unable to check pollution. And they provide a solution to this mounting crisis which we can ignore no longer.

My judgment tells me that the people of America are ready at long last for this kind of legislation. It may take a while for such a broad program to be fully understood. It may require some budgeting skill to make the necessary funds available. But if the public and its elected representatives really want to save their threatened waters, then we have no real alternative but to adopt this comprehensive approach. Pollution itself is costly and controversial. If we are not willing to pay the price to save our fresh blue waters, we will pay a far more terrible price in their destruction.

During the past 3 years, I have discussed this subject in speeches in some 23 States from coast to coast. It is my conclusion that it will cost us anywhere from $50 to $100 billion over the next decade and a half to save our fresh waters from complete destruction. This is a large amount of money. However, it amounts to about 1 or 2 years' budget for the Department of Defense. This certainly is a reasonable amount to invest to enhance the environment in which we live. Everywhere I have gone I have found the public willing to undertake an attack on pollution of such magnitude. The public, in fact, is far ahead of the Congress in its concern over this issue.

Last fall, I was asked by the Milwaukee Journal to write a detailed series of articles on the nationwide pollution problem and to propose some solutions. These articles were inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] on January 19.

Since that time, these proposals have been translated into bill form with the assistance of the Department of the Interior, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Senate legislative counsel.

Many others, of course, share my concern about this national pollution problem. The Senate Air and Water Pollution Subcommittee, on which I was privileged to serve in the last session of Congress, has announced its intention to introduce legislation in this field.

Last Sunday the New York Times published a story expressing the President's deep concern on this issue and speculating on the legislative proposals which he might make to meet the problem.

Because I feel a personal obligation to propose a comprehensive program to meet the pollution crisis, I will offer these bills for the consideration of the Congress. It is my hope that after considering these bills, along with those recommended by the President and the Senate Air and Water Pollution Subcommittee, the Congress will go on this year to enact a truly comprehensive program to check and eradicate water pollution.

THE POLLUTION CRISIS

Never before in history has our Nation become so aware of the growing crisis of water pollution. In the past 12 months,

it has drawn the urgent attention of the President of the United States, has dominated the covers of our national news magazines, has filled the front pages of American newspapers, and has been dramatically portrayed in television documentaries.

The grim facts have shocked the Nation:

Every major river system in America is polluted.

Almost all our lakes face possible ruin, from the smallest pool in the woods to the mighty Great Lakes chain.

Experts warn that vast Lake Erie may already be too far gone to save, as it suffocates from a surge of pollution which has consumed all the oxygen in the 2,500 square mile heart of the lake and set off a cancerlike explosion of weeds and algae.

Southern Lake Michigan's pollution has been labeled "practically irreversible," with the grim report that even if all pollution stopped today it might take 100 years for it to be clean again.

Cities are now discharging the equivalent of the untreated sewage from 75 million people.

Industries are now discharging the equivalent of the untreated sewage from 165 million people.

Poisonous pesticides which do not decompose are being used at the rate of 700 million pounds a year, and their use will increase tenfold in the next 20 years.

Ships, yachts, marinas, and lakeshore cottages are polluting many of our choicest lakes and rivers.

A New York woman reviewed these facts recently and summed up the situation in these words:

We Americans are standing ankle deep in sewage, shooting rockets to the moon.

The problem has been clearly documented, by the President, by the U.S. Public Health Service, by State and local health officers, and by conservation groups all across the Nation. The question is, What do we propose to do about it?

Surely we cannot build a Great Society while standing ankle deep in sewage.

WHAT IS BEING DONE?

It is true, of course, that many dedicated people have done many admirable things in an effort to protect our Nation from the hazards of water pollution.

Our cities have built costly sewage treatment plants, often burdening their property taxpayers by doing so. Many industries have also installed costly waste treatment facilities and spent great sums of money on imaginative research. State and local enforcement officials, usually understaffed and underfinanced, have worked valiantly to protect the public interest.

The Federal Government has moved steadily forward, beginning with the enactment of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in 1956, and the strengthening of that act which took place in 1961 and 1965.

But the tragedy of our time is that all this effort has been too little and too late.

The harsh truth is that we cannot control the present level of pollution pouring out of our cities and our industries today. There is no likelihood whatever that present programs will be able to cope with the coming surge of pollution.

Everything we have done, everything we are now doing in an effort to control pollution, is inadequate to meet the threat we face.

WHAT IS WRONG?

Pollution control programs are complicated. But it is possible to state in a few simple words what is wrong with our existing programs at the local, State and Federal level:

Many cities cannot or will not spend the money needed to build adequate sewage treatment plants. The same is true for industries.

Enforcement of antipollution laws is weak. But even tough enforcement will not solve the problem at present. You cannot purify city or industrial wastes with a court order.

We need to know more about the wastes pouring into our waters and how to purify them.

We are trying to dispose of sewage and dangerous new chemical wastes with the same methods used for more than 100 years.

These methods will work no longer. We have got to use our American scientific genius to find more efficient and more effective treatment. You might summarize these conclusions by saying:

We need more knowledge, more money and a new method of enforcement.

That is what is proposed in the package of antipollution bills which will be introduced in the next few days.

Briefly described, the bills in the package will do the following:

First. Greatly increase Federal grants to cities for sewage plant construction. The Federal share of construction costs would be increased from about 30 to 90 percent.

Second. Authorize direct Federal grants to qualifying industries for waste treatment plant construction.

Third. Establish a Federal "pollution tax" for those industries which continue to pollute public waters.

Fourth. Greatly increase federally financed research into waste management and disposal.

Fifth. Strengthen Federal authority to move against pollution when local enforcement fails.

Sixth. Control the kinds of pesticides and other chemicals which may be used, in order to prevent water supplies from becoming permanently poisoned.

Seventh. Require ships and marine terminals on our lakes, rivers and harbors to install approved sewage treatment equipment.

Eighth. Authorize a rejuvenation program once pollution has been checked on a given body of water—to clean up the filth left behind and begin restoration of the quality of the water.

Each of these bills and the problems and existing programs with which they deal will be discussed in detail as they are introduced.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a news story from the Cleveland Plain-Dealer of January 13, 1966, a news story from the Milwaukee Journal of February 3, 1966, and an article from my January 1966 Newsletter, which described these legislative proposals to control pollution. I also ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill to coordinate and improve the waste management activities of the Federal Government and of other government and private organizations, the Waste Management Research Act of 1966, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, news stories, and articles will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2940) to coordinate and improve the waste management activities of the Federal Government and of other government and private organizations, introduced by Mr. NELSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2940

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Waste Management Research Act of 1966."

FINDINGS AND PURPOSES

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds—

(1) that the air, water and soil of the Nation are being polluted by the discard and discharge of wastes, seriously impairing the suitability of these resources for other uses and threatening the health and welfare of the people;

(2) that this pollution will become more severe because of great increases in the quantity of wastes and the continuing appearance of new kinds of wastes;

(3) that the present methods and processes for collecting, treating, reclaiming, and disposing of wastes are inadequate now and will be useless in the future for preventing further severe pollution of air, water, and soil;

(4) that research and development in waste management by government and private agencies are not now organized and financed to the extent, nor conducted with the urgency, necessary to solve the problems of waste management in time to avert what will soon be a national pollution crisis; and

(5) that research and development in waste management by government and private agencies should therefore be greatly expanded and accelerated.

(b) The purposes of this Act therefore are—

(1) to provide centralized organization and direction, and adequate financial resources, for expanded and accelerated research and development in waste management by the Federal Government;

(2) to provide guidance and information to State and local governments, and to industrial and other private agencies, for expanded and accelerated waste management research and development;

(3) to insure that the advanced engineering and scientific capabilities developed by government and industry for the defense and space programs are exploited for waste management research and development; and

(4) to direct the development of a comprehensive national waste management program.

COMPREHENSIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT RESEARCH PROGRAM

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary shall organize the research and related activities author-

ized by the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, the Clean Air Act, and the Solid Waste Disposal Act, into a comprehensive program for research in waste management. The Secretary shall insure that the program is organized, planned, and conducted with singleness of purpose and maximum effectiveness, and for this purpose the most advanced management and research methods and techniques, including systems analysis and systems engineering, shall be employed.

(b) The Secretary shall also establish within the Department an office to collect from appropriate sources and to disseminate actively to the general public, to agricultural, industrial, and commercial groups and their representatives, and to Federal, State, and local government agencies and their representatives, such information as is available regarding all aspects of air, water, and soil pollution, including in particular the extent and dangers of such pollution, and the financial and technical assistance available from the Federal Government for research on, and prevention and abatement of, such pollution.

(c) As a foundation for the work of the waste management research program established by subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary shall have compiled a national inventory of waste management needs and problems, and of present waste management methods, including the costs of these methods. He shall then develop and recommend to the Congress a comprehensive national waste management program, including therein alternative waste management systems and a comparative analysis of the cost of such systems, which will meet present and future national waste management needs.

INTERAGENCY COOPERATION

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary shall encourage and arrange for full and complete cooperation between the waste management research program established under section 3(a), and those programs of other departments and agencies of the Federal Government engaged in research and development work on any aspect of waste management.

(b) The Secretary is hereby authorized to request, and such departments and agencies are directed to grant, the use of the waste disposal installations and facilities of any Federal Government department or agency for the purpose of testing and evaluating new methods, procedures, and equipment for waste management: *Provided*, That in the judgment of the department or agency concerned such test and evaluation work will not disrupt, disorganize, or in any way interfere with the normal activity, operations, and functioning of such agency or department: *Provided further*, That any expense incurred in such test and evaluation work above and beyond the normal and usual expense of operating the waste disposal installations and facilities of the agency or department concerned shall be borne by the Department.

APPROPRIATION AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1966, and for each of 5 succeeding fiscal years, such amounts as may be necessary for the puropses of this Act.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 6. When used in this Act—

(a) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare;

(b) the term "Department" means the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(c) the term "waste" means the unwanted solid, liquid, and gaseous materials from agricultural, industrial, commercial, domestic, and community production and consumption activities, discarded or discharged into or onto the atmosphere, water courses, or the ground;

(d) the term "waste management" means the planned, organized, and efficient collection, treatment, reclamation, and disposal of waste to minimize or prevent air, water, and soil pollution; and

(e) the term "research" means (1) studies, investigations, and experiments for the development of basic and applied knowledge bearing on waste management in the physical, biological, social and earth sciences; and (2) the design, development, and testing of equipment, methods, and processes for waste management.

The news stories and articles presented by Mr. NELSON are as follows:

[From the Plain Dealer, Jan. 13, 1966]

ONE BILLION DOLLARS TO FIGHT POLLUTION ASKED

(By Thomas R. Guthrie)

WASHINGTON.—U.S. Senator GAYLORD NELSON, of Wisconsin, who has described Lake Erie as "a primeval swamp," told the Plain Dealer yesterday he intends to introduce legislation in the present session of Congress to provide $1 billion a year in Federal funds for the war against water pollution.

The Plain Dealer reported Tuesday that NELSON will urge 90-percent Federal financing for sewers and sewage treatment facilities, as proposed by Cleveland Mayor Ralph S. Locher in a recent letter to the 16 Senators in 8 States bordering the Great Lakes.

In response to an inquiry by this reporter, the Wisconsin Democrat yesterday outlined for the Plain Dealer a sweeping pollution abatement program which he will propose:

Direct grants to industrial companies to build sewage treatment facilities.

A pollution tax to be levied against certain industrial companies in proportion to the amount of pollutants they discharge into the waters.

A major expansion of Federal, State, and private research programs in an attempt to find creative new solutions to our waste disposal problems.

Stronger enforcement procedures to carry out our existing Federal antipollution laws.

Legislation to require all ships and marine terminals to install approved sewage treatment facilities, combined with improved enforcement of laws against pollution from vessels and marine terminals.

A lake "rejuvenation program," to clean up waters and beaches and restock fish once pollution has been checked.

Along with this package of legislation the Wisconsin Democrat will put before Congress a bill to establish a Great Lakes water authority which would exercise jurisdiction over the water resources of the eight-State lakes region.

"I am delighted," NELSON said, "that Mayor Locher and the Plain Dealer are providing the public leadership in your area which is so vital if we are to attack the mounting nationwide crisis of water pollution."

He said he had already found Senators FRANK J. LAUSCHE and STEPHEN M. YOUNG, of Ohio, to be interested and helpful.

Today, LAUSCHE will meet with officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to discuss problems relating to new legislation in the war against pollution.

LAUSCHE already has indicated he intends to call a meeting of the lakes Senators to consider a crash program to clean up the lakes and streams of the Nation.

Locher proposed in his letter a 90–5–5 formula for Federal-State-local financing of sewerage programs. NELSON pointed out that at present the Federal Government pays only about 30 percent of such costs.

Other Senators commenting on Mayor Locher's proposal were WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin, PAT MCNAMARA, Democrat, of Michigan, and BIRCH BAYH, Democrat, of Indiana. Their comments:

Mr. PROXMIRE. "Under the present system of cost sharing, more sewer construction per Federal dollar is undertaken than would be the case under the 90–5–5 system. Consequently, it would be necesasry to increase Federal appropriations if the formula is changed."

Mr. MCNAMARA. "I will keep (Mayor Locher's) views in mind should water pollution legislation come before the Senate."

Mr. BAYH. "Obviously we must increase the quantity of our expenditures and quality of our programs if we are to abate and prevent the poisoning of our lakes, rivers, and streams. (Locher's) suggestions strongly merit consideration."

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Feb. 3, 1966]

NELSON MAPS MASSIVE DRIVE TO CLEAN UP LAKES, STREAMS

(By John W. Kole)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The most comprehensive package of water pollution bills ever introduced in Congress is being prepared by Senator NELSON, Democrat, of Wisconsin.

The Senator disclosed Thursday that he planned to introduce the sweeping legislation before the end of the month.

The bills will call for billions of dollars in expenditures to spearhead the $100 billion Federal program NELSON believes is necessary during the next 15 years to clean up the Nation's rivers, streams, and lakes.

Among the revolutionary concepts in the package:

Federal grants to finance 90 percent of the cost of sewage treatment facilities built by local governments.

A "carrot and stick" approach of helping industries to build waste treatment plants with direct Federal grants, perhaps up to 20 percent of the cost, fast tax depreciation writeoffs and penalties for dumping untreated wastes in waterways.

An unprecedented expansion of Federal support for Government and university research programs to find new methods to deal with the huge pollution problem.

A massive national study which would use the newest computer techniques to draw up a comprehensive waste management program for the Federal Government.

NELSON said in an interview that he realized that any legislation which called for billions of dollars in new Federal aid faced rough sledding in Congress this year because of the sharply rising costs of the war in Vietnam.

But he said he was convinced the problem had been mishandled for so long that the Federal Government had to direct a huge program if the problem ever was to be solved.

AID FOR INDUSTRY

The most revolutionary item in the package is the 90 percent Federal financing for local sewage disposal facilities. That item alone could cost billions of dollars a year.

At present, NELSON said, the Federal Government pays only about 30 percent of the costs of sewage plants.

The Senator said he realized that there was an inherent penalty in such a program for communities which had spent large sums to upgrade their sewage treatment plants. But he said he knew of no way to make such a program retroactive.

About two-thirds of the pollution volume comes from American industries with the other third coming from municipal sewage systems.

Nelson's proposal to combine incentives and penalties to deal with industrial pollution would go a long way toward meeting the demands of industrialists who contend that waste treatment should be a "social cost."

While the Senator believes that industry generally has been shamefully negligent in dealing with the problem, he recognizes that the public probably will pay the bill

no matter what approach is taken—either through higher taxes or increased prices.

The incentives of Federal grants and tax write-offs for industry would be balanced with "effluent charges" which would be levied against corporations according to the volume of pollution they contributed.

Such a program has been used successfully on Germany's Ruhr River.

NELSON noted that many States for years had relied on the "punish the polluter" concept in dealings with industry.

"But this simply hasn't worked because the laws haven't been enforced," he said. "In Wisconsin, for example, there are orders against industries to stop polluting which are 10 years old."

NELSON said he hoped that he could work out a retroactive feature for this part of his bill to help industries which had built adequate disposal facilities in recent years.

He cited Wisconsin's Kimberly-Clark Corp., which spent $5 million or 10 percent of the cost of a new paper mill at Anderson, Calif., for waste treatment facilities.

THE NELSON NEWSLETTER

(By Senator GAYLORD NELSON)

POLLUTION PACKAGE: SENATOR OFFERS COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The Nation has become alarmed at the mounting pollution of its lakes and streams. The threat to our waters has won the attention of newspapers, magazines, television, and book publishers. Public officials, right up to the President of the United States, have recognized it as a crisis deserving emergency action.

Yet for all that has been accomplished in recognizing the crisis, the Nation does not now have a program to meet it. Pollution is being fought by local, State, and Federal Government, but at each level the fight is hopelessly inadequate.

As Senator NELSON said last fall in a Milwaukee Journal series of articles: "We have 175 Federal pollution experts at work—conducting autopsies on dead or dying waters. It will be 25 or 50 years before they can get to the waters which are still clean, and by that time those waters will be ruined, too."

Convinced that urgent action is necessary, and that the public is ready for the bold new programs necessary to fight pollution, Senator NELSON announced this month that he would offer a comprehensive package of antipollution legislation to the 1966 Congress.

The NELSON package would revolutionize the Nation's approach to pollution. Instead of accepting the inevitability of grossly polluted rivers and slowly dying lakes; instead of seeking just a slight advance each year in antipollution efforts which might not even offset population and industrial growth, the NELSON package aims directly at pollution prevention, followed by a new program to rejuvenate waters now ruined.

The heart of the Nelson pollution plan is the acceptance of the fact that neither cities nor industries can now afford to build necessary sewage treatment facilities.

Cities rely on overburdened property taxes, plus a small Federal aid program for 30 percent of the cost—but requests exceed approved projects by a margin of about 3 to 1.

Industries, whose pollution load is now about double that from cities, face stiff competition and see no profits in costly waste treatment works. The Nelson package of legislation will tackle that problem this way:

A vast increase in Federal grants to cities, from the present $150 million to about $1 billion a year, and a boost in the Federal share of costs from 30 percent to 90 percent.

Industrial grants and fast tax writeoffs to build treatment facilities.

A pollution tax on industries which continue to pollute.

Greatly expanded research to find new, more efficient waste disposal methods to avoid the tremendous costs now expected.

Other Nelson bills will strengthen enforcement, fight pollution from ships and detergents, and rejuvenate waters after pollution is checked.

The package will be offered just as the Federal Government begins organizing a Great Lakes River Basin Commission, urged by Senator NELSON as a way to coordinate State-Federal efforts in this crucial region. NELSON also will offer legislation to create a strong new Great Lakes Water Authority to follow up on the water resource plans to be drawn by the new Commission.

WASTE MANAGEMENT RESEARCH ACT

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the first bill which I offer today is the Waste Management Research Act of 1966.

This bill will enable us to explore new frontiers of knowledge, in search of imaginative solutions to our presently overpowering pollution problems.

The bill would establish, under the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, a comprehensive waste management research program, coordinating all such research now done under a number of different Federal programs. This research program would employ the most advanced management and research methods and techniques, including systems analysis.

In addition, the bill would establish a new information office, which would gather information on pollution and waste disposal and make it available to business, industry, municipalities, and the general public. This would be a valuable new storehouse of information and an effective way of spreading the facts on the pollution threat and how it can be met.

Most important of all, the bill would direct the Secretary to compile a national inventory of waste management needs and problems. and it directs him to recommend to the Congress a comprehensive national waste management program, including alternatives and an analysis of comparative costs and benefits.

This bill is broadly drawn so as to give maximum freedom of action to the imaginative administrators and researchers who will implement it.

But the simple goal of the bill is to give a competent Federal agency the funds and staff necessary to take a look at our antiquated waste treatment methods—and then propose the most efficient new methods which modern science can devise.

We do have Federal research programs into water pollution and sewage disposal today. But as in the case of our other antipollution programs, it is too limited both in scope and in financing. It is not adequately coordinated. It is not aimed squarely at coming up with a new waste management system for America.

Our present antiquated disposal system relies upon our waters to absorb the waste of modern society. Modern science and technology have never been brought fully to bear upon the problem.

Substantial research grants should be made to private industry and universities to develop new methods and devices to refine, use, neutralize, or destroy pollutants. We muset evaluate chemical pesticides and their effect upon the environment. Those which threaten to destroy our environment should be outlawed.

We need to develop programs that take into consideration the total problems of air, water, and soil pollution. Research contracts should be made with private industry to inventory and evaluate the whole waste management problem and to compute waste management costs and propose alternative management plans to meet the problem.

It is helpful to discuss this problem in terms of examples.

At the southern tip of Lake Michigan, we have one of the most tremendous concentrations of pollution problems anywhere in the world. We have several dozen independent municipalities, hundreds of industrial plants, hundreds of ships, and a number of grossly polluted rivers.

Most of these units have individual programs for waste treatment on which they are spending sizable amounts of money.

But despite millions of dollars in spending, despite all the governmental authority and the scientific genius clustered together in this area, the sum total of all their antipollution efforts is overwhelming, disastrous, almost irrevocable pollution.

What a great opportunity such an area presents for a really imaginative study of broad scale waste management.

Think of the challenging questions which confront us here:

Could the waste treatment systems of this area be made more efficient by combining or coordinating them?

Could the industrial byproducts now being dumped into the rivers and Lake Michigan be recovered and reused?

Would a really imaginative new program of waste treatment for this area be economically feasible if you considered the cost to the public now resulting from air and water pollution?

We know that everything we do costs money. But in the field of pollution, we do not know enough about comparative costs to make intelligent decisions. We do not know whether our present inadequate methods are more costly than the most advanced and effective new techniques.

THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER

Another outstanding example of a special problem which would benefit from advanced waste management research is the Mississippi River. Throughout its length, it is soiled by pollution, even though along its shores taxpayers and stockholders are investing millions of dollars in waste treatment facilities.

Imagine the frustration of a small city on the Mississippi, trying to devise a treatment system which will protect this great commercial and recreational waterway, knowing full well that it cannot control what is done along the other 2,300 miles of this river.

An imaginative Federal waste management study of the Mississippi—or key sections of it—could lead to a great breakthrough in our pollution fight. What is the present cost of waste treatment for communities along this river? What would it cost to do it right?

These are just a few examples of what might be done under the Waste Management Research Act.

It could open the door to solving our nationwide pollution crisis. Combined with the other bills which I will offer it could provide the knowledge, the scientific technique, the funds, and the governmental leadership needed to meet one of our gravest public problems.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILLS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] be added as a cosponsor of S. 2815 which I introduced on January 24, 1966, to establish a joint congressional committee to make a continuing study and investigation of the activities and operations of the Central Intelligence Agency.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] may be added as a cosponsor of S. 2797, a bill to give the President new emergency strike powers.

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

MAINTENANCE OF SCHOOL MILK AND SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAMS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I add my name today as cosponsor of two very important bills concerning the maintenance of the school milk program and also the availability of dairy products for the school lunch program. As I stated last week on the floor of the Senate, I strongly oppose the administration's proposed budget cut for the school milk program.

I note with interest that the President in his message on food for freedom sent to the Congress on February 10 stated:

> We must have adequate supplies of dairy products for commercial markets, and to meet high priority domestic and foreign program needs. Milk from U.S. farms is the only milk available to millions of poor children abroad.

I agree with the President as to the great need to help the needy children of the world, but I believe that we should spare nothing in taking care of our own. I therefore join with the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) in his bill (S. 2921) to make the school milk program permanent, and also to gradually increase funds available under the program over the next several years.

Also, I wish to add my active support to the bill (S. 2888) of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] which would provide that milk and dairy products in the store of the Commodity Credit Corporation may be used in nonprofit school lunch programs without regard to priorities set up in other laws. Due to certain of these priorities, when the surpluses of the CCC have been low, the Secretary of Agriculture has in the past determined that stocks on hand should be sold domestically or exported before used for the school lunch program

This Nation cannot afford to play with the nutritional development of our children merely to balance the administration's budget. I feel certain, as I have said before, that my constituents would rather increase their taxes than restrict either the school milk or the school lunch program.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, February 17, 1966, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1407) for the relief of Frank E. Lipp.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 2722

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, I wish to announce that hearings on S. 2722 will be held on March 1, 1966, at 11:30 a.m., and on March 2, 1966, at 9:30 a.m. in room 6226 of the New Senate Office Building.

S. 2722 provides for the appellate review of sentences imposed in criminal cases arising in the district courts of the United States. The bill would give every defendant sentenced to imprisonment for more than 1 year the right to appeal on the ground that the sentence, although lawful, is excessive. On review, the court of appeals would be empowered to reduce, increase or otherwise modify the sentence imposed by the district court. The bill would also allow the court of appeals to make rules providing for the availability on appeal of any presentence reports or other evaluations made of the defendant prior to the imposition of the sentence.

Any person who wishes to testify on March 1 and 2, or who desires to submit a statement for inclusion in the record, should communicate as soon as possible with the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, room 6308, New Senate Office Building.

SUPPOSE—OUR RESPONSIBILITIES IN VIETNAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there has come to me from Mr. Tedis Zierins, of Chicago, Ill., a copy of a poem written by Pfc. Robert E. Blankenship 3 days before he was killed in action in Vietnam. The poem was sent to the Chicago American by someone in the 1st Marine Aircraft Wing in Da Nang in Vietnam. It will certainly give anyone who will take time to read it pause to think about our responsibilities.

I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the poem be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

SUPPOSE

(By Pfc. Robert E. Blankenship)

Suppose this Sunday morning
The church bell didn't ring,
And as you paused upon the step,
The choir didn't sing.
Suppose the door was padlocked
Or maybe nailed up tight.
Suppose a guard was standing
There to stop you day or night.
Suppose you saw Old Glory,
A dirty, tattered rag.
And floating high above your town
Another country's flag.
Suppose the only sound you heard
Was soldiers' marching feet
Suppose the army near your home
Was of some foreign power
Sent to march along your streets
Instead of boys of ours.
Suppose your friends were carried
Off to prisons or their deaths
And all their pleading for a trial
Was just a waste of breath;
You say this couldn't happen here,
We'll pray to God it can't
For if everyone prays earnestly,
We must believe it shan't.

SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM COMBATS MALNUTRITION IN THE YOUNG

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the administration's recent decision to cut the school milk program by 80 percent is going to have a serious effect on teenage America. The morning and afternoon milk breaks which are so common in schools across the Nation will largely be a thing of the past.

Many of my colleagues may say that malnutrition among teenagers is not a serious problem in this, the most prosperous Nation in the world. Yet an article published in 1960 in the New York Times indicated that "6 of every 10 teenage daughters suffer serious diet deficiencies." Research showed at that time that more than 5 million girls between the ages of 13 and 19 exist mainly on snacks, soft drinks, French fries, pizza, candy, hamburgers, and waffles. I seriously doubt that this problem has solved itself in the interim.

This is the principal reason for the existence of the school milk program. The Federal Government encourages young men and women to drink milk—nature's perfect food—by helping them to pay the costs of morning and afternoon half-pints. But now the administration has decided that this school milk program is not necessary for young people unless they are selected by the school administrator as charity cases.

The Times article goes on to point out:

> Starving teenagers come from rich, poor, and middle-class homes. At a junior high school here [Washington], morning hunger headaches are common and valuable class time is lost when youngsters are sent to the nurse. At a senior high school, when breakfastless boys fainted at early-morning cadet drill, authorities began a better breakfast campaign.

Mr. President, that morning milk break under the school milk program is a

way to combat this malnutrition. However, unless Congress decides to reject the 80-percent cut proposal put forth by the administration, morning milk breaks will be the exception, not the rule.

I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times article be printed in the RECORD.

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

YOUTHS SUFFERING FROM POOR DIETS—SCIENTISTS FIND MOST ARE MALNOURISHED AND NEED ADVICE IN EATING HABITS

WASHINGTON, March 26.—While Mom and Dad are setting the world's best table and running up a $78 billion annual food bill, 6 of every 10 teenage daughters suffer serious diet deficiencies.

Most of the future wives and mothers in the United States are so poorly fed that scientists call them malnourished.

Teenage boys are close behind in this deficiency. But nutritionists worry mostly about 9 million girls between the ages of 13 and 19. More than 5 million exist mainly on snacks, soft drinks, french fries, pizza, candy, hamburgers, and waffles, research shows.

Americans are taller, live longer and eat 15 percent more than they did a half a century ago. But unless the younger generation learns about nutrition and fills dangerous diet gaps with milk, meat, fruits, and vegetables the pendulum could swing backward.

BENSON CITES NEEDS

"Never have young people been more in need of wise advice and guidance on food," Agriculture Secretary Ezra Taft Benson said this week.

"Replacing their present faulty food habits with good ones will take the full cooperation of parents, teachers, and teenagers themselves."

Schoolwork and alertness suffer when the teenage body is lacking in vital food elements. It shows up in bad temper, acne or loss of stamina. Too often pimples are borne patiently as "part of growing up," when they are a sign of poor diet.

A teenage girl, obsessed by beauty, may cut her intake so drastically that her authentic long-range glamour is undercut.

"In her concern for a slim figure," a nutritionist said, "a girl may gamble with her health by making total war on calories. She plunges into a hippo-to-slimmo routine, inventing her own reducing diet.

"Too often she skips valuable potatoes, bread, and milk, bypassing entire meals, then cancels it out with gooey sweets. A low-calorie diet, if properly planned can include every nutrient. If it doesn't, it's dangerous."

CRITICAL YEARS

The long-term results are impaired health and a weakening of future generations. Malnutrition is sometimes connected with juvenile delinquency.

At about 11, a girl's growth spurts, and for the next 9 years her body burns a lifetime high in food energy. By 16, she should reach her maximum height. By 18, her weight probaby will level off as nature turns to firming muscle, bones, and tissues—in short, building an adult body.

The food she eats must fuel this growth, at the same time providing teenage energy for jitterbugging, softball, hockey, and a hectic school calendar.

But at the time her body demands a peak intake of calories, vitamins and minerals, her parents relax discipline over her food habits. Even if they did not, the young lady, proudly wearing her first pair of 2-inch heels, would issue her declaration of diet independence.

"No time," she shouts sprinting past the breakfast table, or "not hungry."

The starving teenagers come from rich-, poor-, and middle-class homes. At a junior high school here, morning hunger headaches are common and valuable classtime is lost when youngsters are sent to the nurse.

At a senior high school, when breakfastless boys, fainted at early morning cadet drill, authorities began a "better breakfast" campaign.

The food habits of these youngsters mirror a nationwide teenage famine amid plenty. For lunch a girl selects a luscious wedge of pie from the cafeteria line. Watching the trays go by, dietitians who plan balanced hot meals see many nutritious, energy-packed dishes ignored.

"They'd eat three desserts if we didn't have a rule against it," one commented.

Arresting this trend which is rooted in ignorance, indifference, or poverty, will take a shift in food habits. In the average home a nutritious diet may be had for much less than the family spends, but it takes know-how.

FEDERAL ON-THE-JOB TRAINING PROGRAM EXCELLENT TAXPAYER INVESTMENT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have been one of those Members of the Senate who has criticized wasteful Government spending. I have introduced amendments to reduce proposed spending programs in the past. I intend to do so in the future.

But when the Government can show that its programs not only achieve social results in improving human welfare, but also save money for the taxpayer, they deserve our audible and enthusiastic support.

Yesterday, the Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz appeared before a subcommittee of the Senate Education and Labor Committee.

Mr. Wirtz proved that the Government's on-the-job manpower development training program has helped do a superb job of putting unemployed, unskilled workers back to work. By itself this is a worthy goal; but the program has also succeeded in paying back to the Government and the taxpayer its total cost in full within 2 years—simply based on the Federal income taxes paid by the newly employed workers.

Of course free enterprises which employs these workers in partnership with the Government program deserves great credit too.

Here is an example of Government and business working together through training unskilled workers to achieve three mighty important goals: First, to put unemployed unskilled men and women to work in skilled jobs that pay well; second, to reduce the inflation threat by hitting the toughest inflationary problem—our shortage of skilled workers; and, third, to return to the Government the full cost of the program within 2 years with the taxpayer reaping rich dividends in subsequent years.

I ask unanimous consent that a brief excerpt from Secretary Wirtz' testimony be printed in the RECORD.

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

In my considered judgment now, however, the controlling consideration is that the on-the-job training program has supplied us—as a lesson of proven experience—with the answer we were looking for.

It puts the training almost entirely in the employer's hands.

It has become an effective instrument for implementing national policies which employers share with the entire community.

And it is proving to be an almost historically economic program.

Let us look at this program in hard-headed, dollars, and cents terms—in terms of who the trainees are, what it costs to train them, what their earning power becomes, and what the Government (which is the country) gets back on its investment.

Here are some of the key facts:

Most of the OJT trainees (about two-thirds) were unemployed before they joined the program.

We estimate that the average Manpower Development and Training Act on-the-job trainee earns $59 a week during 19 weeks of training, and $80 a week as a full-time worker after his training. Thus the average trainee earns $3,761 the first year.

The cost to the Government of on-the-job training averaged about $495 a trainee in 1965. Some cost more, some less.

According to the Internal Revenue Service the average Federal income tax for married workers with one child who earn $3,761 a year is $211.

Thus, in the first year, a typical on-the-job trainee repays the Federal Government about 43 percent of its total investment in him. Before the second year is over, the Government has been repaid in full.

It is difficult, of course, to find the "average" illustration. Programs vary from the most expensive, during which 52 weeks of training is provided, to those lasting only 8 weeks.

Those trainees already approved will earn almost $392 million during their first year of training and work. Their training will cost the Federal Government $51 million, of which about $20 million will be repaid in taxes during the first year, and the remainder the second year.

On-the-job training programs are a sound investment.

These programs have been warmly received by American employers, who, in the long run, must provide the jobs for American workers. The business community, along with American labor, has cooperated in making Manpower Development and Training Act on-the-job training an exciting and successful program.

NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS WOULD ELIMINATE TEACHER SHORTAGE IN LOW-INCOME AREAS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, few appropriation requests will come before us, during this session, of greater importance than the President's recent request for funds to support the National Teacher Corps.

Today, our national shortage of elementary and high school teachers is estimated at 100,000 a year, and there are about 80,000 teachers in the Nation's school systems with substandard credentials.

In the Nation's poverty pockets, where there are 5 million schoolchildren whose families earn under $2,000 a year, the

teacher situation is even more grave. School budgets in these poverty areas cannot be stretched to attract or hold enough talented, or even qualified, teachers. Competing with the wealthier school districts for the limited number of new and replacement teachers available each year, the poverty schools inevitably lose out. Each fall, slum schools open with too few good teachers, too many substitute teachers, too many temporary teachers, and too many teachers whose qualifications are far below minimum standards.

The very youngsters who are culturally handicapped to begin with—those who come from families where parents, brothers, and sisters make up the one-fifth of America that has not finished elementary school—are being educated today by some of our least gifted teachers. No wonder that, after 6 or 8 years of listless schooling, these boys and girls join the ranks of the undereducated unemployables—the underprivileged of our Nation—who contribute little to our society or our economy.

Teaching children of the poor takes dedication, talent, and training. To reach a child whose concept of books is limited to the comic strips, whose ear is attuned only to the simplest verbal exchange, requires a very different approach from that used in our schools today, where every child, regardless of his background and abilities, is taught according to standards suitable only for the middle-class child whose home is comfortably furnished with books and art and conversation. The need, then, is not simply one of numbers, but also of kind.

To break out of the tradition of poverty, disadvantaged youngsters must receive the best—not the least—in education. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is a giant stride. But although it provided over a billion dollars in aid to low-income areas, it does not provide the means to attract the thousands of men and women with the enthusiasm, the dedication, the understanding, and the talent that are essential to make effective use of the newly available Federal funds.

The National Teacher Corps will do this.

If we had to single out the most important available tool in combating poverty, it would have to be education.

This program is perhaps not nearly as dramatic as Vietnam, but it is equally essential to the well being of the country.

Our survival in this world depends heavily on how well our citizenry flourishes. And this, clearly, is one of the most effective devices we can employ toward the conservation of this Nation's human resources.

AMERICAN ECONOMIC ASSOCIATION SUPPORTS LIBERALIZATION AND EXPANSION OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, a distinguished member of the economics department of Michigan State University and a noted scholar in the field of antitrust and monopoly, Dr. Walter Adams, has called to my attention a petition signed by 100 members of the American Economic Association.

These gentlemen used the petition as a means of making known to Congress their concern over the pending Herlong-Hartke bill (H.R. 8510 and S. 2045).

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Adams' remarks on this petition, as expressed in a letter to the presidents of both Houses of Congress, be printed at this point in the RECORD in order that Senators may be aware of them.

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

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY,
January 24, 1966.

Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: At the national convention of the American Economic Association, held in New York City on December 27–30, 1965, a group of leading economists decided to make known to the Congress its concern and alarm over the pending Herlong-Hartke bill (H.R. 8510 and S. 2045).

The following petition, addressed to you and the Speaker of the House, was circulated informally and initially signed by some 100 members of the association:

"As members of the American Economic Association, we support the liberalization and expansion of international trade and endorse the recent congressional action toward that goal, embodied in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

"By the same token, we oppose such measures as the Herlong-Hartke bill (H.R. 8510 and S. 2045, 89th Cong.) which would erode our national commitment to trade expansion and liberalization. The Herlong-Hartke bill, while intended to prevent unfair import competition, would have the effect of suppressing any import competition. As such, it represents as great a threat to the international trade of the United States as some of the most onerous tariff acts of the past."

The signatories include Prof. Fritz Machlup (Princeton), the current president of the American Economic Association; Prof. Milton Friedman (Chicago), the president-elect of the association; and the following ex-presidents of the association: Prof. Alvin Hansen (Harvard), Prof. Edward S. Mason (Harvard), Prof. Joseph J. Spengler (Duke), and Prof. George Stocking (Vanderbilt).

The following officers and former officers of the association also signed the petition: Profs. William Baumol (Princeton), Kenneth Boulding (Michigan), Lester V. Chandler (Princeton), Frank W. Fetter (Northwestern), Harry G. Johnson (Chicago), Ben W. Lewis (Oberlin), Richard Musgrave (Harvard), Lloyd G. Reynolds (Yale), and Clair Wilcox (Swarthmore).

The current secretary-treasurer of the association, Prof. Harold F. Williamson (Northwestern), as well as his predecessor in that post from 1936 to 1961, Prof. James Washington Bell (Northwestern), signed the petition.

So also did Profs. Alfred E. Kahn (Cornell) and Oswald H. Brownlee (Minnesota) who are ex-members of the editorial board of the American Economic Review, the Association's publication.

Other distinguished signatories include, inter alia, Dean Richard Lindholm (Oregon), Dean Arthur E. Warner (Tennessee), Dean William S. Devino (Maine), and Professors Jesse Markham (Princeton), Richard Heflebower (Northwestern), Joel B. Dirlam (Rhode Island), M. E. Kreinin (Michigan State), Warren L. Smith (Michigan), Alexander Eckstein (Michigan), Robert F. Lanzillotti (Michigan State), Forest Hill (Texas), John Letiche (California, Berkeley), Thomas Mayer (California, Davis), Karl Brunner (UCLA), Samuel M. Loescher (Indiana), Caleb Smith (Brown), Melvin Eggers (Syracuse), Charles M. Tiebout (U. of Washington), Nathan Rosenberg (Purdue), Robert F. Wallace (Montana), and many others.

In view of the enthusiastic response to the informal, initial circulation of this petition, it has been decided to solicit an expression of opinion on a more systematic basis from most of the major universities and colleges in the country. Once this effort is completed, we shall take the liberty of forwarding to you and to the Speaker of the House a complete list of the signatories—in the hope that this might in some small measure contribute to the defeat of the Herlong-Hartke bill which is so utterly incongruous with our national commitment to trade expansion and trade liberalization.

I need not point out that the signatories to the petition are expressing only their own views and do not presume to speak either for the association or the universities with which they are affiliated.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Senator DOUGLAS, a past president of our association, as well as to Senator LONG, chairman of the Finance Committee, and to Congressman MILLS, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Respectfully yours,

WALTER ADAMS,
Professor of Economics.

DEATH OF WILLIAM L. CLAYTON, FORMER UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it was with great sadness that I learned of the passing on February 8 of William L. Clayton, a longtime friend and a man I very much respected.

Will Clayton's quiet but highly effective role in the liberalization of U.S. foreign economic policies at once combined belief in the ideal of economic internationalism with high courage and toughness of mind.

As Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, Will Clayton carried on and developed the reciprocal trade policies inaugurated by Cordell Hull. He was one of the chief architects of the postwar foreign economic policy of the United States, and was one of those responsible for the Marshall plan. The policies he stood for continue to serve us well as the guidelines for the step by step and essential liberalization of our trade policies. In the past 20 years, our international trade has expanded from $18.5 to $47 billion.

Will Clayton strongly urged the United States to seek a closer relationship with the Common Market as a means to strengthen our ability to meet the growing demands of developing nations and to meet the economic competition caused by the Soviet Union and its allies.

Two years ago, in order to assist the economic development of Latin America, he proposed before the Joint Economic Committee the creation of a Western Hemisphere free trade area limited to raw materials, but also involving free

trade in industrial products among Latin American nations within the next 10 years. I have espoused this initiative and I am indebted to Will Clayton for his inspiration.

Will Clayton's life is evidence that the American dream can, and does, still exist; from a position of stenographer at the age of 16, he rose to leading American businessman as a cotton broker at the age of 63. Clayton combined his skill as a diplomat and his determination as a businessman to serve his country as it created a new and viable means of continuing as world economic leader in the crucial transition period of the postwar years.

It is with regret and a deep sense of loss that I join my fellow Americans in this tribute to Will Clayton.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a Washington Post editorial of February 13 and a New York Times article of February 10 on Mr. Clayton be printed in the RECORD.

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

WILL CLAYTON

"Economic nationalism," Will Clayton used to say, "just won't mix with political and military internationalism." In his quiet, courtly way, Clayton fought with a ruthless missionary determination for his creed, and it was Clayton as much as anyone who made economic internationalism come alive during the crucial transition period spanning the war and postwar years. He picked up where Cordell Hull left off in the newly created role of Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs. Economic expertise found a place within Foreign Service sanctums for the first time in the heady early days of the Clayton regime at the State Department when the Marshall plan was born. Later, as an elder statesman peering down on Washington from retirement in Houston, he became one of the first to see the interrelationship between trade and aid in the western approach to the developing countries.

The personal charm which gave Will Clayton his special finesse as a negotiator and bureaucrat was a blend of warmth and commanding dignity. His manner and style instantly conveyed the story of the self-made man who could go from a sharecropper's cabin in Mississippi to the cotton brokerage houses of Manhattan and then, at 63, to fulfillment in a new career as one of our exemplary public servants.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 10, 1966]

WILLIAM L. CLAYTON DEAD AT 86; ONCE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE—ROOSEVELT AID WAS FORMER NEW DEAL FOE—FOUNDED GIANT COTTON COMPANY

HOUSTON, February 8.—William Lockhart Clayton, a cofounder of what is believed to be the world's largest cotton company and a former Under Secretary of State, died of a heart attack in Methodist Hospital here Tuesday afternoon. The tall, stooped, white-haired, 86-year-old Mississippian died at 4 p.m. after he was stricken in his Houston home.

STARTED AS STENOGRAPHER

Will Clayton, who became stenographer to a cotton broker at 16 and an economic diplomat at 63, was a cofounder in 1904 of Anderson, Clayton & Co., at Oklahoma City. The firm today buys and sells a large part of the country's cotton crop and operates cotton-producing and marketing subsidiaries in Mexico, Peru, Argentina, Paraguay, Brazil, and Egypt.

It was estimated a few years ago that, with his family, Mr. Clayton held over 40 percent of the $50 million capital, surplus, and undivided profits of the cotton company.

Mr. Clayton retired from administrative duties for the cotton company in 1951 but remained a director and worked in his Houston office 6 days a week.

The Texan-by-adoption, who looked like a polished cowboy and wore bushy white sideburns, has been recognized by many as the idea man behind the Marshall plan after World War II.

He was a financial backer of the Liberty League that fought the New Deal in the 1930's. But in 1940 he joined the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs under Nelson A. Rockefeller, and later became a deputy to Jesse Jones, then Federal Loan Administrator. He was named Assistant Secretary of Commerce in charge of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation's foreign activities and, as such, headed several of its wartime subsidiaries and was vice president of the Export-Import Bank.

Early in 1944 he resigned his Commerce post to become War Surplus Administrator, to handle disposal of Government plants and surplus material after the war. He resigned as Administrator 8 months later after Congress repudiated his ideas on the sale of Federal real estate.

OPINION OF CARTELS

During hearings on his appointment as Assistant Secretary of State, Congress made clear it had not forgotten the dispute that preceded his withdrawal as Surplus Administrator. He was asked:

"How do you feel about cartels?" and "What are your business connections?" On cartels, Mr. Clayton shot back: "A cartel smells the same to me by whatever name it may be called." To the other, often-asked question, he replied that he received daily reports of the total sales and transactions of Anderson, Clayton & Co., which "are thrown in the wastebasket." His frankness impressed the Senators and they approved his nomination.

When diplomacy became inextricably interwoven with economics in the final months of World War II, Mr. Clayton was appointed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt as Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs in December 1944, to keep the diplomatic and economic fields coordinated within the State Department.

Twenty months later he was elevated to the higher post of Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs. Although a neophyte diplomat at the start of his State Department days, Mr. Clayton carried on and developed the reciprocal trade policies inaugurated by Cordell Hull. In reply to Congressional criticism of his big business background and trading policies, Mr. Clayton always contended that he was laboring for the good of his country, not for any private business interests.

As a cotton merchant, Mr. Clayton traveled in many countries and acquired early the international viewpoint that made him one of the chief architects of the postwar foreign policy of the United States. His observations in Europe and as his country's representative at the Geneva Trade Conference in 1945–46 produced the memorandum to Secretary of State George C. Marshall that was one of the principal bases of the Marshall plan—a plan for the economic recovery of wartorn Europe.

WORKED FOR COURT CLERK

Will Clayton was born in Tupelo, Miss. He moved with his family to Jackson, Tenn., and at 13 he left school and went to work in a local court clerk's office. He became a deputy clerk at 15, studied shorthand and became a court reporter. Among his clients was William Jennings Bryan.

Still in his teens, he became stenographer to a cotton broker. He went to New York seeking advancement, and got a job with the American Cotton Co. and rose in that company to the post of assistant general manager.

In 1904, with his brothers-in-law, Frank D. and M. E. Anderson, he formed Anderson, Clayton & Co., which moved its operations to Houston in 1917 so that it would have available the facilities of a deepwater port. Mr. Clayton temporarily withdrew from the company in 1918 to become a member of the Committee of Cotton Distribution for the War Industries Board.

In 1961, Mr. Clayton agreed with Secretary of State Dean Acheson, in discussion before a Senate-House economic subcommittee, that the United States should make some arrangement with the European Common Market or split the non-Communist world and vastly strengthen the Soviet Union and its allies. "Together," they agreed, "Western Europe and North America can forge a free world economic system which nothing can equal and the power of which nothing can threaten."

With Christian A. Herter, who succeeded John Foster Dulles as Secretary of State in the Eisenhower administration, Mr. Clayton was named in 1962 as cochairman of a congressionally appointed Citizens Commission on the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The creation of a permanent high council and a high court of justice for the nations of the organization were subsequently among the chief recommendations submitted to Congress by the group.

In the same year, Mr. Clayton was one of 21 American business leaders who, in full-page newspaper advertisements, appealed for a ban on the testing of nuclear weapons.

Until close to the end of his life, Mr. Clayton kept himself in good physical condition. He was a proficient horseman, and he worked regularly with Indian clubs in a home gymnasium. During his years in Washington he customarily walked from his home in Rock Creek Park to the State Department Building.

In 1903, Mr. Clayton married a Kentucky girl, Susan Vaughan. She died in 1960. Four daughters survive.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is once again my privilege to mark and honor the declaration of Lithuanian Independence Day. This declaration was made 48 years ago, and the great Lithuanian people have never ceased to courageously fight for their freedom. Despite these long years of Communist rule, the Lithuanian people have not lost their strong sense of what liberty means. Their struggle still stands as a symbol to other nations yearning to be free.

After years of subjugation by Russia, and after the German occupation of World War I, the Lithuanian people declared the establishment of an independent Lithuania on February 16, 1918. Russia again moved in by the end of that year, only to discover once again that the Lithuanian people would fight. Because of this, the Soviet Union was forced to recognize Lithuania as a sovereign state in 1920.

But this brief respite was too short lived. In 1940, Soviet troops once again occupied the country and annexed it. And history further repeated itself with another German occupation until 1944. In 1944, Soviet troops again crushed Lithuanian uprisings.

For more than 7 years during and after the war, the Lithuanian people fought for their own country. Thirty thousand Lithuanian people died in this cause, and many more were deported to the Soviet Union only to die in Soviet concentration camps.

The Lithuanian people should never abandon hope for a truly independent state. We, in the United States, who know what freedom is, commemorate their courage and the principle for which they stand: Freedom and self-determination.

IN SUPPORT OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE TO OVERSEE THE CIA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the time has come for the Congress to exercise legislative oversight on the intelligence community generally and the CIA in particular in a consistent, formal, continuing, and responsible way. Since the CIA was instituted in 1947 as a part of the National Security Council, the Congress has proscribed itself by statute from checking the activities of the CIA to the extent that Congress normally oversees governmental policy. As a result, the activities of the CIA are monitored by the Congress only in a limited way and this monitoring is done by a number of congressional committees, but mainly in the appropriations process.

Before elaborating on the need for a Joint Congressional Committee on the Central Intelligence Agency as proposed by Senator YOUNG, from Ohio, I should like to review the statutory background and congressional committee responsibility as regard the CIA.

In the National Security Act of 1947, Congress made the Director of the CIA responsible for "protecting intelligence sources and methods from unauthorized disclosure." In the CIA Act of 1949, Congress specifically exempted the CIA from existing statutes which required all governmental agencies to publish "the organization, functions, names, official titles, salaries, or numbers of personnel" which they employed. The act also forbade the Director of the Budget from issuing the usual reports to Congress.

In 1956, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] moved to establish a joint committee, but his bill was defeated on the floor of the Senate by 59 to 27. Subsequent bills have been introduced, but they have all died in committee. Recognizing the necessity and importance of intelligence activities, Congress has deliberately tied its own hands in an attempt to maintain the security and integrity of the CIA.

Rather than establish a joint committee, Congress has decided to oversee the CIA through a variety of separate committees. There are, at least, six different committees in both Houses of Congress which monitor the CIA to greater and lesser degrees: the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, the House and Senate Armed Services Committees, and the Senate Foreign Relations and the House Foreign Affairs Committees. None of these committees has the time or the inclination to probe the CIA carefully and deeply, except in cases of sensational events such as the U–2 flights and the Cuban missile crisis.

Most Americans recognize the need for intelligence agencies in a dangerous world; most Americans also recognize the need for security in these matters. We in Congress also appreciate the fine job now being done with the CIA by the various congressional committees. But there is a need for line authority and responsibility in exercising the legislative oversight function of the Congress. The joint committee proposed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] seems to fit the bill, for the following reasons:

First. Intelligence gathering is a major operation in foreign policy and national security affairs, involving the expenditure of vast amount of funds.

Second. Intelligence agencies sometimes find themselves making policy rather than simply executing it. This sometimes occurs without conscious design on the part of the intelligence agency either because policy directives from above do not exist in certain areas or because the CIA has people on the scene when the action happens who are not responsible to the local ambassadors. By force of circumstance, then, the work of the CIA sometimes in effect creates the policy where the President has not acted or even had a chance to act. There must be accountability to Congress for these on-the-spot decisions.

Third. The intelligence field is broad and complicated. Congress needs expertise on these matters, and the staff of the joint committee would be a step in that direction.

Congress has demonstrated restraint and reliability in past cooperation with the executive branch in respect of intelligence. The Joint Atomic Energy Committee is a good example of this. There is little reason for the executive branch to fear that Congress through the joint committee would now abuse this privilege. Congress has the responsibility to exercise legislative oversight over future intelligence operations and activities on a closer, continuing, and formal basis. For these reasons, I join with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] in cosponsoring S. 2815, a bill to establish a Joint Committee on the Central Intelligence Agency.

PHILIPPINE-AMERICAN ASSEMBLY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to a forthcoming meeting in the Philippines which will have significant effect on our relations with the Philippines. Philippine-American friendship from time to time is taken for granted, or even overlooked. This relationship, forged before Philippine independence, has survived a war and has been strengthened through the years. I do not mean to suggest that there have been no irritants in our relationship, nor that there are none now. Innumerable differences have arisen which could have weakened the bonds between our two countries. Nevertheless, the benefits of the friendship and the mutuality of interest have caused us to work just a little harder to resolve these disagreements before they reached the danger point.

There are probably many explanations for the strong bonds of friendship that exist between our two peoples—so unlike each other in culture, history, and temperament. They are all probably correct. How they were forged is not so important as how they are kept strong. Filipinos and Americans, both, have continued this friendship on the government level, through the trade that flows between our two countries, and in the cultural exchange that draws us closer together. We all owe a debt of gratitude to these people, for without their determination, the traditional ties might have weakened.

Less than 3 years ago, prominent citizens of both countries established the American-Philippine Society, a nonprofit and nonpolitical organization devoted to clarifying and elevating United States-Philippine understanding.

The first honorary chairman of the society was Gen. Douglas MacArthur. Mr. MacArthur has succeeded her husband and shares his desire to perpetuate the good will between the two countries. Other prominent Americans and Filipinos—Howard Cullman, chairman of the New York Port Authority; George S. Moore, president of the First National City Bank; Miss Helena Benitez, Philippine educator and diplomat; and Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Secretary of Education, are among the society's officers.

The society was organized for the purpose of promoting intercultural relations between the peoples of the two nations through the mutual exchange of persons, groups, exhibits, and publications and through the presentation of lectures, forums, and similar media with respect to education and the humanities; namely, music, dance, language, and other art forms. It also seeks the clarification and elevation of United States-Philippine understanding through conferences by leaders of both countries.

The society's first major project is such a conference on the future of United States-Philippine relations soon to take place in Davao, in the Philippines, on February 23 to 26. The conference will be under the direction of the American Assembly, an affiliate of Columbia University established in 1950 by Dwight D. Eisenhower when he was president of the university.

The assembly at Davao, the first binational meeting of its kind under the American Assembly, will bring together a group of distinguished Filipinos and Americans to discuss social, political, military, and economic ties between the two countries.

In small discussion groups these Filipino and American representatives of government, industry, finance, labor, the humanities, science, and the press will consider the full range of problems of United States-Philippine relations. They will hear formal addresses by three persons of stature. On the fourth day, in plenary session, the participants will draw upon their own experiences and knowledge to review a final report of conclusions and recommendations for the

improvement of Philippine and United States relations. As is the practice for these assemblies, the statement will be issued immediately to the press and then printed for distribution in both nations. It is expected that this consideration of questions such as military bases and mutual security, foreign policy, and the Laurel-Langley agreement will be repeated in subsequent regional assemblies in both nations.

I hope that their conclusions and recommendations will receive the most serious consideration by both our governments. We would be negligent if we did not listen to this distinguished group of Filipinos and Americans. I shall await their report eagerly and hope that my colleagues in these Chambers and in the Philippine Congress will accept the report as the judgments of responsible men seeking to perpetuate a friendship which has been mutually advantageous. I also hope that by giving this dialog the importance it deserves, we will encourage the organizations of other binational assemblies.

RESOLUTION RELATING TO PURCHASE OF SURPLUS OR USED EQUIPMENT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD three resolutions adopted by the three counties of Delaware, Ontario, and Essex, in my State, dealing with the purchase of surplus or used equipment.

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

Mr. Briggs offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

"RESOLUTION NO. 24—RESOLUTION RELATING TO PURCHASE OF SURPLUS OR USED EQUIPMENT

"Whereas counties and towns frequently have need for certain types of machinery and equipment, the use of which will be for a limited time and surplus machinery and equipment or used machinery and equipment would be adequate and the ability of a county or town to purchase at reduced prices would result in considerable savings to taxpayers; and

"Whereas the State finance law permits the office of general services to sell surplus, obsolete, or used machinery and equipment and it has been the experience that much of such machinery and equipment is sold to dealers who then offer the same items for sale to counties and towns at a large increase in price; and

"Whereas the Federal Government from time to time disposes of surplus machinery and equipment and about the only way a municipality is permitted to make purchase of particular items is through the local office of civil defense; and

"Whereas it is the consensus of opinion of this board that such surplus, obsolete, or used machinery and equipment should be made available to counties, towns, cities, and villages at a fair price before being sold to dealers: Be it

"*Resolved*, That the board of supervisors of the county of Delaware hereby urges the legislature to amend the State finance law, the general municipal law and other applicable statutes to require the several departments of the State having surplus, obsolete or used machinery and equipment for sale to prepare an inventory of the major items, such as trucks, power shovels, bulldozers, cranes, and other highway equipment, and the price established for each item, and that copies of such inventories be furnished to each county, town, city, and village and that such municipalities be given a limited time in which to purchase such items at the price indicated on the inventory and that any items not sold to municipalities then be sold at public sale; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That Congress be urged to enact legislation which will permit municipalities to purchase surplus, obsolete or used machinery and equipment at appraised value before the same are sold to the public; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the clerk of the board of supervisors be and he hereby is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Supervisors' Association, Association of Towns, the County Officers Association, county superintendent of Highways Association, Town Highway Superintendents Association, Senator NILES, Assemblyman MASON, Congressman DOW, Senator JAVITS, and Senator KENNEDY."

The resolution was seconded by Mr. ECKHARDT and adopted by the following vote: Ayes, 19; Noes, 0.

I, Edward McCandlish, clerk of the Board of Supervisors of Delaware County, do hereby certify that the above is a true copy of a resolution passed by the board of supervisors at regular meeting held February 2, 1966.

EDWARD MCCANDLISH,
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors.

RESOLUTION 43—PURCHASE OF SURPLUS OR USED EQUIPMENT

Whereas counties and towns of New York State frequently have need for certain types of machinery and equipment, the use of which will be for a limited time, and surplus machinery and equipment, or used machinery and equipment, would be adequate, and the ability of a county or town to purchase such machinery and equipment at reduced prices would result in considerable saving to taxpayers; and

Whereas the State finance law permits the Office of General Services to sell surplus, obsolete, or used machinery and equipment; and it has been the experience that much of such machinery and equipment is sold to dealers, who then offer much of such machinery for sale to counties and towns at a large increase in price; and

Whereas the Federal Government from time to time disposes of surplus machinery and equipment, and about the only way a municipality is permitted to make purchase of such particular items is through the local office of civil defense; and

Whereas it is the consensus of this board that such surplus, obsolete, or used machinery and equipment should be made available to counties, towns, cities, and villages at a fair price before being sold to dealers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of supervisors of the county of Ontario hereby urges the State legislature to pass legislation to require the several departments of the State having surplus, obsolete, or used machinery and equipment for sale, to prepare an inventory of the major items, such as trucks, power shovels, bulldozers, cranes, and other highway equipment, with prices established for the items, that copies of such inventories be furnished to each county, town, city, and village, that such municipalities be given a limited time in which to purchase such items at the prices indicated on the inventory, and that any items not sold to municipalities then be sold at public sale; and be it further

Resolved, That the U.S. Congress be urged to enact legislation which will permit municipalities of the United States to purchase surplus, obsolete, or used machinery and equipment at appraised value before the same are sold to the public; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of this board be, and she hereby is, directed to transmit certified copies of this resolution to the senator and assemblyman representing Ontario County in the State legislature and the U.S. Congressman and the U.S. Senators representing the people of Ontario County, and all other county boards of supervisors of the State of New York, to the supervisors' association, the association of towns, the county officers' association, the county superintendent of highways' association, and the town highway superintendents' association.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
County of Ontario.

I do hereby certify that I have compared the preceding with the original thereof, on file in the office of the clerk of the board of supervisors at Canandaigua, N.Y., and that the same is a correct transcript therefrom and of the whole of said original; and that said original was duly adopted at a meeting of the board of supervisors of Ontario County held at Canandaigua, N.Y., on the 27th day of January 1966.

Given under my hand and official seal at Canandaigua, in said county, this 2d day of February 1966.

RUTH G. KAVENY,
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of Ontario County, N.Y.

RESOLUTION RE PURCHASE OF SURPLUS OR USED EQUIPMENT

Whereas counties and towns frequently have need for certain types of machinery and equipment, the use of which will be used for a limited time and surplus machinery and equipment or used machinery and equipment would be adequate and the ability of a county or town to purchase at reduced prices would result in considerable savings to taxpayers, and

Whereas the State finance law permits the office of general services to sell surplus, obsolete or used machinery and equipment and it has been the experience that much of such machinery and equipment is sold to dealers who then offer the same items for sale to counties and towns at a large increase in price, and

Whereas the Federal Government from time to time dispose of surplus machinery and equipment and about the only way a municipality is permitted to make purchase of particular items is through the local office of civil defense, and

Whereas it is the consensus of opinion of this board that such surplus, obsolete or used machinery and equipment should be made available to counties, towns, cities, and villages at a fair price before being sold to dealers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of supervisors of the county of Essex hereby urges the legislature to amend the State finance law, the general municipal law and other applicable statutes to require the several departments of the State having surplus, obsolete or used machinery and equipment for sale to prepare an inventory of the major items, such as truck, power shovels, bulldozers, cranes, and other highway equipment, and the price established for each item, and that copies of such inventories be furnished to each county, town, city, and village and that such municipalities be given a limited time in which to purchase such items at the price indicated on the inventory and that any items not sold to municipalities then be sold at public sale; and be it further

Resolved, That Congress be urged to enact legislation which will permit municipalities to purchase surplus, obsolete or used machinery and equipment at appraised value before the same are sold to the public; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of this board of supervisors be and he hereby is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Supervisors' Association, Association of Towns, the County Officers Association, County Superintendent of Highways Association, Town Highway Superintendents Association, Senator Ronald B. Stafford, and Assemblyman Richard Bartlett, Congressman CARLETON J. KING, Senator JACOB JAVITS, Senator ROBERT KENNEDY, and all other county boards of supervisors of the State of New York.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
County of Essex, ss:

I, Zelma A. Cook, clerk of Essex County Board of Supervisors, do hereby certify that I have compared the foregoing copy with the original resolution filed in this office on the 1st day of February 1966, and that it is a correct and true copy thereof.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal this 4th day of February 1966.

ZELMA A. COOK,
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of Essex County.

DEATH OF ALEXANDER "CASEY" JONES, INFLUENTIAL AND FIERY EDITOR

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to the death of Alexander "Casey" Jones, an influential and what the press calls, a fiery editor of one of the leading newspapers in the State of New York, the Syracuse Herald-Journal.

Mr. President, Casey was a great reporter and a great newspaperman and a man greatly responsible—through his hard-hitting editorials—for much that is good and true in the politics and public policy of our State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two obituary notices on Mr. Jones.

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

[From the New York Herald Tribune]

ALEXANDER "CASEY JONES, INFLUENTIAL, FIERY EDITOR

ORLANDO, FLA.—Alexander F. Jones, 74, former president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, died here yesterday, apparently of a heart attack.

Former managing editor of the Washington Post, Mr. Jones once fought the admission of Tass (the Soviet news agency) representatives to the Senate press gallery on the grounds that they were not newsmen, but government representatives.

Later in his career, he successfully fought an order by President Truman that put severe curbs on information made available by Federal departments. He urged the Nation's newspaper editors to investigate the possibility of Federal legislation that would break down governmental news barriers.

Mr. Jones, who retired after 53 years in the newspaper business last April, became executive editor of the Syracuse Herald-Journal in 1950.

Surviving are his wife, Edna, two sons, and a daughter.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post]

ALEXANDER JONES RITES SET AT ARLINGTON MONDAY

(By Edward T. Folliard)

Alexander F. (Casey) Jones, managing editor of the Washington Post from 1935 to 1947 and executive editor of the Syracuse Herald-Journal and Herald-American from 1950 to 1965, will be buried in Arlington Cemetery at 10 a.m. Monday.

Jones, one of the most colorful figures in American journalism, died after a heart attack Tuesday night in the Florida Sanitarium and Hospital in Orlando, Fla. He was 74.

A native of Wisconsin Rapids, Wis., Alexander Francis Jones attended the University of Wisconsin from 1911 to 1914, and began his newspaper career as a reporter on the Madison State Journal. One of his early assignments was to travel with Senator Robert (Fighting Bob) La Follette, the elder. He joined the staff of the Minneapolis Journal in 1916.

Casey volunteered for service in World War I and was an Army stretcher bearer in France.

STAR UP REPORTER

After the war, he was a star reporter for the "night side" of the old United Press. He covered the Black Sox scandal that shook organized baseball in 1919, and he used to recall writing about the little boy who approached Shoeless Joe Jackson, the great outfielder, and pleaded "Say it ain't so, Joe."

In 1923 Casey returned to the Minneapolis Journal, where he served as sales and promotion manager and city editor.

The late Eugene Meyer, who bought the Washington Post at auction in 1933, hired Casey as managing editor in 1935. The paper, although bearing a famous name in journalism, had gone into a serious decline. Jones pitched in to help publisher Meyer rescue and rehabilitate it.

"UPHILL YEARS"

When Jones left to go to Syracuse in 1950 after 15 years with the Washington Post—12 as managing editor and three as assistant to the publisher—the paper said in an editorial:

"It is hard for us to lose the services of a man who has endured the heart and burden associated with the creation of an institution out of a bankrupt property. Most of his 15 years were uphill years. His devotion to his responsibilities was catching, his interest in his work unflagging."

When Casey first came to Washington in 1935, he was introduced to the late Sir Willmott Lewis, distinguished correspondent of the London Times. Lewis, on being told that Casey was the new managing editor of the Post, shook his head and said: "Don't you know, old boy, that Pennsylvania Avenue is paved with the bones of former managing editors of the Post?"

"JUST A GYPSY"

But Casey stayed around a long time. His brown hair turned gray, and then white, as he guided the news department in the Washington Post's great comeback period. When he left, after 15 years, he said he guessed he was "just a gypsy."

He was managing editor throughout World War II, and many stories were told about him in that tumultuous period. On the day the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor, Sunday, he rushed from his Wesley Heights home to his office, and began rounding up reporters, desk men, printers, and pressmen so that the Washington Post could get out an extra.

The extra was about to go to press when Robert Tate Allen, then the paper's church editor and known to the staff as "Bishop," burst into Casey's office.

"Hold it, hold it, Mr. Jones," Allen cried, "The Reverend * * *, pastor of the Georgetown * * * Church has resigned."

MURROW "SCOOP"

Later that night Casey dropped in on a party at the home of Harry Butcher, who was to become an aid to Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower in the war. Among others at the party was Edward R. Murrow, the radio commentator for the Columbia Broadcasting System.

Murrow had been a dinner guest of the Roosevelts at the White House earlier in the evening. He had heard of the terrible damage done at Pearl Harbor—the sinking of the *Arizona* and the *Oklahoma* and all the rest—but he couldn't use it in a broadcast. He had been a guest, and therefore he felt that he was "sewed up."

Casey Jones was under no such inhibition, and he saw to it that what Murrow picked up at the dinner table got into the Post's news columns next morning. Murrow used to carry the clipping of the story in his wallet. It was a sad reminder of how he got the biggest story of his career and could do nothing about it.

FLAG-WAVING PATRIOT

Fortune magazine once described Casey as "cyclonic, convivial, incurably romantic about his profession."

He was all these, and also an unabashed patriot—the flag-waving kind. In 1942 he became impatient with what was being called the "war effort," especially with what the Government was doing or not doing.

In 1943 Casey was elected to membership in the Gridiron Club, made up of 50 Washington newspapermen. He became one of the club's most accomplished performers, being possessed of the necessary ham quality.

Some of his reporters who never saw him in a Gridiron skit agreed that he had great ability as an actor. He used to put on his most dramatic performance when a reporter hit him up for a pay raise. He would slump in his chair and a look of pain would appear on his face, causing the reporter to feel that he had landed a foul blow.

Jones is survived by his wife, the former Edna Schultz, a daughter, Mary Will of West Palm Beach, and two sons—Richard, of Orlando, Fla., and Compton, of Bethesda, Md.

RITES IN SYRACUSE

A funeral service will be held in the Park Central Presbyterian Church of Syracuse at 11 a.m. Saturday, after which the body will come to Arlington Cemetery.

Katharine Graham, president of the Washington Post Co., said yesterday that Jones was "a valued friend and colleague," and added:

"For 15 years he shaped the news policies of the Washington Post under my father and, later, my husband in an original, aggressive and exciting manner. He was the model of the tough reporter with a heart of gold."

Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY, Democrat of New York, said that Jones represented "the quest for excellence in American journalism," and added that his "imprint will long survive."

J. R. Wiggins, editor of the Washington Post and president of the Gridiron Club, asked the club members to form a committee to be at the chapel in Arlington Cemetery at 10 a.m. Monday.

VIETNAM REPORT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in a February 9, 1966, column published in the New York Times, C. L. Sulzberger supports a point which I made in my Vietnam report. He argues that American liberals have been much more inclined to make concessions to the Communists in Europe than in Asia, without realizing that the main thrust of the Communist threat today is in Asia and that this threat must be met where it is posed.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Sulzberger's article printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Feb. 9, 1966]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS: ROOTS OF BEFUDDLEMENT

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

PARIS.—International opinion is quite as bewildered as American opinion concerning U.S. policy in Vietnam. This is as true for adversaries of the United States as for friends. Senator FULBRIGHT was referring only to Americans when he said he had never seen "such dissent, reservation, groping and concern." But he might just as well have been referring to the outer world, choosing Russia and China for a start.

The Chinese proclaim our Vietnamese policy is part of a Russo-American global conspiracy to encircle China. Moscow's friend Castro throws the ball back into China's court, likening Peiping's actions to those of "Yankee imperialism." No wonder the average American gets mixed; Uncle Sam can't win.

NUCLEAR ESCALATION

The southeast Asian conflict is the first since 1945 that contains an implicit danger of nuclear escalation—which was never a serious threat in Korea. This implicit danger adds a muddled element to political thinking on Vietnam.

Since Hiroshima many U.S. liberals and intellectuals have been increasingly reluctant to endorse Washington's diplomatic actions, especially if they are tough. Such groups have unconsciously developed a mood of appeasement especially in Asia, that contrasts with the attitude of liberals and intellectuals toward Europe before World War II.

This pattern is confused by the traditional U.S. policy conflict between "Asia first" and "Europe first" schools. Broadly speaking, American liberals have always tended to belong to the latter group. Following World War II, U.S. foreign policy focused primarily on European matters; Korea being an exception.

The "Europe first" school has never been happy about accepting risks in the East. It took dramatic aggressions like Pearl Harbor or the invasion of South Korea to produce a consensus on our foreign policy between liberal "Europe first" and conservative "Asia first" groupings. The gradual intensifying of the Vietnam crisis by disguised aggression never achieved the same result.

Foreign opinion is bewildered for different reasons by American involvement in Vietnam. When the United States was firmly wedded to a "Europe first" policy it spurned General de Gaulle's request for a three-power committee, the United States, Britain, and France, to coordinate global strategy. This request, made in 1958, was never seriously pondered in Washington although De Gaulle made it clear that if no such arrangement were devised he would reduce French participation in NATO.

We have come full circle. The United States now urges its allies to help us in Vietnam but Europe, stripped of its Asian colonial possessions, is content to pursue its own version of a "Europe first" policy. Europeans want to avoid taking sides in communism's intramural dispute between Peiping and Moscow. They are more concerned with the problems of German unification than that of Vietnam; the present emotional atmosphere of the United States is not felt here.

DOUBLE SWITCH

Many Europeans, led by the French, were once extremely eager to attract Washington into Far Eastern commitments and an "Asia first" policy, a prospect then welcomed by American conservatives and opposed by liberals. But now that Washington has moved in the direction formerly desired by such Europeans, they in turn have shifted to our own previous position.

The "dissent, reservations, groping, and concern" noted by FULBRIGHT can thus be detected abroad also—but for entirely different reasons. The odd thing is that when American policy shifted from "Europe first" to "Asia first," those Europeans who originally wished to bring us into the East objected most.

Both Americans and Europeans who now criticize us have been on the same side of the policy fence—in fact on both sides—but at different times. Each has managed the strange feat of simultaneously reversing its position.

AMERICAN LIBERALS

For a third of a century American liberals and intellectuals have been more inclined to endorse appeasement in Asia than in Europe. The nuclear danger in Asia has only reinforced this traditional position. But the U.S. Government has shifted the emphasis of its policy interests from West to East.

Some 20 years of hegemony in world power politics have apparently persuaded Washington that its views always represent the general interest—even when such views are switched. Trouble comes when some Americans can't get used to the switch and some foreigners can't get used to its timing.

THE PEOPLE'S WAR LAND REFORM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to a series of four articles which were published in the Washington Star, written by Richard Critchfield, explaining the war for land reform and the problems of pacification.

Critchfield details the Saigon land reform program, its failures, and most importantly its importance for the masses for Vietnamese peasants. Critchfield also argues convincingly that the key to future reelections in Vietnam and the success of democratic institutions hinges upon land reform and the need for a pacification program that educates and cares for the people and gives them a sense of participation as well as protects them. Mr. Critchfield's analyses in these respects confirm my own observations from my recent trip to Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Critchfield's articles printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star]

THE PEOPLE'S WAR: PEASANTS TOIL FOR THE EARTH, NOT FOR A GOVERNMENT

(By Richard Critchfield)

(NOTE.—This is the first of four articles on the Mekong Delta, South Vietnam's rice bowl. Critchfield recently completed an extensive tour there.)

TAN AN, SOUTH VIETNAM.—"This earth which formed their home and fed their bodies and made their gods * * *"

The Asian peasant's deep attachment to the soil he tills and in which his ancestors are buried, described in Pearl Buck's "The Good Earth," is strongly evident here in the Mekong Delta rice bowl of South Vietnam.

It is harvest time now. The golden fields of the great fertile plain between the Mekong, Bassac, and Saigon rivers are dotted with men and women winnowing the precious rice against tall, curved shelters of plaited bamboo so as not to lose a grain.

In black pajams and pointed strawhats, barefoot, bronzed by the January sun, the peasants have the sturdy look of men and women who can endure disease, natural disaster, and war so long as they have some land to farm.

But very few have land of their own. In Long An, one of Vietnam's most fertile provinces, more than 85 percent of the peasant population are tenants.

This landownership pattern may help explain why, despite a tremendous cost in lives and material, the war in Long An is no closer to being won than it was several years ago.

Last year, the heaviest fighting raged in the jungles and rubber plantations north of Saigon, the rain forests and grasslands of the high plateau and in the swamps and rice paddies of the narrow central coastal plain.

But if the main theater of war lay elsewhere, the rice-rich heartland of the Saigon region and the upper Mekong Delta, linked together by Long An, remains the prize for which the war is being fought.

Here, in less than 14 provinces, live almost two-thirds of the 15 million South Vietnamese.

In June 1964, the summer before the Vietcong began massing multibattalion forces for pitched battles, Long An was held up as the showplace of how a combined Vietnamese-American military and economic pacification effort could defeat a Communist insurrection.

Visitors went to Long An if they wanted to see how the protracted, guerrilla war was going on in the countryside.

But now, 18 months later, little has changed.

There has been no dramatic turn in the guerrilla fighting; the government has won some villages and lost some.

There are no signs of any serious deterioration. But there has been no real improvement either; since it is primarily a war of subversion in Long An, the creeping Communist initiative simply has crept further.

Other peasants have replaced the hundreds of Vietcong killed in battle, and American military and civilian advisers agree there are many more Vietcong than a year ago.

OPPOSING SIDES

Most important in Long An, however, the government and the mass of peasantry still seem to be on the opposing sides of the fight.

None of the successive Saigon governments has succeeded in analyzing the peasants' grievances and then tried to right these wrongs, though there are signs Premier Nguyen Cao Ky's regime is moving in this direction.

Land is of such paramount importance here that the Vietcong allow only the landless or very poor farmers in the delta to command guerrilla units or qualify as party members.

The provincial government's social order is the exact reverse. Most of the military officers, civil servants and community leaders come from the landowning gentry.

The same is true in Saigon, here only 1 of the 10 generals now sharing power has any rapport with the masses. He is Central Vietnam's erratic Maj. Gen. Nguyen Chanh Thi, who also is the only one of peasant origin.

The traditional Mandarin ruling class fell from power with Ngo Dinh Diem, but their political heirs are the nonpeasant urban middle classes and their relatives.

LODGE PUSHES REFORM

Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge and his top aids have made it clear that the United States regards major land redistribution as essential in successfully prosecuting the war.

Ky recently announced a land reform program that will initially convey 700,000 acres to 180,000 peasants.

Eventually, the program will be expanded to encompass over 500,000 acres of land

formerly owned by the French, 660,000 acres now farmed by "squatters" and 300,000 acres where free titles will be awarded in resettlement areas.

The crux of the problem, however, has yet to be tackled. This is the redistribution from big to small owners of more than 2 million acres in the Mekong Delta.

Good delta land is worth about $50 an acre; it is roughly estimated by the South Vietnamese generals that it would cost between $150 and $200 million to carry out equitable reform programs here.

Land reform under Diem left a bitter aftermath, since 2,279 dispossessed landlords were paid only 10 percent in cash as compensation and given low-interest, nontransferable, 12-year bonds for the rest. The bonds since have plummeted in value.

U.S. GENERATING MONEY

The United States could solve this problem by generating $150 million in local currencies so that an outright compensation could be made.

It already is generating piasters to pay for the Vietnamese share in the war—to the tune of $350 million this year—by giving the Saigon Government imported commodities to sell to local merchants.

Both North Vietnam's Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap and the U.S. commander Gen. William C. Westmoreland describe the Vietnam conflict as "a people's war," and not "a war of attrition."

Since the emphasis, first, is on converting and, second, on killing, the investment of $150 million in land reform to undermine the Vietcong's peasant support would seem like a bargain in a war that is costing $16.5 million a week.

During the early days of the Diem regime, the United States spent $4 million on land reform. From 1961 through 1965 nothing was spent. And $1.1 million is budgeted for the current fiscal year.

PROBLEM NOT UNIFORM

The problem is not uniform throughout the country. With the exception of the Saigon area, the upper Mekong Delta and a thin, populated strip along the coastline, South Vietnam is mostly empty terrain. More than 85 percent of the land total is covered with jungle, swampland, or dense foliage.

Along the overpopulated coastal fringe, now heavily burdened with refugees, most farms are small and owner operated and there is real land hunger.

In the highlands, the problem could be solved simply by giving the Montegnard tribes clear title to land they have farmed for centuries.

The real problem is in the delta.

Out of 1.2 million farms, only 260,000 are owner operated; 520,000 are rented and 330,000 more are partly rented.

There are 71 farms of more than 250 acres and 85,000 more over 12 acres (though all one peasant family can reasonably handle is 5 to 7 acres).

Some 3,000 rich Saigon families still are the big landlords.

In Long An, the pattern is even more lopsided. According to one official U.S. survey made last July, 65 rich landlords, 3,000 farmer-owners and 28,000 tenant families comprise the population.

COULD INFLUENCE ELECTION

The landownership pattern probably would significantly influence the outcome of a free election, such as envisaged in the 1954 Geneva agreements.

Lodge has observed the Communist promises of land to the tiller is "perhaps the greatest appeal the Vietcong have."

Why there is so much opposition to sweeping land reform among some Saigonese is suggested by the tremendous wealth of a delta Province like Long An.

In a good year, such as 1963–64, Long An produced 320,000 tons of rice (Saigon's annual requirement is only 600,000 tons.) It also sold that year 10,000 tons of pineapple, 70,000 tons of sugarcane, plus chickens, ducks, pigs, and other cash earners.

The legal land ceiling is 220 acres. Even so, a Saigon landlord who charges double the legal rental rate of 25 percent, as he can do if the land is fertile enough, stands to profit as much as $40,000 in a single-year on 220 acres.

This compares with a Vietnamese policeman's monthly wage of $25, or the monthly cash allotment of a Vietcong guerrilla, which is 40 cents.

POLITICAL ATTITUDES AFFECTED

More important, perhaps, is how this unequal distribution of land affects these political attitudes of the Vietnamese.

What seems to be absent here is the kind of political code that Theodore H. White has described as President Johnson's "grassroots liberalism":

"You get yours and he gets his and we all share what there is to share."

In Long An, this gets no further than "you get yours" and he, the peasant, can either lump it or try to get his by joining the Vietcong.

But most of the peasants have learned by now that under the Vietcong nobody keeps his.

This has created the kind of political vacuum where many Vietnamese peasants regard the war as a pointless slaughter. They still feel they stand to be the losers no matter who wins.

CAUGHT IN VISE

Caught between bloodsucking landlords, many of whom charge double the legal rents, and pitiless Vietcong tax collectors, who shoot first and talk later, the peasants appear ready to call a plague on both sides of this indecisive struggle.

Yet there is an appeal to the Vietcong's three main propaganda themes: "Land to the tiller," "The soldier helps the peasant," and "The government exists for the people."

These are novel and explosive ideas to a man who works knee deep in mud 14 hours a day, growing half his rice for somebody else, whose idea of government may be a venal local tax collector, and whose chickens and ducks may have disappeared when the last militia patrol passed through his village.

If his home has been destroyed or relatives killed by ill-directed bombs and shells, he might make a ready Vietcong convert without knowing what for.

U.S. MILITARY FRUSTRATED

Within the American military command in Saigon, there is widespread frustration over the failure of pacification efforts in the delta provinces like Long An.

One hears talk that the only way the Vietcong fish can be deprived of the water in which they swim is to make things so hot in Communist-held zones that the peasants will come over to the government side as refugees.

Others argue there is no substitute for thoroughgoing land reform.

One veteran American adviser in Long An said:

"These people have country that doesn't need a government. They could go back 2,000 years and they'd be happy, fish in every pond, crabs in every paddy, bananas, coconut, and ducks. All they need is a little land of their own to be happy. Five percent of the Vietnamese in this province are honestly progovernment by their own personal beliefs and ideology, 5 percent are with the Vietcong for the same reason and the other 90 percent are right."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Jan. 25, 1966]

THE PEOPLE'S WAR: MILITARY ACTION VERSUS LAND REFORM

(NOTE—This is the second of four articles on the Mekong Delta, South Vietnam's rice bowl. Critchfield recently completed an extensive tour there.)

(By Richard Critchfield)

TANAN, SOUTH VIETNAM.—A respected Vietnamese journalist, when asked why Saigon's generals temporized on enacting the kind of land reform that most people agree is needed to win the war, replied:

"They're still convinced it's winnable their way, and if not, it's not worth winning."

This harsh judgment may have more than a grain of truth in it.

Here in Long An Province, in the rice-rich heavily populated upper Mekong Delta, the Vietnamese officials and Army officers seem as fiercely determined as ever to defect the Vietcong eventually.

The Vietnamese still are fighting their own war here.

But local leaders become curt and evasive when questioned about land reform or other innovations to improve the peasant's lot.

"All the land we can distribute in secure areas, we have distributed already," said one senior Vietnamese official.

Most of these local leaders are reserved, sensitive, French-educated men, generally respected by their American advisers as "very competent" and "fine people." All have lived amidst war and violence since 1939.

Yet most of the higher ranking ones see South Vietnam's salvation in terms of military action rather than political remedies.

A typical response on how to win the war came from a civilian administrator in his midthirties:

"We don't have enough troops. If the free world would go to war with China, then OK. The unique way to win is to attack North Vietnam and China. If not, the war of subversion will last another 5 years."

Asked about the fate of the 3,000 Vietcong of South Vietnamese origin in Long An in the event of a cease-fire, the official said, "They all must go back to Hanoi."

His opinion was seconded by a Vietnamese officer, "Once the fighting stops, it will take us another 2 years to pacify Long An. We must throw the Vietcong forces out and destroy the Communist infrastructure."

A year ago, the U.S. mission in Saigon agreed to finance grievance committees in each of Long An's six districts in an attempt to analyze and then to right the wrongs that turn the peasants into Communist guerrillas.

One Vietnamese officer explained how the committees were working out:

"Each cadre has a small room. Everybody must come in for 5 minutes so as to keep security for the man who seeks to tell something. The cadre asks, 'How is your family? How is your life?' In this way, we get information on the Vietcong political organization and make our intelligence net. The grievance committees are the eyes of the Province chief."

Other officials praised the committees as a good way of learning the peasantry's education needs, getting military intelligence, controlling the population's movements and detecting secret Vietcong cells.

No one mentioned the genuine grievances that the peasants presumably voiced.

ATTITUDES DIFFERENT

Going down the ladder one rung to the district officials, however, there seems to be a distinct difference in attitudes.

While most senior Provincial officials are from Saigon and make no secret of their personal ambition to be transferred back there some day, the district officials seem to identify

themselves much more closely with the local peasantry.

Typical of this group is Nguyen Van Dhien, in Long An's most pacified district, Thu Thua. A goateed former Vietnamese ranger with a reputation as a tough fighter, Dhien writes poetry and has let his fingernails grow half-an-inch long to show he has risen above manual labor.

Dhien does not think that an invasion of North Vietnam would solve anything—and he is a strong advocate of land reform.

Asked what might happen if there were a free election contested by the Communists and the Saigon regime in Thu Thua, he said that if the Communists promised land reform, they might get the votes of 85 percent of the 45,000 who are landless peasants. In contrast, he said, the 8,000 refugees who have poured into Thu Thua in recent weeks from Vietcong-held territory probably would vote for Saigon since most are bitterly anti-Vietcong after experiencing Communist rule.

Twenty percent of Thu Thua's land, he said, is owned by rich absentee landlords who live in Saigon and Tan An.

Unlike the provincial leaders, Thien does not think the protracted guerrilla war will last long. "There is a big flame in the lamp just before it goes out," he said.

A third distinct Vietnamese attitude is moral indifference to the war, typically expressed by the bonze superior of Tan An's towering Nguyen Thuy Pagoda.

During a conversation marked by long silences, distant gongs, and burning incense, the bonze, a shaven-haired intelligent-looking man in his midthirties, had no opinion on land or any other concrete reform to help the peasantry.

"The Buddhist doctrine is tolerance, not violence," he said. "People move to town because they are afraid of bombing and artillery. I hope it is possible you can cease the bombing and shelling. Even where there is no engagement made with the Communist forces, the Americas still bomb, causing much harm to the people."

Most of the refugees, however, do not associate airstrikes with the Americans since they have seen few foreigners.

One refugee, Mau, a 49-year-old tenant farmer who fled to Tan An with his wife and five children a month ago, said his hamlet, An Nhut Tan, had long been under Vietcong control.

"At home I rented a hectare of rice land from a landlord who lived in Lac Tan village. The VC promised to give us land; they called the village chiefs together last year to make a land reform plan, but they didn't do anything."

Asked what he thought of the Vietcong, Mua stuck his tongue out and made a face as if he had bitten into a sour pickle.

"They usually shoot artillery around my house so I must move. Too much bombing also since November."

Since he had no identity papers, he said, he could not qualify for refugee relief and instead was earning 50 cents a day as a construction laborer in Tan An. "It's easy to get work now; many rich men building houses."

Asked what he thought of Americans, he had to ask the interpreter what Americans were.

After a pause, he shrugged, "The Government used to help more with rice and money. Why doesn't Mr. Diem come back? When he was there we got bank loans."

A 25-year-old Vietcong defector, who used to lead a 37-man guerrilla platoon, explained why peasants like Mua were turning against the Vietcong.

In his area, he said, the Vietcong initially redistributed land. But now they have raised taxes 300 percent.

"The more air strikes, the more people moved away and the heavier taxes became," he said. "The National Liberation Front (the Vietcong's political arm) failed to solve anything. There was no security to work in your field. An F–105 jet got there too fast, there was no time to run for cover. Those and 250-pound bombs were most feared."

He said if he were directing the war in Saigon he would intensify air and artillery attacks on the Vietcong villages, and then would offer the peasants amnesty and safe harbor elsewhere.

He suggested the offers be broadcast via heliborne loudspeakers by people who previously had left the Vietcong held villages.

He said he had joined the Communist Party 2 years ago.

"Everyone wants to join because it is an honor. You are known everywhere."

His platoon, he said, was assigned the military mission of "destroying strategic hamlets, building roadblocks, and encircling and inflicting casualties on the enemy" and the political task of "visiting farmers to inquire about their poverty and ask about their sufferings."

He said the Vietcong's motto was "Eat together, live together, and work together," meaning the soldiers and peasantry.

"The people liked us until our presence began to attract bombs and artillery to their villages," he said.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 26, 1966]

THE PEOPLE'S WAR: THE BATTLE TO WIN PEASANT'S LOYALTY

(NOTE.—This is the third of four articles on the Mekong Delta, South Vietnam's rice bowl. Critchfield recently completed an extensive tour there.)

(By Richard Critchfield)

TAN AN, SOUTH VIETNAM.—"Vietcong?" said the teenage American corporal, shoving a magazine into his carbine. "Hell, half the people walking by could be Vietcong. How you gonna tell Charlie from the friendlies?"

Here in Long An Province in the densely populated Mekong Delta, as most everywhere else in Vietnam, it is impossible to tell "our side" from "their side." A grin or a wave means nothing at all.

The corporal is one of about 60 Americans who are spending a year in the province, advising its military officers and civil servants on how to destroy Vietcong units, counter political subversion, and win over the loyalty of the peasantry.

It is no easy task, since an unrecognizable minority of the people the advisers are trying to befriend are trying to kill them.

And unless they befriend and convert more people than they kill, the fighting accomplishes nothing.

This is the basic difference between the "people's war" in Vietnam and more familiar "wars of attrition" elsewhere.

AWAKENED BY MORTARS

That night the Americans at Tan An were awakened at 1:30 a.m. by incoming mortar bursts. For some minutes the night was full of whirring, shrieking explosions.

Then the Vietcong firing stopped as abruptly as it had begun.

Out along a fence where men in pajamas and underwear and others in full combat fatigues had taken their positions, everyone listened.

When the night stayed quiet, someone muttered, "Well, I'll live to see another day."

A garrison radio crackled to life and a voice reported two 30-man Vietnamese militia posts had been attacked, one less than 2 miles away.

Flareships and "razorback" armed helicopters were soon circling the northern horizon; the tracer bullets looked like a man on a rooftop sprinkling firewater from a hose.

The commanding officer sent word from the province command post, telling everyone to go back to bed and get some sleep. They would need it in the days and weeks ahead.

SUSPECT BIG ASSAULT

The night mortar barrages have become a routine in Long An Province. Either Tan An or one of the six district capitals gets hit at least once a week.

And many of the American advisers, airmen, and technicians suspect a big assault on one of the district towns sometime this winter. Most are convinced such an assault can be turned back with Saigon's armed hueys, jets, flareships, and Long An's artillery.

It is rough for the five-man American advisory teams stationed in the six district towns.

One major said that everytime his garrison has been mortared, he has gone out and found the outside gate open, unlatched from inside the compound.

"If the Vietcong ever get inside that gate there's no place to go but down. At that point, I take off my flak vest, 'cause if they're going to get me, I don't want it to be alive."

A captain in Tan Tru, Long An's hottest district since it straddles the main Vietcong supply route between the South China Sea and base camps along the Cambodian border, says the morale of the Vietnamese militia he advises is "the damndest thing I've ever seen. I don't see how they can continue to smile and joke all the time; but they do."

He said his 2 months at Tan Tru has felt "like a lifetime; something happens every night."

He added, "We also have to keep the 12-mile road to Tan An open three times a week and it seems like every time we go to clear it we lose one man, either killed or wounded."

One major described a recent daylight operation to clear a Vietcong roadblock off Highway 4. He said his driver, while waiting in the jeep, was shot between the eyes by a sniper.

HARASSMENT RISING

After nearly a year of comparative peace and quiet in Long An, the Vietcong moved a second main force battalion into the province in November and the pace of ambushes, attacks, and mortar harassment has risen steadily ever since.

This climaxed at 1:30 a.m. on December 26 when the Vietcong chose to break the United States-South Vietnamese Christmas truce by firing 40 mortar shells into Tan An, while simultaneously laying down mortar barrages on all six district towns.

They inflicted heavy casualties and eventually overran two company-sized outposts and beheaded one Vietnamese soldier's wife.

Twenty-five militiamen were missing after the attack; an American captain speculated they "either bugged out, were carried off or directly hit by a mortar shell and blown to bits."

Many of the ill-equipped militia, or popular forces, as they are officially called, fight with only carbines and shotguns while wearing floppy hats, swimming trunks, pajamas or a scrounged uniform.

Recently a four-man outpost held off a company-sized Vietcong attack for 6 hours; when morning came two militiamen were dead and two were wounded, but the post had not fallen and they had managed to capture six Vietcong weapons.

One hamlet of 300 people, deep within Vietcong territory, recently pacified itself by erecting fortifications and passing the hat to buy a 60-mm. mortar to scare off the Vietcong. So far the Communist guerrillas have let the village alone.

Many of the American advisers believe the pattern of Vietcong attacks on isolated outposts and newly fortified hamlets along Saigon's defensive perimeter and Long An's northern boundary suggests that the Communists may be trying to sever Highway No.

4, and cut off Saigon from the rice-rich Mekong Delta.

COUNTER STRATEGY

To counter this strategy, Long An's Government forces, composed of two South Vietnamese regular army regiments and several thousand more locally recruited militiamen and police, have tried to fix the two Vietcong battalions with ground action and destroy them with heavy artillery and airstrikes.

Long An is so short of troops, however, that most operations must be stopped at sunset so the militia and police can return to guard their homes and families.

Despite this troop shortage, both the American advisers and Vietnamese commanders oppose bringing American combat units into the delta where the war is still almost entirely a Vietnamese fight, except for U.S. air support.

The Americans seem to feel that moving more U.S. troops into the delta would lead to a put-down-tools attitude among the Vietnamese forces. Vietnamese officers emphasize that the local economy would be disrupted and that the Vietcong could exploit a foreign invasion propaganda campaign among the local peasantry.

American combat soldiers in Vietnam are always amazed to hear the U.S. advisory teams live in scattered groups of four and five, wholly defended by Vietnamese troops.

The advisers themselves often wouldn't have it any other way.

Says Capt. Maurice H. Krause, 31, of Wahpeton, N. Dak., Long An's pacification adviser:

"This is an extremely nice country. What happens if you get assigned to a big unit is that you're close to a conventional war environment, moving with the troops. Down here in Long An we see people getting schools and medicine, see the spontaneous expressions of loyalty to this side and dissatisfaction with the Vietcong."

Two enlisted men in Long An have extended their tours for a second year and one will marry a local Vietnamese girl next month.

The biggest problem for the advisory team, as the fighting intensifies in Long An, is how to avoid inflicting casualties on the civilian population.

"HAVE TO GET CALLOUS"

Half of the patients at Tan An's new 155-bed hospital are civilians wounded in the fighting.

"Usually you can count on receiving at least a couple a day," says an American doctor on the hospital staff. "They mostly step on grenades or mines or get shot by stray bullets. But we do get some bombing and napalm victims. You have to get callous or you'd drive yourself crazy worrying about it."

A U.S. Air Force forward air observer, one of a team who flys reconnaissance and combat support missions over Long An every day and knows its terrain by heart, says, "If I go over a village and see women and kids, I flatly refuse to call in an airstrike."

Another American, after many months in Long An, says, "No one who goes to indemnification meetings where they pay war victims can be morally callous. No one can say a 2-year-old child or a 90-year-old grandmother is a Vietcong. But I think we should and must continue the bombing.

"It's effective. It kills Vietcong and interdicts their movements. I think care is taken. There are instances where American forward air controllers have refused to call in strikes or when the province chief has ordered helicopters back home that were ordered out.

"What you've always got to remember, though, is that the people are the key to winning the war. There's no reason to go out in the woods and kill lots of people unless it helps in pacifications."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 27, 1966]

THE PEOPLE'S WAR: AND NOW ANOTHER TRY AT PACIFYING LONG AN

(NOTE.—This is the last of four articles on the Mekong Delta, South Vietnam's rice bowl. Critchfield recently completed an extensive tour there.)

(By Richard Critchfield)

TAN AN, SOUTH VIETNAM.—After months of reappraisal and careful preparation, South Vietnam has launched its fourth pacification plan since 1961 to win back the loyalty of the Vietnamese peasantry.

It differs hardly at all from the old plans on the two key issues involved—land reform and military against civilian rule in the countryside.

As a result, many observers fear it will be no more successful than former President Ngo Dinh Diem's Operation Sunrise, Gen. Nguyen Khanh's Chien Thang plan or Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor's Hop Tac plan.

Nor is anybody predicting spectacular success.

After a brief tour of Vietnam recently, David Bell, Director of the Agency for International Development, said, "We don't except large areas to be cleared, but they will be significant."

It has never been so much a question of devising a successful pacification program as applying it and redressing the genuine political grievances of the peasantry.

In essence, all the programs have been derived from the tache d'huile or "oil slick" or "ink blot" theory, first developed by the French Foreign Legion in Morocco in the 1920's. It was a method of securing some solidly held, key centers from which "pacification" forces could spread out in an ever-widening perimeter against rebellious natives.

PHILIPPINE SUCCESS

After being humanized and refined with civic action, most notably land reform, the method worked against Communist insurgents in the Philippines. And by added emphasis on promises of independence, police methods, strict population control, and fortified villages, the British made it work in Malaya.

Land reform or the promise of independence, however, provided the psychological impetus in both of these successful efforts.

As U.S. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge puts it, the people "must adhere to the government because they like it before it can win."

It was not until March 1962 that Diem, with the help of Malayan-experienced British advisers, launched the first attempt at Vietnamese pacification, Operation Sunrise.

Diem misused the program by making it an instrument of his personal rule. But even so, it was far more successful than any of the efforts that followed it.

For instance, here in Long An Province, Diem succeeded—in just a little over 1 year—in regrouping 1,000 hamlets into 220 strategic hamlets and isolating the Vietcong into the remaining 35.

Diem had three things his successors lacked—a functioning countrywide rural administrative system, an efficient, tightly controlled political apparatus, and a civilian chief in each Province whose authority was absoluete and who superimposed a political judgment over military actions in his Province.

DIEM AIDS PURGED

The wholesale purge of public servants and other Diem appointees, whatever their personal record or reputation, and the destruction of his Can Lao Party left the Vietnamese Army as the only countrywide organization.

Colonels and captains took over the job of running South Vietnam's 43 Provinces and 240 districts.

It soon become apparent, however, that these men were not subject to Saigon's direct administrative control; rather they were responsible to the commander of the nearest Vietnamese Army division and through him to the local corps commander.

Seen in retrospect, the three successive military coups of Minh, Khanh and the Young Turks were in large part supported by the officer corps to enable them to consolidate the administration in the countryside.

Thus, beginning with Diem's fall, government was made incidental to waging the war.

On the Provincial level, meanwhile, the army, jealous of its powers, exempted Vietnamese soldiers from the civilian penal code, even in crimes involving civilians.

Since the army lacked the judicial apparatus and military police to control its troops, the net effect was to turn loose in the countryside 550,000 young soldiers who had little reason to fear being arrested or prosecuted for crimes such as rape or petty theft.

The Vietcong leaders, meanwhile, were concentrating on getting their men to "eat, live and work" with the peasants. The Vietcong helped the peasants till their ricefields and sweep their houses, while through terrorism, they were eroding law and order in Government-controlled areas.

Two months after Diem's overthrow, an American-Vietnamese factfinding team, was sent to Long An Province.

The team uncovered an alarming Communist advance. By then the Vietcong had overrun and burnt down all but 6 of Diem's 220 strategic hamlets.

After interviewing 1,500 peasant families, the team concluded the war against the Vietcong "cannot ever be won" unless Saigon carried out drastic reforms at the village level.

Its conclusions were:

Land must be distributed. The local militia must be paid regularly. The use of artillery and bombs against villages must be limited.

Forced labor had to be stopped. Army extortion and food thefts must be prevented.

Corruption and bribery must be eliminated among local officials. District and Provincial forces must send reinforcements when they were sought by village outposts under attack.

These conclusions were pretty basic, yet today most of the troubles remain largely unremedied.

Local militia are a little better paid and housed, but still not adequately. Forced labor has been eliminated in most of the country. The introduction of more armed helicopters, flareships, high-speed jets and more artillery has reduced the need for ground reinforcements.

But there has been no serious land reform. Bombing and shelling of villages has multiplied tenfold or twelvefold. Army extortion and food thefts are as common as ever and corruption is still endemic.

LODGE SHOCKED

When the report on Long An was originally published in early 1964, it had the impact of a bombshell in Saigon. Lodge, shocked at the seriousness of the situation, urged General Khanh to launch a crash pilot pacification program in the Province. If the Communists could be turned back in Long An, Lodge argued, it would be shown they could be turned back everywhere.

Khanh agreed. Economic aid was stepped up, U.S. heliborne flights deployed for stop attacks, the military advisory team was expanded and more men were assigned to district and mobile units operating in the Province.

A Vietnamese airborne brigade was flown in to start operations to clear lost territory.

Maj. Gen. Richard Stilwell, now U.S. Commander in Thailand, told newsmen Long An would be "pacified" and cleared of Communists within 6 months.

But the following July, 6 months later, the Government held only 25 hamlets, mostly clustered around Tan An and the six district towns. Khanh's "Chien Thang" plan had been a fiasco.

Partly, this was because Khanh's heart was never in pacification. He weakened pacification efforts from the start by leaving it up to his Province chiefs to proceed as best they saw fit in their own bailiwicks.

After Maxwell Taylor arrived in Saigon that summer as Ambassador and surveyed the wreckage of years of costly trial and error, he developed a pacification philosophy calling for giving the peasants military security while demonstrating to them the revolutionary idea in Vietnam, that Government exists for the people.

By then, one of the main Vietcong slogans had already become: "The Government exists for the people."

URGES CONCENTRATION

Taylor pushed for concentrating the Government's resources on a small area, the seven Provinces encircling Saigon, hoping for visible results. This was the "Hop Tac" plan (which roughly means "togetherness.")

Taylor also urged a return to civilian government. This was not simply to have Vietnam's leader a man in mufti instead of uniform, but because Taylor saw it was the way to restore a workable administration and law and order in the countryside.

Lodge's strong advocacy for a return to civilian rule, no matter who the man on top is, is based on the same reasoning.

Yet now, almost 18 months since Hop Tac got underway, Long An still has only 76 of its 252 hamlets anywhere near pacified.

The cost of men and material has been heavy; four of the young American officers who pointed out shortcomings in the pacification effort to me on previous visits since have been killed in action.

Since June 1964, there have been four different American province advisers and eight different American pacification advisers in Long An, although the Vietnamese Provincial officials have stayed the same.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. MAY CRAIG

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, at the time of her retirement last December 31, May Craig was one of the most widely known women in America.

As a journalist for more than 30 years, Mrs. Craig gained the confidence of five Presidents.

As a panelist on more than 250 televised broadcasts of "Meet the Press" and other public affairs programs, she became a national personality.

As a columnist for the Guy Gannett Publishing Co., she gave Maine newspapers a refreshing and perceptive view of Washington and the world.

As a correspondent, she circled the world in war and peace. She witnessed the most exciting and trying events of our times. She spoke with the wisdom of experience and the optimism of youth.

Throughout her unparalleled career, she was a voice of decency.

To the Maine congressional delegation and to two generations of official Washington spokesmen, May Craig was a tireless and impartial reporter. She also was a lady whose charm and character won our hearts. We will carry our respect and affection for her always.

Earlier this week, President Johnson and 400 other friends honored her at a reception at the National Press Club.

When May Craig's retirement was announced, her newspapers in Maine outlined the highlights of her career and reported the many tributes she received.

I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Post story on her National Press Club reception, and the Guy Gannett Publishing Co. stories on her retirement be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Portland (Maine) Press-Herald, Dec. 4, 1965]

NEWSWOMAN MAY CRAIG SLATED TO RETIRE DECEMBER 31

WASHINGTON.—May Craig, one of America's most famous newspaperwomen and for more than 30 years the capital correspondent for the Guy Gannett newspapers of Maine, will retire at the end of the year.

Mrs. Craig, who combined penetrating questions with pert hats, for more than 3 decades has been the most widely read columnist in Maine. She covered Washington and the world for Guy Gannett newspapers in Portland, Augusta, and Waterville.

For thousands of Maine families her daily column "Inside in Washington" was must morning breakfast table reading. Although little read outside Maine, Mrs. Craig became nationally famous as a panelist on the radio and television program "Meet the Press."

Millions of Americans came to know her as the Washington reporter who could be counted upon to enliven Presidential press conferences with the pointed question, the incisive query.

Yet, though her questions occasionally rankled the famous, she was a close friend of every President from Franklin D. Roosevelt to Lyndon Baines Johnson.

And, though she asked literally thousands of questions, "I never asked a question I later regretted," she noted as her retirement neared.

Her column reflected the same penetrating quality that punctuated her questions. One column in 1964, "Decline of the United States—And Fall" attracted nationwide attention, was reprinted in U.S. News & World Report as well as newspapers throughout America.

Her travels in search of the news took Elizabeth May Craig around the world, as a war correspondent in World War II, as the first woman to fly the Berlin airlift, as a correspondent during the Korean war, and to Africa as the continent merged during the early 1960's.

Maine readers followed her byline around the world as she reported the great events of more than 3 decades.

Yet May Craig also kept a close finger on the pulse of the Maine delegation in Washington as she furnished readers with the news that most closely affected them.

Mrs. Craig said that, when she retires at the end of the year, "I'm going to take a little time off to do nothing," but few readers will believe that she'll remain inactive long. She's been under contract for some time to write a book, so there's the strong likelihood that the typewriter, which for a third of a century had recorded the events that shaped the world, will not long be stilled.

Millions of Americans who have seen Mrs. Craig on "Meet the Press" and at Presidential press conferences, have come to think of her as a Maine native. It comes as a shock to learn that she's a native of Coosaw, N.C., who moved to Washington as a young girl.

No matter. She remains Maine in Washington to many. She knows Maine intimately and news of a postmaster's appointment in Waterville received the same close attention as a Washington national story.

Now in her seventies (although she maintains that she'll be 50 until she dies), Mrs. Craig never slowed down. Her columns from the beginning reflected her intense interest in almost everything and anything, from renovations of the White House to the war in Vietnam.

For years she was up and on the go at 6 a.m., and Maine Senators and Congressmen quickly learned to become accustomed to a telephone call from May Craig long before they had risen from bed.

She became in time almost as famous as some of the officials she covered; more famous than most.

Married to a newspaperman, the late Donald Alexander Craig, the Washington bureau chief for the New York Herald, as well as for the Guy Gannett newspapers, Mrs. Craig became the Washington correspondent for these newspapers in the early 1930's after the death of her husband. She has two children, a son and a daughter, and several grandchildren.

She maintains a home in Washington close to the Capitol.

During her career Mrs. Craig covered the V-bomb raids in London during World War II, the Normandy campaign, the liberation of Paris, and the Korean war. Her travels for these newspapers have taken her to almost every point on the globe.

She was made a doctor of human letters by the University of Maine in 1946. She is a member of the Women's National Press Club, the Overseas Press of America, and Theta Sigma Phi.

PRAISE FROM L.B.J.

President Johnson, learning in Texas of May Craig's retirement, sent her the following telegram Friday:

"It's a long time from May to September, but May will always be May to me."

[From the Portland (Maine) Evening Express, Dec. 3, 1965]

TRIBUTE FROM PUBLISHER

Mrs. Jean Gannett Arnzen, president and publisher of the Guy Gannett Publishing Co., issued this statement of tribute to May Craig:

"May Craig has for many years been as inseparable from our papers as their nameplates. She has made them known, not only in Maine but in the Nation. Competing in an environment of top talent and strong personalities, she has had the vigor and the ability to be outstanding.

"Obviously her retirement, so richly deserved cannot be treated casually. It will leave a lonesome place in our columns. Her departure is too close to me, personally, to be dismissed in the course of business.

"She was employed by our papers by my father, the late Guy P. Gannett, when he was establishing them and laying the foundations for their success. He always believed that one of his most important contributions was employing May Craig to represent his papers in Washington.

"I shall always remember my father's great pride in his Washington correspondent and the delight he had in her success."

[From the Portland, Maine, Sunday Telegram, Dec. 19, 1965]

"NATION IS BETTER FOR THIS OUTSTANDING WOMAN"—FROM PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S TRIBUTE TO MAY CRAIG

(By Donald E. Hanson)

To imagine a Presidential press conference without May Craig is like imagining the Capital without the Washington Monument.

For May Craig, to thousands of Maine newspaper readers, is Washington. For more than three decades she's been an indelible fixture on the Washington scene.

Presidents came and went. Elections changed the faces in the city and altered the complexion of the Nation. May Craig remained.

Now that too changes, for May Craig, who with pert hat and pointed question became one of America's most famous newspaperwomen, retires at the end of the year.

Presidents from Franklin Delano Roosevelt to Lyndon Baines Johnson came to know and respect—and occasionally chafe at one of her barbed questions—the little and unquestionable First Lady of the Washington press corps.

Although for thousands of Maine readers her column "Inside in Washington" has been daily must reading for years at the breakfast table, Elizabeth May Craig was comparatively unread outside the State, except on occasions when her comments were reprinted in other newspapers and magazines.

Her face, however, became almost as famous as those of the personages she covered.

Visitors to Washington have, after viewing the landmarks of the city, often inquired of their host: "All this is fine, but where's May Craig?" And a Sunday Telegram reporter, traveling in California, had only to mention that he worked for the Portland papers to receive the reply, "Oh, you mean May Craig's papers."

To millions of Americans she became famous as a fixture on the radio and television program "Meet the Press." She once made President Jim Carey, of the Electrical Workers Union, gulp visibly by asking: "Don't you think it un-American for a man to have to belong to a union to earn a living?"

NO ONE IMMUNE

No President was immune from the sharp May Craig question. President Roosevelt, after fielding a sharp one on three hops, asked May if she stayed awake all night thinking it up. "As a matter of fact," shot back May, "I did."

Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson all came to expect the unexpected from May. President Kennedy was wise enough to realize that when a press conference began to take a dull turn that it was probably time to recognize Mrs. Craig.

Yet, if Presidents occasionally rankled at a May Craig question, none was ever able to harbor a grudge.

She was often a visitor at the Hyde Park home of President and Mrs. Roosevelt. President Johnson, perhaps better than most, came to realize the many facets of May Craig. In 1956, when the then Senator Johnson suffered a severe heart attack, each day to his hospital room was delivered a private letter from May, cheering him and informing him of the activities in the Senate.

If the pointed questions, the unusual hats or the familiar features made May Craig a celebrity, they may also to some extent have obscured her real ability as a member of the Washington press corps.

Eisenhower's press secretary, Jim Hagerty, ranked her equal to any reporter he knew, man or woman. Pierre Salinger, George Reedy, and Bill Moyers also learned she was a press correspondent to be reckoned with.

May seemed to have a knack for knowing where a story was; if she didn't intuitively know, her apparently insatiable curiosity about nearly everything and everybody led her to it.

She wrote for more than 30 years with an unmistakable crisp style that occasionally crackled with brilliance. A 1964 column on the "Decline of the United States—And Fall" became an overnight sensation, was reprinted in U.S. News & World Report and many newspapers. Thousands of readers throughout the United States sought reprints.

After an early interview with Cuba's Fidel Castro, May rightly presaged that "Pistol packin' Fidel Castro will have to lay this pistol down if he is going to do the administrative job that lies before him. He is apt to find being a statesman is more difficult than fighting."

WITH THE TROOPS

Although based for most of her newspaper career in Washington, May Craig's byline appeared over datelines from throughout the world.

She was a tenacious war correspondent in World War II, heard the deadly buzz of the V-bombs over London, later was present at the allied liberation of Paris and became the first woman ever to fly the Berlin airlift.

She was in Korea during that war; in the early 1960's toured Africa as that continent emerged.

She went where the news took her, and diplomatic doors around the world opened to let her in.

Most readers think of May Craig, who incidentally is 77 years old today, as a Maine native, yet she was born in Coosaw, S.C., one of a family of nine children.

She moved to Washington, D.C., as a youngster and high school officialdom was the first to quail before her pen. She was suspended from high school for 3 days after a piece she wrote for the school paper was judged to be disrespectful of the faculty.

She later married Donald Alexander Craig, himself a topdrawer newsman who was the Washington representative of the New York Herald in addition to the Maine newspapers.

May's Maine newspaper career was launched when she began substituting for her husband, who was ill for a time before his death. In the early 1930's after her husband's death she agreed to continue as the Guy Gannett correspondent in Washington.

Since then May's working day has begun at 6:30 a.m. and Washington officials long ago became accustomed to being awakened by an early query from May. By 8:30 a.m. she was heading toward the Capitol, the White House, or some other Government agency in search of news.

"Miss May," as President Truman called her, for years wrote her personal column "Inside in Washington" six times a week, a chore in itself. In addition, she daily covered the major breaking news as well as the more local stories from Maine's delegation at the Capitol.

Although she is retiring, she's reluctant to decide whether to retain her red brick home close to the Capitol she is so much a part of, or move nearer her son and daughter who live in Maryland.

As a woman reporter, May fought hard for the same privileges as her male colleagues, but never used her sex as a plea for special consideration. She's long argued that women should be accepted for membership in the National Press Club in Washington.

In 1947, while accompanying President Truman on a trip to Brazil, the press corps was scheduled to return to the United States with the Chief Executive aboard the battleship *Missouri*. May, barred because the Navy argued they had no facilities aboard for ladies, gave the Navy something to ponder and 2 years later was its guest on a cruise.

Once dubbed "Dynamite in the blue dress" by a fellow journalist (she customarily wears blue), it's a description that somehow doesn't quite fit. For if May Craig's questions could be sharp or her battles with officialdom blistering, her underlying personality is far more pixie-ish than vindictive.

"It hurts me," she once confessed, "to be thought of as a wisecracker. Actually, I never ask a question for any other purpose than to bring out something important."

And only recently she declared that she'd never asked a question that she'd later regretted. May has always taken time phrasing her questions, mentally closing loopholes through which the answerer might escape.

Although she has described herself as 75 percent in favor of the New Deal, May Craig has always prided that she belongs to no political party. No matter who was in office, May was after the news.

She clashed occasionally with public officials that she covered; most recently with Maine's other famous lady in Washington, GOP U.S. Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH. But such clashes are usually short lived.

Her century-old Washington home is crammed with mementoes of a rich Washington life and frequently she hosts intimate dinner parties for a small group of friends and dignitaries.

The menu is invariably the same, half a broiled chicken, sliced peaches soaked in brandy and a green vegetable for color contrast. And the after dinner conversation, like May's writing, is never dull.

Few Washington correspondents have traveled as widely or interviewed more foreign officials than has May Craig. From Germany's Adenauer to the Congo's Kasavubu, to Cuba's Castro, May Craig has talked to them all. Thirty articles on her tour of Africa were inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the request of U.S. Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE.

She's been behind the Iron Curtain into Russia twice, has toured Latin America, flown over the North Pole, has been to Korea and South America.

Yet, Washington remained her beat and her home and to many Americans she and the capital became inexorably entwined.

To these, a Washington without May Craig just won't be the same.

TRIBUTES

Since the announcement of May Craig's retirement, letters of tribute have been pouring in. In addition to the President Johnson tribute, others have been received from:

Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, former President Harry S. Truman, former Vice President Richard M. Nixon, Thomas E. Dewey, Barry Goldwater, Senate President CARL HAYDEN, Senate Minority Leader EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, House Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK, House Minority Leader GERALD R. FORD, U.S. Senators MARGARET CHASE SMITH and EDMUND S. MUSKIE, U.S. Representatives STANLEY R. TUPPER and WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY, former U.S. Representatives Robert Hale and Clifford G. McIntyre, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Interior Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor, and Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., December 4, 1965.

May Craig was not only one of the first women reporters in Washington, but from the first she was one of the best.

As Congressman, Senator, Vice President, and President, I have always found May Craig to be a help and an inspiration to me.

She knows the world. More importantly, she seems to hold a stethoscope to the heart of mankind. I think she does so because she cares deeply for people and she is concerned with decency and justice.

The Nation is better for having had this outstanding woman on the scene to help chronicle the events of our day.

Her friends will not forget her, and her influence will remain.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

[From the Portland (Maine) Sunday Telegram, Dec. 5, 1965]

L.B.J. LEADS IN HONORING MAY CRAIG

Tributes from some of the Nation's leading citizens were pouring in Sunday for May Craig, Washington correspondent for

the Guy Gannett Publishing Co. for more than 30 years.

Mrs. Craig announced Friday she will retire at the end of the year.

President Johnson led those honoring the veteran newswoman in a cryptic message from his Texas ranch: "It's a long time from May to September, but May will always be May to me."

The President's press aids said L.B.J. who is at his Texas ranch, would have more to say about May's retirement later.

U.S. Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH flatly predicted that "history will record her as one of the truly great women of America."

Pinpointing one of Mrs. Craig's best known qualities, Senator SMITH said, "She has been a shining symbol of journalistic independence and known throughout the world as the dedicated and persistent reporter who never tolerated an evasive answer—even from Presidents.

"Journalism has never had the equal of May Craig and the Washington scene will not be the same after her departure," Senator SMITH said.

Former President Harry S. Truman hailed Mrs. Craig "after a long and colorful career as Washington correspondent for the Portland Press Herald-Evening Express and Sunday Telegram."

"May was not only well thought of by those in Washington, but throughout the Nation as well, and she made an excellent correspondent. I hope the Portland newspaper will be able to find someone to fill May's place—but that is not going to be easy," President Truman said.

He said he hoped "the years ahead will be the best and happiest of her life."

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall said, "We hate to see May Craig go—and wonder in dismay who will ever replace her."

He added, "Despite the modern conspiracy against individualism, May Craig has been a sturdy, colorful individualist who has added an extra dimension to the Washington scene.

"Possessed of a perceptive reporter's eye, she has always gone right to the heart of the real issue—and I suspect that it was this quality plus her inherent character that made her so respected and beloved in the Nation's Capital."

Barry Goldwater called her a "highly competent newswoman * * * with the gracious qualities of a lady."

He said, "One of my sweetest and fondest memories of my 12 years in Washington will always be May Craig."

Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, in a statement from Vietnam, said "May Craig has earned a unique niche among the elite of Washington's press corps. Her writing and her television appearances have brought honor to the people of Maine and to the Guy Gannett Publishing Co.

"Her dispatches have given Maine people an eye witness perspective on the most exciting and challenging developments in the history of our Nation.

"I will miss her daily inquiries. I will miss her charm and wisdom. And with her many readers, I will miss her voice of decency and experience.

"As a news correspondent, May Craig won the confidence of Presidents. As a lady, she won the respect of all of us. As a friend, she won our hearts," Senator MUSKIE concluded.

Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY said, "The Nation's Capital just won't seem the same without May Craig at her customary front-row seat, asking searching questions of Government officials and informing the American public.

"I am exceedingly sorry to hear that she is retiring."

U.S. Representative STANLEY R. TUPPER called Mrs. Craig a "delightful, sparkling, and ageless woman.

"In every trade, profession, or calling, there are men and women who tower above their contemporaries. By a combination of talent, drive, and sagacity these people climb to the top and stay there. Such a person is May Craig—a reporter, war correspondent, and television personality without peer," TUPPER said.

"Our friendship grew slowly but solidly on the basis of mutual respect. At all occasions when I have been her guest at Washington functions, I have been immensely proud at the recognition she always received.

"The Guy Gannett Publishing Co. should be commended for affording its readers such an intimate view of the Washington scene and the political life of our Capital over a long period of years.

"I understand that May will be working on her autobiography in the months to come. It would be my prediction that it will be a 'bestseller,'" TUPPER said.

U.S. Representative WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY called her "the first lady of the press," and a "genuine celebrity."

"A no-nonsense lady, May has never let her fame go to her head," HATHAWAY said. "She has retained her keen wit and sense of humor, and has devoted herself to her profession ethically and skillfully.

"More importantly, she has reported the happenings in Washington with honesty and accuracy, mincing no words," he said.

"She has been invulnerable to sham and phoniness, and has never been one to sweep the dust of truth under the rug of pretense.

"We will miss her pink and blue bonnets, her pleasant voice on our telephones, the personal encounters in the Press Gallery, the Speaker's Lobby, and at meetings of the Maine delegation.

"May has been a most distinguished ambassador to Washington from our State," HATHAWAY concluded.

JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts, Speaker of the House of Representatives, expressed sorrow at "her retirement, because May Craig has for many years been an institution in Washington, and in the national life of our country.

"I admire and respect May very much, and I extend to her every future happiness and success," he said.

Robert Hale, former Maine First District Congressman, said he was "sorry to learn that May Craig is retiring as Washington correspondent for the Gannett papers in Maine.

"My wife and I are among May's most devoted and consistent readers," he said.

House Minority Leader GERALD R. FORD, Republican of Michigan, expressed his "gratitude to her for a job well done," and extended his "very best wishes."

Secretary of Commerce John Connor said he "shares the consternation of all of official Washington that May Craig would contemplate retirement," and conveyed his "warmest good wishes."

Also paying tribute to Mrs. Craig were Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz; Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat of Montana; former Vice President Richard M. Nixon; and two-time Republican presidential candidate Thomas E. Dewey.

President Johnson also praised Mrs. Craig September 28 last year, when he made a campaign appearance in Portland.

After a tumultous welcome on the steps of Portland city hall, Johnson said, "I think this is the most wonderful welcome May Craig has ever received."

He went on to say, "When I was sick in 1955 I did not know whether I would see the sunrise the next day * * *. But every single day, without exception, May Craig wrote me a letter and made me want to live and get well."

[From the Portland (Maine) Press Herald, Feb. 15, 1966]

PRESIDENT SALUTES MAY CRAIG AT RETIREMENT PARTY

(By Donald Larrabee)

WASHINGTON.—The Nation's No. 1 man was among those who honored May Craig Monday night.

President Lyndon B. Johnson brought tears to Mrs. Craig's eyes when he showed up unexpectedly at a Valentine's Day party honoring her retirement as correspondent for the Guy Gannett newspapers of Maine.

The party was held in the National Press Club ballroom. Some 400 persons, including Government officials and men and women of the press corps, paid tribute to Mrs. Craig.

The President gave Mrs. Craig a gold bracelet carrying the seal of the United States on one side.

As Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE walked by, the Chief Executive quipped: "It's my New England friend. She'll have to have her initials engraved on it herself."

Mrs. Craig retired December 31 after 35 years as correspondent for the Maine newspapers.

The President arrived at the Press Club, about 2 blocks from the White House, with Press Secretary Bill Moyers and Harold Pachios. The latter is of Cape Elizabeth, Maine.

Pachios said that the President told him in the limousine on the way over about Mrs. Craig's daily letters to him while he was hospitalized after a heart attack in 1955. He added:

"She remembered me and I am going to remember her."

The President remained for about 10 minutes, spoke briefly with Mrs. Jean Gannett Arnzen, president and publisher of the Guy Gannett Publishing Co., of Maine, and her husband, J. Richard Arnzen, and Senator and Mrs. Muskie.

The President earlier had sent an orchid to Mrs. Craig. She wore it in the receiving line.

In formal ceremonies, Mrs. Craig was presented a dozen red roses from Mrs. Arnzen, and a new chapeau from U.S. Representative EDNA KELLY, of New York. She was introduced by Windsor Booth, president of the National Press Club as "everybody's sweetheart."

Mrs. Craig responded to the tributes by saying the evening was "the loveliest thing that ever happened to me."

Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., remembered Mrs. Craig from his father's years in the White House.

He told Mrs. Arnzen:

"She has been a part of my family, I feel I've been a part of hers for as long as I can remember. I trust this Valentine's party is just the first of many happy occasions for her."

The party was jointly sponsored by the National Press Club—which once barred women at its doors—and the Women's National Press Club which, under Mrs. Craig's leadership, fought an unending battle for the rights of women reporters in the Nation's Capital.

Mrs. Arnzen flew in to supervise the festivities. The White House—including several press secretaries of past years—was represented, as well as almost every Federal agency from the CIA to Capitol Hill.

Senator and Mrs. MUSKIE represented the Maine congressional delegation. Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH telegraphed her regrets to Mrs. Arnzen, having left over the weekend for Santo Domingo where she will confer Tuesday morning with U.S. Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker and officials of the Organization of American States.

Senator SMITH called the party "deserved tribute to America's first lady of journalism"

and asked Mrs. Arnzen to convey her best wishes.

The guests enjoyed a lavish buffet from a table which featured Mrs. Craig's famed hats in a symbolic centerpiece. Topping a floral arrangement was a huge hat made of shredded newspapers and teletype tape. Lifesize photographic portraits of Mrs. Craig in familiar press conference poses, including a famous Life magazine action picture last year, were on display.

The entertainment feature was a 10-minute film, prepared by NBC, highlighting some of Mrs. Craig's appearances on the "Meet the Press" television show. Veteran United Press International White House correspondent, Merriman Smith, narrated and the show's producer, Larry Spivak, added his own tribute.

President Johnson's former press secretary, George Reedy, was there; also, Jim Hagerty, a vice president of ABC, who was President Eisenhower's press chief; Mrs. Elizabeth Carpenter, press secretary to Mrs. Lyndon Johnson; and assistant to the President, Douglas Cater, and Mrs. Cater.

From Capitol Hill came Senator and Mrs. ERNEST GRUENING, of Alaska; Senator JOSEPH TYDINGS, of Maryland; Senator and Mrs. STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri; Senator and Mrs. FRANK CARLSON, of Kansas; Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY, of Minnesota; Representative and Mrs. HOWARD SMITH, of Virginia; and Mr. and Mrs. Ed Hudon. Mrs. Hudon, the former Blanche Bernier, has served for many years as secretary to Senator SMITH.

Representative WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY was unable to attend. His office said he is under doctor's orders to restrict his social activities because of a recent leg injury. Representative STANLEY TUPPER is in Las Vegas, Nev., on a speaking engagement and also sent his regrets.

Other longtime friends from officialdom who attended included Adm. and Mrs. W. A. Raborn (he heads the CIA); Roosevelt, Director of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity; Prof. Albert Abrahamson, of Bowdoin College; Mr. and Mrs. Edgar A. Comee (he is a former Gannett papers editorial writer, now with the Agency for International Development); Maritime Commissioner and Mrs. James V. Day, of Kennebunk; former Maine U.S. Representative Clifford G. McIntire, and Mrs. McIntire; and Mr. and Mrs. Stephen Leo. Leo is a former political writer for the Gannett newspapers and former Government official, now in private business here.

U.N. Ambassador Arthur Goldberg, who couldn't come, sent May warm greetings and said he was going to "miss you and your extremely able and discerning reporting—as well as your unfailing sense of humor and other fine qualities. We treasure our association with you on the Washington scene."

He said he'd been trying out "the muse" and sent a long poem dedicated "To May" written by Mrs. Steven Goldstein of New York, who was not further identified.

It went:

"To May—who's retiring much too young,
I join the chorus of praises sung.
Since first you started back with Hoover,
You've been the press corps' primest-est mover.
You've livened Presidential chats.
You've made us buy our wives new hats.
You've caught us blushing, you've caught us wincing,
You've caught us when we're not convincing.
But on each story that you file,
You never fail to make us smile.
Oh, don't leave future press conferences waiting.
They depend on you for their Neilsen rating.
For you've made the toughest hem and haw—
Thank God you didn't take up the law."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 15, 1966]

WINTER TRIBUTES ARE WARM FOR MAY

(By Dorothy McCardle)

For years Washington newspaperwoman May Craig was famous for two things—her flowery hats and her prickly words. Millions of Americans laughed or gasped at the words and gawked at the hats on TV's "Meet the Press" and on televised Presidential press conferences.

Last night at a reception in honor of Mrs. Craig, she wore one of her famous hats, but she hadn't a single astringent word left in her. She was so touched by all the tributes paid her that she was close to tears.

The first moment of emotion came when President Johnson arrived unexpectedly during the reception given jointly by the National Press Club and the Women's National Press Club.

As he entered the clubrooms of the NPC, he embraced Mrs. Craig and whispered at length into her ear. She was already wearing a white orchid corsage which he and Mrs. Johnson had sent her.

"What did he say to you?" she was asked.

"It was just for me," she said, and her voice quivered.

A White House aid revealed how the President had spoken warmly of Mrs. Craig on his drive over from the White House. The President told his associates that he would never forget how thoughtful she had been to him when he had his heart attack in 1955.

"She wrote to me or sent me a poem or a book every single day," the President recalled.

May said later, "I have known him for 30 years, first as a Congressman and a Senator and Vice President. I never thought of him as the President. I worried about him when he had that heart attack, just lying there."

The President produced an even more tangible gift as he walked with Mrs. Craig among the 400 guests in the crowded club ballroom. He reached into his pocket for a small gold-wrapped box. "I brought you this," he said.

Mrs. Craig was so undone as the crowd surged about her and the President that she handed it back to him to open for her.

The President fished in his pocket for his glasses so he could see to unwrap a gold bracelet, bearing a single charm embossed with the Presidential Seal. The opposite side was blank, and the President noted that it should be engraved with the date. "You'll have to pay for the date," he quipped to her.

After a 10-minute round of the ballroom with Mrs. Craig on his arm, the President left before the formal tributes began. They came in the shape of roses and hats presented by Mary Gallagher, president of the Women's National Press Club, Windson Booth, president of the National Press Club, and Jean Gannett Arnzen, president of the Guy Gannett Publishing Co. of Maine, for which Mrs. Craig was a correspondent for 35 years before she retired in December. A poetic tribute was read from U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Arthur J. Goldberg.

Called upon for a speech, Mrs. Craig, wearing a Valentine red lace dress with matching hat of red velvet bows, said, "This is the loveliest thing that ever happened to me."

But there was more fun to come with a 12-minute film put together by Lawrence Spivak, producer of "Meet the Press," and selected from Mrs. Craig's more than 250 appearances on that TV show. Her hats and her hatpin sharp questions were on parade again, and she laughed as heartily as everyone else at her reruns.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE ALBERT THOMAS OF TEXAS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I regret that an engagement in Illinois prevented my being present yesterday on the floor of the Senate when the Senate agreed to a resolution concerning the late Congressman Albert Thomas, offered by my distinguished colleague from Texas, on behalf of himself and me.

Representative Thomas was a close friend of mine and I have always held the highest respect for his abilities, accomplishments, and character. It was with great regret that I learned of the death of this distinguished Texas Congressman who honorably served the best interest of his district and his country. Texas has never had a better Congressman in Washington.

His positions on powerful House committees allowed him to use his capabilities to further the progress of this Nation, and with strong devotion and sincere dedication he served with distinction for more than 29 years.

It is with great sorrow and deep sympathy for Albert Thomas' family that I assume the honor of being a representative of Congress at the funeral of this great man.

HIGH-RISK AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE COMPANY INSOLVENCIES

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I have become increasingly disturbed by the intrusion of a highly corrosive element into the insurance industry, an industry which has always been a glowing example of integrity and stability in our Nation's business community.

The high incidence of insolvencies among high-risk automobile insurance companies gives me reason to be concerned over the insurance industry's continued command of the public's confidence as well as the welfare of the individual insurance buyer.

During the hearings conducted by the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee last May, we probed quite extensively into the question of high-risk insurance insolvencies. At that time we did not have a complete tabulation of the number of failures, but our investigation has continued and now the full scope of the problem is known.

Since 1960 a total of 58 companies doing business in high-risk automobile insurance have failed, leaving well over a million persons without insurance.

In 1964 and 1965 alone, 31 companies failed.

Our research indicates that perhaps as many as 350 companies are engaged in the business of high-risk automobile insurance throughout the country. In just 2 years 31 out of a group of 350 companies have collapsed.

In percentage terms that amounts to an appalling 8.9 percent.

On November 15, 1965, the senior Senator from Nebraska placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement in favor of continued control of the insurance industry by the States. Among other points, he maintained that the number of failures among high-risk automobile insurance companies was not disproportionately high.

My very distinguished colleague, of course, was not aware of these figures at

that time for certainly no one could argue that a 2-year, 8.9 percent failure rate is other than a problem of the highest order, particularly when we consider that this involves more than half a million persons left without insurance.

According to Dun & Bradstreet, businesses are currently failing at the rate of approximately 1.2 percent every 2 years. The failure of insurance companies should be at a far lower rate for they, unlike businesses in general, are the custodians of funds entrusted to them by the public. Yet the rate for high-risk insurance is over seven times higher.

These statistics trouble me deeply, and have moved me to reflect at length upon the consequent economic hardships thrust upon the American public. It is difficult to fully appreciate the grave injustices flowing from so many insurance company failures.

The failure of an ordinary business has little effect on the average man, but the failure of an insurance company leaves policyholders unprotected, and accident victims uncompensated. In addition, sued policyholders stand to lose their homes and their life savings, not to mention the possibility that they may secure for themselves the frightening prospect of a life of debt.

It is true that Congress, in enacting into law the McCarran-Ferguson Act, carefully determined that insurance should be regulated by the States. However, the legislative history of this act clearly indicates that Congress was making only a conditional delegation of authority to the States, to be reconsidered if the States should demonstrate an inability to properly serve the public interest.

Is it not difficult to imagine a greater disservice to the public interest than one insurance company failure after another?

I hasten to point out that there are many insurance departments whose record of regulation is excellent and whose service to the community has been in the highest traditions of public duty. But there are others whose record is less enviable, and it is to those departments and the legislatures behind them that I am addressing myself.

It is argued that the States are adequately doing their job of regulating insurance.

But, can a form of regulation be adequate which allows virtually 9 percent of the high-risk automobile insurance companies in the Nation to fail over a 2-year period, leaving considerably more than half a million persons without insurance?

Can a form of regulation be adequate which generally does not maintain examiners sufficient in number to carefully analyze the financial standing of thousands of insurance companies?

Can a form of regulation be adequate in which at least six of the States have three or less examiners and at least nine States have no examiners at all?

Can a form of regulation be adequate which is operated on a marginal budget of usually less than 4 percent of the premium taxes and fees collected from insurance companies by the States?

One cannot help but wonder about the adequacy of State regulation when the unregulated businesses fare better than the regulated ones.

It is my conviction that these weaknesses strike at the very core of a regulation instituted for the protection of the American consumer who pours 9 cents out of every dollar spent into insurance.

I do not entertain naive hopes that the difficult job of insurance regulation can be conducted in a near-perfect manner, but what we are getting now is not even within shouting distance of this ideal, and in my judgment the American insurance buyer deserves something better.

It is contended that even a system of complete Federal control would not be a perfect one, and that failures would continue to occur, as in the case of banks subject to some degree of Federal control.

This, of course, must be conceded. No system of supervision controlled by human hands could hope to achieve perfection, but at the same time we know that no type of Federal control would tolerate a failure rate of the magnitude of that presently occurring in high-risk automobile insurance.

The collapse of so many of our banks in recent years should be a cause of real concern. Since 1960 there have been 30 failures. The highest 2-year rate occurred in the last 2 years, during which period 14 banks failed.

Of course, these failures cut across the entire banking industry of 14,281 institutions, and result in a failure rate of one-tenth of 1 percent. This is, as it should be, just a fraction of the general business failure rate of 1.2 percent.

But a comparison with the high-risk insurance rate literally staggers the imagination when we calculate that the insurance failure percentage is 89 times higher than the banking failure rate.

If there was so much excitement and concern raised last year over the number of failures in the banking industry, how much greater our concern should be with this astronomically higher failure rate in high-risk insurance.

The failure problem in the banking industry does not even approach the tragedy of the wholesale insolvencies in high-risk automobile insurance, particularly when we consider that the vast majority of the banking public is completely insured by the Federal Government against bank insolvencies.

The impact upon the public by the financial demise of banks and insurance companies is virtually the same since both are trustees of the public's funds. Consequently, the Federal Government has a profound interest in both of these vital areas of our national economy.

Long ago we saw fit to step into a troubled banking industry. Is it not time to seriously reconsider the Federal Government's relationship to a now-troubled insurance industry?

I, personally, find the arguments against Federal control to be quite persuasive. Federal control of the insurance industry would be to me a rather distasteful alternative. It is my belief that insurance can be regulated best at the level most aware of the local and regional needs of the consumer.

But the simple fact is that State regulation is not adequately protecting the consumer, and at all costs, he must be protected.

I doubt that I could ever philosophically favor complete Federal regulation of insurance, but we have a critical problem in the high-risk automobile insurance area today, one which needs serious attention.

If the States do not immediately and sufficiently respond, the Federal Government will be left with no alternative but to itself respond.

There are alternatives not amounting to outright Federal control which would protect the public from these many insolvencies.

An approach similar to that of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation in banking or a Federal guaranty fund are possibilities which have merit.

The time may be at hand to begin exploring the feasibility of these and other possible legislative solutions to this very serious problem before the American public suffers any further injustices.

PROPOSED PURCHASE OF WEST GERMAN GUN

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement on the subject of the proposed purchase of a West German gun be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR EDWARD M. KENNEDY

I wish to bring before the attention of the Senate a very serious situation regarding the ability of this country to provide for its military needs in the field of small arms.

The Army is considering a contract with the firm, Rheimetall in the Republic of Germany, for the purchase of a 20-millimeter gun, the Hispano-Suizsia HS820, to be mounted on armored vehicles. The gun will be used to give adequate protection to personnel being transported in dangerous territory. The cost of the contract according to the information I have received is between $50 and $75 million.

According to a statement of former Secretary of the Army Ailes, the reason the Army is procuring this gun abroad instead of in the United States is because there is an urgent need for a weapon of this type and because no source in this country could provide a weapon with the necessary characteristics within the time in which it must be delivered. I would note that Mr. Ailes made this statement over 14 months ago and that no delivery has yet been made.

At the same time that the Army is considering going abroad for needed small arms, it is phasing out the Springfield Armory, one of its most important arsenals for the research, production, and development of small arms. It is thus cutting down on its own capabilities to anticipate the needs for new weapons and to supply them to our troops.

I need not remind Senators of the dangers in going abroad in weapon procurement. When we depend upon foreign sources for

vital weapons we run the risk that in time of emergency they may not be available. We put ourselves in the hands of foreign countries and foreign governments which, friendly as they may be, cannot be guaranteed as to their reliability for the reason that they must look first to their own needs. This is the philosophy behind the entire concept of having a domestic mobilization base for the production of weapons, as well as one of the principles behind our arsenal system. I doubt if any other country purchases weapons abroad that it can, within the limits of its economy and technology, manufacture at home.

The Army has embarked upon a dangerous business—one that raises many questions which the Senate should explore:

The first and fundamental question is why the Army let a situation develop in its own arsenal system and in private industry in which no research and development was done on a gun which the Army states is now urgently needed? Was this need foreseen? If so, why was nothing done to develop a domestic production source?

Second, what new development work is being done now, in the arsenal system, leading to the anticipation of future needs and the development of new items in the small arms field?

Third, why, in view of this failure, is the Army continuing to reduce its inhouse research and development capability, as evidenced by the closing of the research and development facility at the Springfield Armory and the breaking up of the Springfield research and development team?

As regards this procurement, it was listed as urgently required by the Army over 14 months ago. If the reasons for this delay in filling our need has to do with the testing and verification of the weapon, why did we not take advantage of this time period to negotiate purchase of the proprietary rights for the weapon for manufacture in our own country? Had this been done in time, the 20 millimeter gun could be in production in the United States today.

Finally, if we have been able to wait 14 months for this "urgently needed" item, could we not wait several months longer until such rights are purchased so that production could still begin in the United States?

These are the questions that should be answered and the issues that should be explored. The Preparedness Subcommittee will soon begin hearings on the Army's policy toward small arms research, development, and procurement, especially as it relates to the justification for maintaining the Springfield Armory. I would hope this hearing would seek as well answers to these questions. And I would hope that the contract negotiations with the German producers might be held up until the questions were answered to the satisfaction of the Congress, with whose appropriations the weapon is being purchased.

For this is an issue that goes beyond any one weapon or any one facility. It goes to the entire rationale of the arsenal system. One of its main functions in recent years has been to look at future needs and develop prototypes of the kind of weapons that private industry would not be included to develop. The dismantling of our armory system, facility by facility, and the stripping of its traditional functions of research, engineering, technological data processing, and pilot line production point to a future in which this case may not be an isolated incident. We may be faced consistently with urgent needs for weapons for which we have no domestic capabilities because we have given up that capability by reducing the functions of our armories. This would be a sorry situation for the Army and for the country. The time to take preventive measures is now. I hope the Preparedness Subcommittee can begin the effort in that direction.

THE SOCIAL SECURITY PROGRAM, MEDICARE, AND THE PROPOSED RESTORATION OF CUTS IN CERTAIN EXCISE TAXES

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, a great many people in my own State of New Hampshire have come to realize that the social security program—including its new stepchild, medicare—is not all that it could or should be. I rather suspect that this same awakening is taking place among thoughtful people throughout the country. In this regard, I desire to bring to the attention of the Senate a short, but pointed editorial observation contained in the Coos County Democrat for Wednesday, February 2, published in Lancaster, N.H., and ask that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

IN OUR OPINION

Finally people are beginning to realize that social security and medicare programs giving benefits neither in relation to need or to amounts paid in are unfair. Can they understand yet that Goldwater wasn't out to end social security but to strengthen it? That wasn't indifferent to needs of elderly but more concerned that they be well met rather than deceiving people by false promises. It's the politicians who have done the latter, not the social security personnel.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, this same editorial column turns to another subject of equal interest to the Senate, that of the proposed restoration of excise taxes on automobiles and telephones, and I ask that this, too, be printed in the RECORD. As the writer points out, automobile use and telephone service are necessities and anything but luxuries to a huge segment of our population. I most certainly concur in the opinion that every effort should be made to find other means of obtaining revenue in lieu of these onerous and unfair taxes.

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

Some of the excise taxes were imposed during the war because of shortages or to discourage luxury buying. Now the President proposes restoring cut in excise taxes on toll calls and automobiles that became effective just last month.

Cars are getting to be more and more a necessity and there is no shortage of them.

Toll calls are a business necessity, and often a personal necessity. The telephone industry has never been better equipped to handle them.

We believe that these taxes should have been entirely eliminated long ago and that any need for new revenue should be met from some other source.

CAREFUL CANVASS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the Washington Post believes that President Johnson's latest appointments "reflect the careful canvass of available candidates and the energetic search for talent that has become standard in the personnel policies of the administration."

The Post editorially commended the appointment of Elmer B. Staats to Comptroller General; Lee C. White to become Federal Power Commission Chairman; Harry C. McPherson as Special Counsel, and Robert H. Fleming and Dixon Donnelley in the field of press relations.

The appointments "seem to indicate a disposition on the part of this administration, greater than that in recent governments, to seek appointees at higher levels from within the establishment," the Post said.

This is a trend of which we can all be proud, and with the consent of my colleagues I offer the editorial to be made a part of the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 13, 1966]

PRESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENTS

The Federal appointments announced by President Johnson Friday elevate to new positions several remarkable career public servants who have demonstrated ability in previous posts in this and other administrations. They seem to indicate a disposition on the part of this administration, greater than that in recent governments, to seek appointees at higher levels from within the establishment. Such a policy, long pursued, no doubt would endow the Federal service with a more professional complexion. It would, at the same time, put a premium on the recruitment of the best young men at the opening of their careers. And it ought to be accompanied, at the same time, by refreshment from nongovernmental life on occasion.

The high caliber of the men the President has named commends his choice, these general principles apart. Elmer B. Staats, because of his long and distinguished career in the Budget Bureau, probably knows as much about the whole Federal establishment as any individual in the country. It is doubtful that the President could have found a man better qualified by training, experience, and understanding to carry out the kind of post-audit that is the Comptroller General's responsibility.

Lee C. White's appointment ends the long search for a qualified successor to the retiring chairman of the Federal Power Commission, Joseph Swidler. He seems to satisfy the President's anxiety to find a man with Swidler's consumer orientation and with the same facility for persuading the industry that what is good for the public is good for it.

Harry C. McPherson's governmental experience and legal training alike fit him ideally for the post of Special Counsel to the President. He has the Chief Executive's confidence gained in legislative work and he has demonstrated his usefulness on the White House staff and in the Defense Establishment and the State Department.

The changes in press appointments advance men well known and long known in their fields. Robert H. Fleming has a good background in all media and possesses the confidence of his colleagues. Dixon Donnelley succeeds an extremely able and well qualified professional, James L. Greenfield, as Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs. His experience in government and knowledge of the gallery will help him on his new job.

Johnson appointments, in these cases, reflect the careful canvass of available candidates and the energetic search for talent that has become standard in the personnel policies of the administration.

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE ROBERT KASTENMEIER, OF WISCONSIN, BEFORE AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION, MADISON, WIS.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, Wisconsin's Representative ROBERT KASTENMEIER has urged the American Automobile Association to commit itself to a consumer research program designed to increase consumer demand for safer cars.

In a speech at the dedication of the new American Automobile Association, Wisconsin division, headquarters in Madison, Wis., on February 11, Mr. KASTENMEIER pointed to the success of present AAA safety programs as evidence of its effectiveness in promoting safety on this Nation's streets and highways. He specifically mentions the school safety patrol, the pedestrian control program, and its driver education program.

Safety experts agree that a vehicle can be designed which would cut drastically the causes of death and injury once a traffic accident has occurred. I agree with Mr. KASTENMEIER that the AAA could perform a valuable service by committing its imagination and resources to increase consumer demand for such a car—the safest car that can possibly be produced.

I commend Mr. KASTENMEIER for his excellent suggestion, and ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

AAA SPEECH BY REPRESENTATIVE ROBERT KASTENMEIER, FEBRUARY 11, 1966

I am pleased to be with you here today and to participate in the dedication of your new headquarters building. I was delighted to be offered this opportunity to talk about a subject that has been of great concern to me for a number of years and one which now is receiving ever greater attention in Congress. That subject, of course, is death on the highway.

Here in the figurative, if not literal, shadow of your new building, it would be inappropriate to fail to pay tribute to the many efforts which have made AAA and particularly the Wisconsin branch so eminently successful.

And AAA has much to be proud of both here in Wisconsin and across the Nation. Not only has it become and maintained its position as the country's largest travel organization, it also has made a determined effort on behalf of highway, driver and pedestrian safety. Let me detail just a few of these for you.

The school safety patrol is an outstanding example. It was conceived around 1916 and formally established by the Chicago Motor Club. It then was pioneered on a national scale by the American Automobile Association. Since the inception of this program, the traffic death rate of schoolchildren has dropped nearly one-half, while the death rate of other age groups has doubled.

What started as a local idea in Chicago has spread throughout the world. In the United States today over 900,000 boys and girls are serving in 40,000 school areas, protecting 19 million schoolchildren, and some 156,000 patrol members are serving in foreign countries. The school safety patrol program is a fine example of cooperation by school authorities, police departments and the Triple A motor clubs.

The lifesaving results of this program are worthy of great tribute. Each year the AAA presents gold lifesaver medals to those young patrol heroes who have actually saved the life of a schoolmate in traffic danger. Last year these awards were presented by President Johnson at a White House ceremony and I point with great pride to three young Wisconsin citizens so honored.

Bruce Pauls, of Madison, and John Ahrens and Stuart Meyer, of Prairie Du Chien. Bruce saved the life of a 3½-year-old boy near his Atwood Avenue duty station here in Madison by rushing into the street and pulling the confused youngster out of the way of oncoming traffic. John and Stuart pulled a 6-year-old out of the way of a train near their patrol station in Prairie Du Chien. The boy had wandered onto the tracks and became paralyzed as the train approached.

This type of courage and devotion to duty is typical of the youth who are members of the school safety patrol. Mobilizing these efforts for the safety of students walking to school is a fine example of AAA efforts.

Another campaign the AAA is primarily responsible for is the pedestrian control program. When we speak of the number of highway deaths, many of us fail to realize that of the total number of people killed, almost 20 percent are pedestrians, and in urban areas this figure is 40 percent.

The pedestrian control program was instituted in 1937 by the American Automobile Association and today there are 1,865 cities in 43 States actively participating in a nationwide effort to appraise and improve local pedestrian safety programs.

The latest available figures show that 8,900 pedestrians lost their lives in 1964 as compared with 8,300 in 1963. In spite of this rise, however, the 1964 total represents a 42-percent drop from the 15,500 fatalities recorded in 1937, while all other traffic fatalities have increased 61 percent.

In Wisconsin the statistics follow the same pattern: While traffic fatalities go up each year, pedestrian fatalities have decreased. In 1940, 752 people died on our highways. Of these, 255 were pedestrians. In subsequent years, as the death toll has risen—in 1960 it reached 927—the pedestrian toll has steadily declined, down to 240. A very disquieting fact is that in 1964 the decline was reversed and 154 pedestrians were killed in traffic mishaps. It is a grim reminder that our efforts to reduce pedestrian deaths cannot be relaxed. The school safety patrol and the pedestrian control programs must receive increased attention now and in the years ahead.

These are just two examples of the very successful efforts of the American Automobile Association. The catalog of AAA programs include:

An extensive driver education program. In fact, statistics show that the AAA driver education program in combination with other driver education efforts has saved nearly 11,000 lives and nearly 381,000 personal injuries.

Other efforts aimed at the improving of highways we drive on have also been impressive. Back in 1955 and 1956, when the Interstate Highway System had been beaten once and looked like it could not be passed in Congress, AAA stepped in and in 1 year's time persuaded Congress to reverse its decision.

And so the list could run to include the preparation of the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control devices, support for a national uniform vehicle code, uniform school bus stop laws, air pollution control programs, and others, including a growing concern with auto safety itself.

Yet, I think you would agree, much remains to be done, particularly in the field of auto safety. The handwriting is clearly on the wall for all to see. In the next decade, 1 out of every 5 Americans will be killed or injured in traffic accidents unless we do something more about it. At the current rate of increase over previous years, traffic accidents will claim the lives of 100,000 Americans annually by the year 1975—just 10 short years away.

Many Members of Congress have been stirred up by this issue. I am happy to say that Senator GAYLORD NELSON has done more than any other Member of Congress to force action from Congress on this critical subject. I am pleased to note, incidentally, that recent AAA policy statements have begun to emphasize the natural Federal interest in this subject.

What is Congress considering at this time? Let me list a few of the bills for you.

Three of them should be well known to all of us since they have been drafted and sponsored by Senator NELSON. They include his tire standards bill, the motor vehicle standards bill, and safe-car prototype bill.

The tire standards bill authorizes and directs the Secretary of Commerce to prescribe (1) minimum tire performance standards, and (2) a grading and labeling system for motor vehicle tires. Several days of hearings have already been held and additional hearings will be held in the future. Testimony at the hearings emphasized the difficulties the purchasers have in obtaining safe tires.

The motor vehicle standards bill would require all new automobiles to incorporate certain safety features which the Federal Government now requires on cars bought by the Government.

The third Nelson bill calls for the design and construction of a fully operational passenger motor vehicle as a prototype of a safe car—a crash-worthy vehicle, so to speak. A bill AAA also supports.

One other major proposal is under consideration in Congress. It is the National Highway Traffic Safety Act, originally sponsored by Senator RIBICOFF. It calls for the establishment of a Traffic Safety Center in the Department of Commerce. It would provide authority for the Secretary of Commerce to conduct programs of highway safety research and development. It has been the subject of continuing hearings in Washington this year already.

One of the most exciting developments in the field of auto and highway safety is the proposal now under consideration at the University of Wisconsin. Dean Bob Marshall and his people of the engineering school have developed plans for a highway safety test center at the university. The plans include an 800-acre tract site with a 3.3-mile test track capable of handling vehicles at speeds up to 100 miles per hour, a crash-test pad, skid-test areas, a multiple vehicle driver education course and many other features.

It will be the first test center of its kind in the United States other than the test tracks owned by the auto manufacturers, and holds the promise of a concerted attack on automobile accidents. The breadth and depth of the attack is indicated by the high interest in the project at the Medical School, the Music School, and other university departments.

As I said earlier, I was delighted with this opportunity to speak on this subject, but it wasn't just to commend you for past efforts or to regale you with the efforts of Congress or the university. I do have a suggestion to make to you.

Throughout all the efforts of the AAA runs a common thread. Whether it is in the safety patrol program, closing of speed traps set up to soak the stranger, or in supporting the Interstate Highway System. This common thread is the underlying theme of the AAA—to make smooth the way for the traveler.

But, in the face of the mounting highway accident statistics, is that enough?

I would like to suggest to you that Triple A can play a much larger and more important role in the field of auto safety. The role I have in mind for your organization would draw heavily on the very aspects of your organization which have been responsible for your success to date. Furthermore, it seems such a logical extension of your program that you may even now be considering it yourself.

Simply stated, I respectfully urge your organization to commit its imagination, resources, and membership to a program of consumer research and information leading toward the goal of safer automobiles.

As an illustration, let me take the Nelson motor vehicle standards bill I was speaking of a moment ago. The bill would require new automobiles to incorporate certain features the Federal Government now requires on the cars it buys. The list includes 17 separate safety devices, many of which I thought I had on my car, some of which I don't. It now appears clear that only the threat of this legislation will force the auto industry to take even these moderate safety steps. As I go through the list, I want you to ask yourself why it should take Federal legislation to get these features built into cars. I also believe you will see from the list that an organization like AAA, by focusing attention on these matters through simple consumer research and information techniques similar to those developed by Consumer's Report, could have forced the auto industry to include them as standard equipment long ago.

I won't read the whole list, but here are a few examples:

Padded instrument panels and visors.

Recessed instrument panel instruments and control devices.

Impact absorbing steering wheel and column displacement.

Safety door latches and hinges.

Anchorage for seats.

Four-way flashers.

Dual operation brake system.

Windshield washers.

Glare reduction surfaces, instrument panel, and windshield wipers.

Exhaust emission control system, air pollution control.

Safety tire rims.

Backup lights.

Outside rearview mirror.

Some of these are on many of your cars—all of them should be on all cars as minimum safety equipment. A consumer research and information program by AAA would have assured their presence on automobiles long ago. An AAA effort would also have served to educate the public on the need for these safety features and as well as for safe driving.

The announcement just yesterday that 1967 cars will have certain safety features incorporated in the steering wheel and steering column emphasizes the point I seek to make here. The industry has responded in this way to pressure for increased safety features in automobiles coming from Congress and the public. The AAA can stimulate and focus this opinion and I am sure the automotive industry will continue to respond with more lifesaving devices in their new automobiles.

The inclusion of this bare minimum safety equipment will not end the battle. There is a continuing need for AAA to play a useful role in assessing the value of new devices and then in promoting their addition to automobiles as standard equipment.

These further pieces of equipment could include such things as a hydraulic bumper system to absorb more of the shock of vehicle collisions, square frames instead of X-frames to add protection to passengers against side collisions, energy absorbing door and panel materials, and others. On auto tires, AAA consumer research and information could be most helpful to tire buyers.

It is interesting to see the increased attention given safety by manufacturers, especially in Ford advertising, yet I do believe the auto industry is subject to criticism for its attitude that its business is business and not safety. There is much that can be done by you and Congress to lessen the chances of death or injury from deficiencies in automotive construction and design. The notorious design defects in the suspension system of a recent model car should be made fully known to your membership and the general public. Vehicles with such design flaws should not be manufactured, but if they are, they should not be purchased. You can play an important role in seeing to it that your members are aware of these defects and that the auto industry, rather than the traveling public, is held to account for their mistakes.

A consumer research and information service within AAA is needed on a continuing basis to evaluate new models from a safety standpoint and to create consumer pressure for more attention to safety by automobile manufacturers.

A major effort by the American Automobile Association in the field of automotive safety is badly needed to generate the support needed not only to get American car manufacturers to build safer cars, but to provide support for congressional efforts to obtain a reduction in highway deaths which result from unsafe automobiles.

Finally, let me also point out that the Wisconsin Division is in an enviable position to begin this effort. Its proximity to the Traffic Safety Center now being planned at the university will provide you here in Madison with ready access to the engineer, and other talents needed to make specific auto safety studies. The university in turn can benefit from your efforts to put to immediate use the theory and knowledge they develop at the center. Such cooperation is what will be needed in the years ahead as increasing numbers of vehicles appear on our highways giving rise to ever-increasing risks of accidents.

Again, thanks for letting me participate in your ceremonies dedicating your new building. I hope that I have contributed something to your thinking about auto safety and that your organization will seriously consider the proposal I have made. Your organization has much to be proud of and it has as large a role as it desires in the continuing struggle for highway, driver, pedestrian, and auto safety. Your efforts in these fields will have the appreciation of your members and the general public alike.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, yesterday, February 16, 1966, was the 48th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day, yet Lithuania regretfully has been under Communist enslavement for 26 years, due to the ruthless Soviet action of enforced corporation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into the Soviet Union.

The consequences of the aggression by communism against this Baltic state are shocking, from the tremendous loss of life in that ruthless action to the serious decline of Lithuanian agricultural production due to the coercive collectivization of land and the pauperization of Lithuanian farmers.

On their Independence Day Lithuanians all have the heartfelt sympathies of the American people and their support in the hope that Lithuania will soon enjoy the joys and liberties of a country free from Communist domination and control.

THE OHIO TURNPIKE—THE WORLD'S SAFEST HIGHWAY

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, it is my pleasure to call to the attention of my colleagues that Ohio's 241-mile toll road known as the Ohio Turnpike has been declared the world's safest highway. At appropriate ceremonies on February 8, 1966, the Ohio Turnpike Commission was the recipient of special recognition for outstanding safety records on the Ohio Turnpike for 1965.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a news release relative to this subject be printed in the RECORD.

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

BEREA, OHIO.—The Ohio Turnpike Commission on February 8 received special recognition for an outstanding safety record on the Ohio Turnpike during 1965.

Col. Robert M. Chiaramonte, superintendent of the State Highway Patrol, presented a superintendent's citation to the commission during a reception held for Chiaramonte at the Berea Turnpike Headquarters. Mr. J. W. Shocknessy is chairman of the Ohio Turnpike Commission.

Colonel Chiaramonte pointed out that outstanding administrative practices, combined with engineering excellence, unusually good maintenance, and strong traffic supervision have produced the world's safest highway. He expressed great appreciation for the commission's full cooperation with the highway patrol which polices the turnpike and is responsible for traffic enforcement on the 241-mile toll road.

The turnpike traffic safety record for 1965, according to provisional figures, is 2.6 deaths per 100 million miles of vehicular travel. This is an enviable record compared to a death rate of 7.3 on Ohio's rural State highways, 4.0 on the Interstate System and a Statewide death rate of 5.0.

"The policies of the Ohio Turnpike Commission have always been directed toward making it one of the safest highways of its type in the world. This status has been reached and the commission is to be proud of its accomplishments," Colonel Chiaramonte stated.

The award was one of the highlights of the reception held in honor of Colonel Chiaramonte and Lt. Col. Clifford E. Reich, assistant superintendent. Colonel Chiaramonte has headed the patrol since November 1, 1965.

The reception was attended by highway patrolmen and their wives, civic leaders, public officials, judges, and friends from the Cleveland area.

A news conference preceded the reception, which was held at the Berea Turnpike Commission Headquarters located at 682 Prospect Street.

PROPOSED FOOD-FOR-FREEDOM PROGRAM

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I enthusiastically support President Johnson's proposed food-for-freedom program, which was presented to the Congress last week. In his message on the world hunger crisis, the President pledged this Nation's leadership in the war against hunger throughout the world. As the President pointed out, this

is a war in which all nations can be victors, and in which all nations must take part.

The President's program makes several much-needed changes in our approach to the world hunger crisis. First and foremost, it eliminates the surplus concept in food aid and looks forward deliberate use of America's tremendous agricultural capacity to meet world food needs. Current farm programs, including the food-for-peace program, are eliminating the surpluses in our warehouses. If we are to lead in the fight against hunger in the developing countries while meeting our domestic needs, we will need to gear farm production to produce what can be used constructively.

The food-for-freedom program proposed by the President also places increased emphasis on the self-help efforts of recipient countries in increasing their agricultural production. Increased food shipments and capital and technical assistance will be provided to those countries that give a high priority to improving and modernizing their own production and distribution of food. That the need for self-help is vital can be seen in the President's warning that "the time is not far off when all the combined production, on all of the acres, of all of the agriculturally productive nations, will not meet the food needs of the developing nations—unless present trends are changed."

The American farmer is one of the chief beneficiaries of the new direction in our food-aid program. Much of the 60 million idle acres on American farms will be needed in the years ahead as our Nation joins with others in the critical race between food and population. These acres will be brought back into production as needed, without, however, creating unwanted surpluses or undercutting farm prices.

I am especially gratified by the President's authorization of purchases of dairy products to meet high priority domestic and foreign program needs. In 1965, I introduced an amendment which became part of the omnibus farm bill authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase dairy products at market prices to meet the needs of foreign and domestic food programs. This provision eliminated the requirement that only surplus products be used to meet these needs. In the new food-aid program, the President has now applied the principle underlying this authorization to all farm products.

I think James Reston of the New York Times has summed up most eloquently the long-range implications of the President's food-for-freedom program. In an article published on February 11, 1966, he observed:

> When the history of this postwar generation is written, the quiet and generous policies of the American Government are likely to stand out even above its military exploits, and nothing illustrates the point better than President Johnson's new efforts to relieve world hunger.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of Mr. Reston's article be printed in the RECORD.

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

WASHINGTON: FIGHT 'EM OR FEED 'EM?

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, February 10.—There is a kind of Gresham's law of journalism in which the bad news drives out the good, the negative overwhelms the positive, and the warmakers drown out the peacemakers.

Yet when the history of this postwar generation is written, the quiet and generous policies of the American Government are likely to stand out even above its military exploits, and nothing illustrates the point better than President Johnson's new efforts to relieve world hunger.

He is no longer thinking of the Nation's food surpluses as a problem but as an opportunity. He is not talking now about taking more acreage out of production but of putting some of the 60 million land bank acres back into production, and in the process, he is likely to prove that this is not only good agricultural policy, but good foreign policy and social policy at the same time.

ROOSEVELT'S FORESIGHT

Here is a field in which the United States has dealt consistently and generously with the causes of war—from the Marshall plan to the Johnson plan. It is just over 20 years ago that Franklin Roosevelt's Atlantic Charter pledge of "freedom from want" was given substance in the formation of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

Since that time, the net total of U.S. economic aid to other countries was over $65 billion, and in the last decade U.S. aid programs have provided over 140 million tons of food for needy nations.

THREAT OF FAMINE

Nevertheless, world food shortages are greater than ever. With the human population increasing by 63 million every year, and food production not keeping up, there is a serious threat of famine in India and other developing countries, and the United Nations estimates are that in these countries total food supplies will have to increase by 103 percent by 1980 and by 261 percent by the end of the century to maintain even a minimum standard of nutrition.

President Johnson's food message this week combined a new sense of urgency and realism about his problem. He knows that peace and starvation do not go well together, but he is also emphasizing that this staggering problem cannot be met for long by the surpluses of the advanced nations but must be faced by modern agriculture in the land of the hungry nations.

Therefore, he is proposing expanded food shipments to countries where food needs are growing, and self-help efforts are underway; increased capital and technical assistance; expanded food production in this country; increased emphasis on high protein foods to combat malnutrition, and provision for adequate reserves to meet any world emergency.

Aside from the humanitarian aspects, the social and political considerations of this program at home and abroad are likely to be considerable. Even a much larger production of food in the United States will not stop the steady flow of people into the cities, but it may slow it up. Farm income is likely to increase, encouraging people to stay on the land and in the small agricultural towns, and if Mr. Jefferson was right about the character of the American farmer and the wickedness of urban societies, this will be all to the good.

Overseas, the most striking advantage of the United States in its competition with the Communist countries is on the land. The Russians have got to the moon but somehow they cannot get out of the hole on the earth. Before the war, the Soviet Union, the Communist countries of Eastern Europe, and even continental China were exporters of food; now they are all importers.

The United States is now producing its vast agricultural surpluses with less than 10 percent of its people on the land while the Soviet Union cannot feed itself with over 50 percent of its people on the farm. Yield per acre has increased by 109 percent in North America in the last 25 years; by only 7 percent in Asia; and these are factors in the world agricultural and political revolution that are not likely to be overlooked by the leaders of the new and hungry nations.

THE PARADOX

All this appeals greatly to President Johnson. He has a feeling for the land and the poor—having come from both—that comes through in his food and poverty messages more clearly than any others; and in emphasizing them, both at home and abroad, he is establishing a record that may in the end be the symbol of his administration.

This in a way is one of the tragedies of Vietnam. Sometimes we give the impression that we are determined to save those people from communism if we have to kill them in the process, and the controversy over this gets in the way of the larger interests and nobler concerns of the American people.

STATEMENT BY LAWRENCE CARDINAL SHEHAN BEFORE THE BALTIMORE CITY COUNCIL HEARING ON OPEN-OCCUPANCY BILL

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, like every major city, Baltimore, Md., has been gripped in a great struggle between the short-term concerns of the pocketbook and the long-term issues of right and wrong.

Recently legislation was introduced by City Council President Thomas D'Alesandro III to achieve the laudable goal of fair housing. The issue was hotly debated, too often with more heat than light. Passions ran high in the city council and throughout the city.

As we are all aware, this is no simple issue, but one bound up in the prejudices which lie deep in every community. I wish I could say to you that the Baltimore City Council rose above these passions and conquered fear, hate, prejudice, and ignorance, but this is not so.

Last month in the midst of this hotly debated issue, His Eminence Lawrence Cardinal Shehan made an unprecedented appearance before the city council to request passage of the fair housing ordinance. Despite threats of bodily harm the night before his appearance, Cardinal Shehan made a strong and eloquent plea for passage of the fair housing ordinance being considered by the council.

Mr. President, Cardinal Shehan's appearance before the council was typical of his record as a defender of human dignity, charity, and decency. His leadership in the quest for fulfillment of human rights has been an inspiration to all Marylanders since he returned to Maryland several years ago as coadjustor bishop for the diocese of Baltimore.

Cardinal Shehan's remarks before the council were another milestone in the life of a man utterly and totally dedicated to the rights of all people to live in freedom, peace, and brotherhood.

His Eminence could well have stayed home as some so-called "leaders" do when just, but unpopular, causes need a champion. No criticism would have arisen. Indeed, the Cardinal's absence would not have been noticed since his appearance was unprecedented. Instead, Cardinal Shehan came forward to lead other distinguished Baltimore clergymen to give witness to the proposition that our Nation must meet its moral and legal obligations to all humanity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD Cardinal Shehan's moving statement.

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

STATEMENT OF HIS EMINENCE, LAWRENCE CARDINAL SHEHAN, AT THE CITY COUNCIL HEARING ON OPEN-OCCUPANCY BILL, JANUARY 13, 1966

I joined with leaders of other religious faiths, of labor, of business, and of civil rights groups in urging the support of the Baltimore City Council for the proposed fair housing ordinance now pending before this honorable body.

On previous occasions since I have become archibishop of Baltimore I have expressed my concern about the plight of the Negro community in its search for decent housing. It would be a matter of overwhelming regret to our entire community should the explosive potentialities of the ghetto produce tragedies such as have torn asunder other major American urban communities.

The dignity of the individual requires that no prohibition be placed against any person with respect to his place of habitation simply because of his race, religion, or ancestry. The overwhelming persuasive moral argument which calls for statutory relief is one which cannot be postponed or crippled.

I have expressed my views to the Maryland congressional delegation to the effect that a national statute is the most desirable method of approaching a solution to discrimination in housing. Realizing, of course, that the sense of urgency which exists in our large cities does not weigh as heavily upon rural legislators, I would be less than realistic to assume that this ideal national goal is within immediately striking distance.

I have also requested the General Assembly of Maryland to pass statewide legislation prohibiting discrimination in housing, and I have given my support to such legislation as House bill 332, introduced in the last session of the general assembly, as well as its counterpart in the State senate.

I am aware that the Baltimore metropolitan community includes more than the geographical confines of Baltimore City. I understand full well that the political subdivisions surrounding Baltimore City should act in a timely fashion to adopt open occupancy legislation such as that which is pending before you, but I cannot be unmindful of the fact that the percentage of the Negro population in these surrounding political subdivisions is so small as to forestall prompt passage of such legislation.

The legislative remedy must be applied in the areas where the social sickness is most apparent. This means, of course, that Baltimore City must take the leadership in providing metropolitan-wide open occupancy legislation. If each political subdivision were to await the action of the other, the mounting tensions brought about by crowded conditions may possibly explode before a common consensus is arrived at. Accordingly, I call upon this body to enact into law the Fair Housing Ordinance before you. I am mindful of the pressures under which you find yourselves. I know that there exists within your body a desire for statesmanlike leadership.

I pledge you my support and the support of the Archdiocese of Baltimore in assisting and encouraging the passage of similar legislation in the political subdivisions surrounding our beloved city. I am aware of the arguments that are made about the possibilities of a population which may desert our city, and I am equally aware of the inequity that may be visited upon some of those developers who have made their commitment to build within Baltimore City and who may find themselves placed at a great economic disadvantage in the event that some of the dire predictions about urban flight to the suburbs should come to pass.

The heart of the race problem is a moral issue. Even if the percentage of the Negro population in Baltimore City were extremely small, rather than in excess of the one-third figure, the justice of the proposal before you would be unaffected. The argument for justice, however, coupled with the practical consideration of tensions, uneasiness, and potential massive resort to lawbreaking, give added impetus to the critical nature of the proposal before you.

I pledge you that this fight for social justice will not be placed upon your shoulders alone, but that the teaching and pastoral capacities of the Catholic Church will support you in what I ask you to do.

I call upon you, then, to make this a matter of civic and social responsibility so as to render to the minorities their rights, and to assist Baltimore in the growth which we mutually desire to see.

ALASKA THANKS MR. SHRIVER

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, about 5 years ago, the American foreign relations took on a new image. Beginning in the West African Republic of Ghana, then spreading to East Africa in Tanzania, and outward to Latin America, Asia and the Far East, the finest concept of the New Frontier has taken American educational and technological know-how to 46 countries of the world.

I am speaking, of course, about the Peace Corps, now more than 10,000 strong—the grassroots diplomats perhaps closest to American hearts.

I say they are the diplomats closest to American hearts because there is an inherent remoteness about the fellow who wears a frock-tailed coat and striped pants. But the Peace Corps volunteer in Ecuador, in his jeans and sweatshirt, is a fellow with whom we all can identify. Last year, he may have gassed your car at the corner service station.

Now, all of this may sound like apple pie, and the Peace Corps may have some of that too, but the U.S. Senate has to be concerned with hard-nosed results. Well, the Peace Corps, in my estimation, has delivered those results. And my State of Alaska also is getting a return from the Peace Corps budget.

Alaska is getting a direct dividend from the Peace Corps because three returned volunteers, two young men who served in Ecuador and one who was a beekeeper in Guatemala, are key people in the Alaska poverty program. Mr. President, I rise today to salute these young people, Mike Valentine of Ogden, Utah, and Gerald Miller of Ceresco, Nebr., who did rural community action work in Ecuador; and Don Johnson, also of Ceresco, who served the Peace Corps in Guatemala.

Alaska Gov. William A. Egan recently paid tribute to the trio when he said:

> These Peace Corps returnees have made the most constructive impact upon poverty in Alaska in its 100 years under the American flag.

Gerald, Mike, and Don are working out of Fairbanks, Anchorage, and Bethel. Ninety percent of their time is spent living with Eskimos, Aleuts, and Indians in remote villages. These men are using Peace Corps skills and the Peace Corps concept of self-help to give Alaska's native people a new sense of personal dignity and value as human beings.

For instance, Gerald Miller, who was a horse trader in Nebraska before he entered the Peace Corps, is working with VISTA volunteers to establish a preschool program in the Eskimo village of Hooper Bay, whose population of 560 includes only 5 persons with salaried jobs. Gerald also has organized adult education classes at Hooper Bay, community action programs at Barrow, Fort Yukon, and Arctic Village.

Don Johnson, working with the Eskimos of Emmonak, has developed a sawmill industry there which will provide paying jobs for people who historically have eked out a subsistence living by hunting and fishing and trapping.

Mike Valentine is working on a program to electrify the Kodiak Island village of Old Harbor. Electrification of the village may help attract a canning plant.

Alaska's 48,200 native people want to pull their share of the load in developing our abundant resources. But in order to fulfill this responsibility, the Eskimos, the Aleuts and the Indians need technical know-how, not how-to lectures from a remote podium. They need demonstrations and examples from people such as our returned Peace Corps volunteers who live in the villages with the people.

That is what Alaska is reaping from the Peace Corps. Now, the real fruits of Sargent Shriver's inspired overseas organization are being harvested in my State, although the seeds were planted in Guatemala and Ecuador.

I want to take this opportunity to thank Sargent Shriver for developing the U.S. Peace Corps into one of America's most effective agencies for international aid, and wish him well in his new full-time assignment as head of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

To Jack Vaughn, the Peace Corps director-designate, I say, I hope that more of your returned volunteers will journey to Alaska, where there is great opportunity for those who want to serve their fellow man.

DEATH OF ALEXANDER F. "CASEY" JONES

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, the death of Alexander F. "Casey" Jones in Florida on February 15 was a great loss not only to American newspapers but also to his many friends and admirers. "Casey" Jones represented the quest for excellence in American journalism. Both the newspapers he managed—the Washington Post and

the Syracuse Herald Journal—and their readers benefited from his forthright and fearless direction. He was properly insistent on the people's right to know about the operation of their government whether Federal, State, or local. His sure and distinctive touch will be missed. His imprint, however, will long survive. For many years I was pleased to be counted among his friends and therefore I feel a personal loss.

THE BASE FOR VIETNAM'S GREAT SOCIETY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the declaration of Honolulu has placed the economic resources of this Nation behind what may well be called a great society program for South Vietnam.

Public attention has been almost exclusively focused in the past year or more on the military situation we face in South Vietnam, and continues to pay little attention to developments within the economy of that country and its internal government structure and operations. The truth is that even though there have been no recent coups it is reported the local nonmilitary situation has continually deteriorated.

Two articles appeared in this morning's Washington Post, written by two of that paper's skilled and experienced foreign service reporters, on the spot in Saigon, under a joint headline: "Vietnamese Skeptical of Pledges; Economic Situation Is Worsening." They deserve universal and careful reading. Some may say these analyses are frightening, and they are. But they are also realistic, and we must be realists in the approach we make to our Vietnam involvement.

Our own Great Society is starting to build upon a stable, steady base of growing prosperity over the past 5 years, prosperity which is unprecedented. We are not trying to overlay it on a society shot through and through with inefficiency, corruption, and apathy toward the Central Government. We are doing it by our own efforts, from the inside, not by a largess stultifying to initiative and involvement imposed from the outside.

But here are some of the conditions reported by the Post reporters.

First, they say that South Vietnam has not as yet established any effective policies of its own to fight the war on the homefront. Writes Ward Just:

> There is no incomes policy, no price policy, only the bare beginnings of import policy, very little control over hoarding.

Yet we, who are talking of taking on what amounts to the major responsibility for South Vietnam's domestic economy as well as for its war, are beginning to think in terms of the rearranging of our own domestic policies, in order that we may shoulder this tremendous and dubious burden. We are told that we are threatened with inflation, and we are rightly concerned by the possibility that the economy of the United States may creep upward in that direction by as much as 2 or 3 percent. But there, where the Government is not controlling inflation, and where we are feeding it daily with our massive injections of funds, prices rose 10 percent last month alone, and nearly 50 percent in the last year. The prediction is that the rise will be another 35 or 40 percent in the next year. This means that by 1967 it will cost us $2 for each dollar it was costing us a year ago.

Think of it—10 percent in 1 month. Do we have any assurance at all, any commitment, from the Government of General Ky that measures will be taken to halt such terrible economic erosion? And even if we get such assurances, will there be any possibility that they can be carried out?

Second, it is very dubious whether controls will be accepted in South Vietnam. It is quite possible that attempts to achieve them will merely result in bringing down the Government. Far too many people in South Vietnam are caught up in making a good thing of this war. Here is Mr. Just's account:

> But there is no enthusiasm for the war in this dazed and weary country, and the population is in no mood to accept stiff controls. While ARVN privates die in the swamps of Haunghia Province, well-off Vietnamese sun themselves at the swimming pool at the Cercle Sportif.
>
> While Americans struggle through the rice fields of Binhdinh, landlords refuse to sell land to the U.S. Government on which to build tent cities to relieve the acute housing shortage in Saigon.
>
> "There is no patriotism here," said one official. "I am not being negative. I am being realistic."

Third, they report that the black market is running away, and a major ingredient in that occurrence is the vast amount of cash, of U.S. dollars, with which we are now flooding the country. Black markets mean corruption, and I raise the question, what assurance have we that we will not spread and compound the corruption now existing as we pour into South Vietnam not only the 27 percent of the fiscal 1967 AID budget earmarked for Vietnam, but further sums—much as they may be needed—for education, health, schools, farm development? Says Mr. Just:

> It is understood that the United States itself will undertake to increase imports of consumer goods like radios, bikes, and television sets. But complicating that problem is an antique import licensing law.

The report by Mr. Just's colleague, Stanley Karnow, elaborates and points up more clearly what this means:

> Economic disruption is naturally accompanied by corruption, which is regarded here as almost as great an enemy to the country as the Communists. Nearly everything, from construction contracts to the delivery of motor scooters, which are rationed by the Government, is said to require a payoff.
>
> Import licenses are being bought and sold, and it is feared that when the U.S. commercial import program is accelerated—in order to absorb the surplus currency in circulation—the traffic in licenses will boom.

We are not without guilt in this situation. It is obvious that we have not required rigorous preconditions of economic controls and reforms from the Saigon government before committing our own funds, without which that government could not exist.

Further, the impact of the "massive infusion of U.S. funds, estimated to total $600 million in 1966" has aggravated the black market in money and contributed to the runaway inflation. We have evidently not put restrictions on ourselves, have not used the kind of self-restraint which the situation demands. Mr. Karnow, for example, cites the case of the landlady wife of a prominent Vietnamese general who is turning out a Vietnamese civil servant in order to rent her property to an American who is willing to pay $600 per month. A barmaid, it is reported, can earn more in a day than a longshore worker in a month, more in a year than a Cabinet official on American money tossed her way. Our employment of 100,000 Vietnamese at high rates has further thrown the local economy into dire straits.

A construction program at $400 million a year is making an impact of $100 million on the Vietnamese economy. With a total population of 15 million at a generous outside figure, this is equivalent to an impact about equal to that of our own poverty program—$1.3 billion. Even 10-year-old boys are getting into the act as construction workers.

Finally, there is the very serious matter which Mr. Karnow raises of skepticism in Vietnam over our Great Society program for them:

> By and large, the promise of new social and economic programs has not aroused discernible enthusiasm, largely because the history of recent years is crowded with unfulfilled plans.

"We've heard it all before," said a prominent trade union leader yesterday. "We are weary of words."

This skepticism seems to permeate the local view of the Honolulu meeting of President Johnson and Premier Ky, which is seen "as primarily an American exercise in bulwarking the local government. And it is believed that another Honolulu meeting this summer, as announced by the President, will repeat that exercise.

"It's like doping horses," commented an irreverent young Vietnamese Army officer the other day. "They run for awhile, and then you've got to give them another shot."

In what I have said, I am not decrying our aims and our good intentions. But if it is essential that we move into a Great Society program in Vietnam, it is essential also that we secure the active cooperation and participation of the Saigon Government. It is futile and self-destructive if we go through the pangs of wrenching our own economy into line for these great efforts, at the expense of serious wounds to our own Great Society program, only to have it fail. Failure is inevitable, however, if we do not take into account the total situation and look realistically at the shaky structure and the limited possibilities of the South Vietnam Government to command the wholehearted cooperative support of those now fattening from the situation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two articles to which I have referred may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

SAIGON BOOM CAUSES PROBLEMS: VIETNAMESE SKEPTICAL OF PLEDGES; ECONOMIC SITUATION IS WORSENING

(By Stanley Karnow)

SAIGON, February 16.—President Johnson's meeting with South Vietnam's leaders in Honolulu last week, followed by visits to Saigon by Vice President HUMPHREY, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, and assorted other American dignitaries dramatized the U.S. commitment to South Vietnam.

Now that the fanfare has faded away, however, Vietnamese are feeling somewhat bewildered and more than a little dubious about the administration's dazzling performance. Their opinions vary, of course, according to their social backgrounds.

Predictably, the educated, articulate civil servants, lawyers, schoolteachers, and other "intellectuals" here in the capital seem to take a skeptical view toward Washington's hopes of helping to build a Great Society in Vietnam.

Some of them were comforted to hear HUMPHREY speak of satisfying popular aspirations and rising expectations—a refreshing antidote to much of the military jargon heard here. Many others were pleased to hear, through the local grapevine, that Freeman had intervened to save one of the country's leading agronomists from being drafted into the army.

By and large, however, the promise of new social and economic programs has not aroused discernible enthusiasm, largely because the history of recent years is crowded with unfulfilled plans.

"We've heard it all before," said a prominent trade union leader yesterday. "We are weary of words."

Doubts about the future are reinforced, moreover, by a fairly pervasive lack of faith in the ability of the South Vietnamese Government headed by Premier Nguyen Cao Ky.

In his speeches and statements, Ky projects an image of himself as an honest, simple soldier dedicated to promoting "social revolution." That image has reportedly captivated the White House, where Ky's statements are said to be on the required reading list.

But to Vietnamese here in Saigon—and to many American officials, too—Ky is far from the hero he is made out to be by his publicists.

The Ky government is stable largely because it is immobile, explain Vietnamese. In fact, they add, it is not really Ky's government but a junta of generals who, for the sake of their own survival, have tacitly agreed not to disagree—at least for the present.

In the view of Vietnamese here, moreover, the Saigon government hangs together because it is supported by the United States, which would not tolerate another succession of coup d'etats and uprisings such as followed the downfall of the Ngo Dinh Diem regime in November 1963.

ANOTHER MEETING

Thus President Johnson's personal identification with the Saigon leaders in Honolulu last week has been seen here as primarily an American exercise in bulwarking the local government. And it is believed that another Honolulu meeting this summer, as announced by the President, will repeat that exercise.

"It's like doping horses," commented an irreverent young Vietnamese army officer the other day. "They run for awhile and then you've got to give them another shot."

Much of this criticism reflects uneasiness with the degenerating economic situation here. Tremendous infusions of American money have simply unhinged and disrupted the local society to the point at which a bargirl can earn in a day what a longshoreman makes in a month.

Soaring prices have especially affected fixed-income groups—civil servants, army officers, schoolteachers and other professionals—who are the intelligentsia of any underdeveloped country.

TENANT BEING EVICTED

A middle-level civil servant is being evicted from his house this week, for example, because his landlady can find an American tenant willing to pay $600 per month rent. The landlady, incidentally, is the wife of a prominent Vietnamese general.

Economic disruption is naturally accompanied by corruption, which is regarded here as almost as great an enemy to the country as the Communists. Nearly everything, from construction contracts to the delivery of motor scooters, which are rationed by the government, is said to require a payoff.

Import licenses are being bought and sold, and it is feared that when the U.S. commercial import program is accelerated—in order to absorb the surplus currency in circulation—the traffic in licenses will boom.

Characteristically, most of the critics of conditions here can offer little in the way of constructive suggestions for handling the situation more effectively. It can be recalled that several of those in positions of authority today were themselves last year's critics, fulminating against the regime then in office and vowing to perform honestly and efficiently if they took power.

FEAR OF ABANDONMENT

Underlying this every-man-for-himself approach, however, is perhaps the one feeling that touches nearly every Vietnamese. It is a fear of being abandoned, forgotten, sold out.

Over the past generation, Vietnamese hopes were buoyed up and then betrayed by the French, the Japanese, the Communists and by successive Saigon leaders.

Despite the gallant words uttered at Honolulu, the Vietnamese are not at all sure how much trust they can place in the United States—which in turn prompts some Americans here to wonder how much trust can be placed in the Vietnamese.

(By Ward Just)

SAIGON, February 16.—Saigon's economic situation, serious for the past year, is becoming critical, and diplomatic sources rate it as second only to the Vietcong as "the most important political problem we have."

According to Government figures released yesterday, prices rose 10 percent last month over December and nearly 50 percent over the year 1965. There is an acute shortage of skilled labor, imports, and consumer goods. A flourishing black market and official corruption add to the difficulties.

Overhanging all is the massive infusion of U.S. funds, estimated to total $600 million in 1966.

The problem is shot through with paradox. Vietnam, a country at war, has a booming economy—but, informed economists say, it is an almost classic example of a sellers' market run riot.

U.S. officials have made it clear to the Government that they regard the situation with the utmost seriousness, and President Johnson himself reportedly told Premier Nguyen Cao Ky at the Honolulu conference last week that even if the military struggle is won, the gain would go up in smoke if the economic situation deteriorates further.

The Government, preoccupied with the war and lacking the competence to deal with economic complexities, has not been quick to confront the crisis.

The black market, in money and in goods, has swollen. There is no incomes policy, no price policy, only the bare beginnings of an import policy, very little control over hoarding.

One key suggestion has been to increase taxes on "the winners" here—bar owners, landlords, hotel keepers.

What the boom has done is throw the economy out of proportion, creating an economic problem first, but bringing social and political problems along with it.

This is a country where a bar girl can make more than a Cabinet minister, where a cyclo driver in Saigon can make a killing a day if he caters to the Americans, where the labor shortage is so acute that the gigantic U.S. construction company, RMK, recently pirated a Vietnamese driver employed by the U.S. Embassy.

Not all these effects are bad. The boom has tended to get money into the hands of the urban poor, where it is most needed (as well as into the hands of the Chinese businessmen, where it is not). Farm income rose by an estimated 25 percent last year.

But the pressure has been on prices: Milk, rice, and cloth have all gone up dramatically. Pork has risen, by one estimate, 200 percent in a year.

Many of the goods people want can be produced locally, but because of the war effort it is practically impossible to increase production. The United States employs 100,000 Vietnamese, for example.

MORE CONSUMER GOODS

It is understood that the United States itself will undertake to increase imports of consumer goods like radios, bikes, and television sets. But complicating that problem is an antic import licensing law and the difficulty of moving goods into Vietnamese ports.

Officials here are frantically trying to open up the port of Saigon (where turn-around time for a vessel is frequently 2 to 3 weeks) to imports, to turn the sellers' market into a buyers' market. But the heavy importation of military hardware makes it a difficult task, despite the improvements to the harbors of Danang and Quinhon and the Brobdingnagian effort at Camranh Bay.

Rippling beneath the surface is the Government's refusal—or inability—to do anything about the black money market, to which many prices are tied. The official rate is 73 piastres to the dollar. The black market rate was 135 piastres to the dollar in August and 170 last week.

Sources here say that the gigantic U.S. construction effort must also be cut back. The U.S. investment in construction is now estimated at $400 million a year, $100 million of which has a direct effect on the economy.

AIRPORTS BEING BUILT

The United States is building everything from airports to billets, with a resulting pressure on iron, steel, and cement. As one example of the social and political implications, 10-year-old boys are becoming construction workers.

The best that can be hoped for this year, economists say, is that the inflation rate will be held to 35 or 40 percent.

Experts say that by the adroit use of a fiscal and monetary policy, a savings-bond campaign, for example, and a conscious effort at belt-tightening, the crisis might be averted.

But there is no enthusiasm for the war in this dazed and weary country, and the population is in no mood to accept stiff controls.

While ARVN privates die in the swamps of Haunghia Province, well-off Vietnamese sun themselves at the swimming pool at the Cercle Sportif.

While Americans struggle through the rice fields of Binhdinh, landlords refuse to sell land to the U.S. Government on which to build tent cities to relieve the acute housing shortage in Saigon.

"There is no patriotism here," said one official. "I am not being negative. I am being realistic."

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, yesterday was a day of remembrance for Lithuanians around the world. On February 16, 1918, this small but heroic country located on the rim of the Baltic Sea declared its independence from the great Russian State. But the taste of freedom was short-lived for during the chaotic turmoil of World War II, this Baltic nation was absorbed into the vast Soviet empire. Since that time the Lithuanians have experienced the cold, driving demands of Communist control. Independent Lithuanian organizations around the world, however, have tried to keep alive the fire of freedom and independence which burned so brightly during the 1920's and 1930's.

And the spirit of the Lithuanian people has not been dominated. For several years following World War II, a courageous Lithuanian freedom army actively resisted Soviet authorities. Today, Lithuanians everywhere look to a time when their people will be once more able to follow their daily pursuits in freedom. Thus Lithuanian Independence Day has become an occasion not only for anguished remembrance but also for renewed hope. The people of this country share the ideals of the people of Lithuania. It is only appropriate that now and throughout the year we recall and record our admiration for the indomitable spirit of the Lithuanian people.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

SUPPLEMENTAL MILITARY AND PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL 1966

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is S. 2791.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 2791) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

In accordance with the previous order, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

WE MUST START FROM WHERE WE ARE

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on yesterday, following the remarks by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], I made a few remarks on the pending bill, with reference to the money figures in it.

This is an authorization bill, but it is certainly a money bill, and almost the same as an appropriation bill. In a few days after this bill passes, we shall have an appropriation bill before us.

I point out, in addition to the points I made about the money yesterday, that a substantial part—at least 30 percent, perhaps—of the funds provided in this bill has actually already been spent because of the war in Vietnam. At least that much will be used, after we appropriate it, to replace the funds that have been used during the first, second, and third quarters of the current fiscal year, expenditures that have been made as part of the expenses of that war. The money provided by this bill will replace those funds for the fourth quarter.

There is nothing illegal about that. It was authorized by the bill. However, the fact that it was necessary is one of the main reasons why I called attention last year, when we were considering the bill, and I was handling it at that time, to the fact that the Defense Department should have requested more money than was being requested at that time.

At that time only $1,700 million was expressly earmarked for southeast Asia. It was generally known that it would require much more money than that. It has taken money out of the "hide" of the military budget. As I have said, we are spending fourth quarter money because we are running out of items for the first, second, and third quarter. This money will be used to replace the money that has been used for that purpose.

February 28 is about the critical date when these funds should be available to keep the accounts in the Defense Department from being embarrassed.

Mr. President, I wish to give a special title to the remarks I shall make today on the bill as a whole and the questions involved. That title is that we must start from where we are with reference to the war in Vietnam. This question is not one of how we got there. That question has long since passed. We have been in Vietnam since 1954. The question is not why we went over there. We can argue that question endlessly. It may be relevant, but it is not in issue now, because we have been there all this time. So the title of my remarks is, "We Must Start From Where We Are."

I said yesterday, and I repeat today, that I shall not vote for any amendment to the bill, unless error should be shown in the figures, even though such amendment may sustain my policy views on the question of the war and what should be done about it. I would certainly vote against any that was drawn to endorse an opposing policy. Such a proposal or argument can be made later, in a proper manner. The real point is that our men are fighting, bleeding, and dying. The war goes on. The ships, planes, carriers, and everything else must move. The money must be appropriated for those purposes. Our men must have more than they need; not the minimum of what they may need.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Virginia, a member of our subcommittee.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I wish to be associated with the fine patriotic sentiments which have been expressed so well by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, who has for years handled the military construction authorization bill, and for 1 or 2 years handled the total appropriation bill.

This bill provides an authorization for war material, where needed, by those who are committed to the war. As the Senator has said, this is not the time for an argument about how we got there or why we got there, or to put in this particular bill policy statements. I assure him that I share those sentiments, and I shall so vote.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Virginia for his remarks and for his solid support, which is always forthcoming. He is a member of our appropriations subcommittee, and is unusually well informed. I repeat, we must start from where we are.

Mr. President, I wholeheartedly support S. 2791 and the $4.8 billion of supplemental military authorizations for southeast Asia which it provides. Senators may recall that during consideration of the southeast Asia $1.7 billion addendum to the fiscal year 1966 military budget last August, I predicted that a much greater amount would be requested of the Congress in January. It was clear to me then that the appropriations requested were entirely inadequate to fund our expanding operations in Vietnam.

No one has a greater or more sincere desire than I for halting the war in Vietnam and ending the sacrifice of valuable American lives. I have supported and will continue to support every constructive effort seeking an honorable solution to this tragic problem and an honorable end to our involvement. Bringing this tragic war to an honorable conclusion is the first order of business with me and should be the first order of business with all patriotic and thoughtful Americans.

That means to me that this takes a high and top priority over any domestic program; both the old ones and the new ones, call them Great Society or whatever they may be called.

The first order of business of Congress is to try to bring this war to an honorable conclusion with the least possible loss of life and expenditure of funds.

The American people, both in and out of the Congress, are rightfully concerned about our involvement in South Vietnam and about its implications for the future. They want to know and are entitled to know just what our policy is and where we are headed.

This is as it should be.

That is why I believe these bills should be considered now on a first priority basis.

However, devisive criticism which gives to the world and our troops in

the field the impression the United States is a divided Nation working at cross purposes and lacking in unity is an entirely different question. This serves to reenforce the belief of the Asiatic Communists that we are lacking in national purpose, determination, and moral strength, and lowers the morale of our troops in the field.

There are those who insist that we should undertake meaningful negotiations at the conference table to bring this war to an end. They overlook the very clear fact that we have made every effort to achieve this result and that the recent unprecedented diplomatic effort to open the door to negotiations was unproductive.

There are those who say that the entire matter should be turned over to the United Nations to work out a just settlement. We have now gone to the United Nations with this problem and there appears to be no evidence that the United Nations is capable of achieving any significant or dramatic results.

There are those who insist that we limit the war as much as possible and make every effort to avoid a wider war. This has been our policy and purpose. No right thinking person in America desires an escalation of this war or the loss of American lives. However, we have been compelled to meet aggressive force with the force which is necessary to contain and repel it. To do otherwise would put victory in doubt and raise the possibility that we might be driven into the sea. At best, it would mean a long and bloody stalemate of 10 to 15 years or more, which, in the long run, would be the most costly in blood and money.

Mr. President, that is a very substantial point in my mind. I hope that we are not at the point where we must engage in a long and bloody stalemate year after year. This has been the policy of other nations in Asia in decades past but it certainly must not become our policy.

I do not believe the American people wish to approach it in that way. I do not believe that they would endorse such a policy.

Debate, of course, is useful and should not be curtailed. I do believe, however, that in this difficult time debate should be helpful, constructive, and positive, rather than negative and divisive. We had a very good debate here yesterday afternoon. However, in all of the recent debate and criticism, so far as I can see, there has not been presented any suggestion or recommendation which offers a feasible, desirable, and effective alternative to the course that we have followed recently and propose to follow in the future.

Although I opposed our original involvement in South Vietnam, one reason being that I believed it to be unwise for us to undertake this commitment alone, I believe it is now too late for disagreement as to whether we should be in South Vietnam. The time has come for Americans everywhere to close ranks and give both the President and our fightingmen in the field the support and backing they need and deserve.

When I say that I opposed our original commitment in South Vietnam, I mean that I opposed it on the floor of the Senate in three Senate debates. I am not bringing that up to say, "I told you so." I do not feel that way about it. I mention that only to show that I am not a fanatic on this subject. I am not warminded. My position is based on the fact that we are already there. We have to make the best of it and have honorable terms before we leave.

Just as I supported the recent peace offensive and the efforts to open a door to the conference table, so do I support the decision to stand firm in the face of aggression and to meet aggressive military force with the necessary military might of our own.

I think that the pause or lull in the air war against North Vietnam lasted too long, but I am sure that those who made the decisions were doing their best under the circumstances.

The world should know that we are not the aggressors. We are not there for business reasons, territorial reasons, colonialism, or any other reason except our originally announced purpose.

The entire history of the Communist movement should teach us that we are more likely to achieve a just and honorable peace in South Vietnam through strength rather than weakness. The Communists have drawn the line in South Vietnam and have determined to make this war a test of our power and our strength of national purpose and determination.

That is a distinct and major fact. I believe that it has been going on so long—and they have been successful in comparative terms—that they have decided now to make this a test to see how long they can bleed us and how much it can cost us in manpower, money, delay, and everything else.

I doubt very seriously that they will be convinced of the folly of their course and be impelled to the conference table unless and until they come face to face with either the prospect or the actuality of military defeat.

We know what they are going to do if we weaken and if we pull out. We know what they are going to do. They will move in. My real surprise is that they have not already moved into other areas of Asia.

For the same reasons I support what I know was a painful and agonizing decision to resume the air war against North Vietnam. I recognize, of course, that air strikes alone cannot and will not completely stop the flow of supplies from the north to the south. However, they will unquestionably slow down and hamper the movement of men and material and, therefore, the resumption and continuance of the bombing in North Vietnam is essential to give maximum support and assistance to our fighting men in South Vietnam and thereby to reduce the number of American casualties.

I reiterate my desire for a just and honorable peace through diplomatic channels. However, if this is impossible, as it appears to be at this time, it is imperative that we be prepared with all necessary military equipment, supplies, ammunition, material, and manpower which are necessary to enable our fighting men in the field to perform their missions with maximum efficiency. It is vital and essential that there be no shortages of the tools and sinews of war.

As I said when the battle started, the only way to insure having enough is to have too much.

To insure that there will be no such shortages is the purpose of the bill which we are now considering and the supplemental appropriation bill which is now in committee. The passage of these bills is indispensable to our military posture and preparedness. Their passage by a unanimous or near unanimous vote will give needed assurance to the troops in the field that we are standing solidly and four-square behind them.

Bringing an end to the war and stopping the bloodshed is the first order of business with me, and it should be the first order of business with Congress and all loyal Americans. If this cannot be accomplished through diplomatic channels, then we must be prepared to face up to the situation and take other necessary steps. First and foremost, we must make a national decision that it is our purpose to win.

I have never talked about a so-called no-win policy. I did not suggest that such a policy existed during the Korean war, and I do not suggest it now. I do not accuse anyone of having a no-win policy. But I know that we have already drifted dangerously near to a situation which could be so interpreted. If we cannot do this, we must either turn tail and withdraw or resign ourselves to the prospect of a long and unhappy stalemate which will be costly both in blood, money, and national resources.

This means—assuming that an honorable negotiated peace is impossible—that we must be prepared, if necessary, to increase our combat troops so as to be able to take the war effectively to the Vietcong and their allies and to beat them on the field of battle. We must and should be prepared to fight to win and not just to keep from losing. We cannot achieve our objectives if we are content to fight only what amounts to a holding action in South Vietnam.

As everyone knows, I am not a military man and have no expert military judgment; but I cannot help believing that when we are really ready to strike and carry out a policy of action in the field, tremendous results will be achieved, and fairly rapidly. I could be mistaken, but I believe that this will make a tremendous difference.

In short, we must be ready, willing, and able to hit the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese as hard, and as often, and wherever necessary from a military standpoint to make them realize that our purpose is to win if we are compelled to continue to fight, and that we will not be content only to defend our positions in the south.

We should face up to the hard realities of the situation. The present indications give no cause for optimism that the way ahead will be easy or that there will be a quick and easy solution to the problem. The war and demands associated with it will directly affect the lives of the American people in many ways and

will demand many and increasing sacrifices.

I have slept with this problem, particularly for the past 2 years. While the Subcommittee on Preparedness was looking into the question of the readiness of the Armed Forces and making many kindred and related inquiries, many members of the committee and of our staff visited Vietnam, although I myself have not been there. However, I have heard the sworn testimony of a great number of men who have been there, on the actual field of battle, at the time when we were led to believe, more or less, that our men were not taking any part in the fighting, unless they happened to be shot at.

Many of the young men in the service who returned told us, under oath, the extent to which they had been engaged in battle. We received briefings about the various developments there, although most of it was classified.

So these are not conclusions that I jumped to as a result of reading articles in the newspapers. I have lived with this subject to that extent, and even before that I was interested in it. I visited the wounded men as they returned to hospitals in the United States. I visited many of them at Walter Reed Hospital, where many of the more difficult cases were sent. I have visited them in Honolulu and at other places as they arrived from the battlefields.

With the increase in military forces there will come a further and added increase in draft calls.

At least a partial callup of National Guardsmen and Reservists is probable, particularly of units with specialized skills.

We will be required to appropriate increasing amounts of money to support our military operations in Vietnam and to maintain our other forces around the world at a high level of combat readiness.

If the war continues, increased taxes in large proportions are certain.

We may ultimately be forced to a choice between guns and butter. This might entail economic controls and rationing of goods and materials and at least a partial disruption of normal business operations.

I am not predicting that these events are just around the corner, or 30, 90, or 60 days or 6 months away; but if we have to continue our action and go deeper and deeper, we shall certainly be confronted with the problem of controls.

Tragically, the toll of American casualties will go even higher, and additional thousands of American fighting men may be called upon to lay down their lives in defense of their country and the cause of freedom.

After soul-searching and conscientious analysis of the entire situation and its implications for our future, I have come to the conclusion that the one course that we should and must follow is that of bringing sufficient military might to bear to force our Communist enemies to the conference table or, failing that, to defeat them on the field of battle. Only this alternative, in my judgment, offers us a chance to peace with honor. I believe that the sooner we undertake this and get about doing the job, the less will be the cost in lives, time, and money.

Where I have use the term "war" in this speech, I have done so advisedly. We all known that we have been carrying a major part of fighting the bloody war in South Vietnam for many months. That does not discredit in the least the South Vietnamese soldier. Under our training and with our equipment—and they themselves have many good officers—they have developed into excellent soldiers. But the push, the aggressiveness, and the offensive part of the battle, and much of the manpower, of course, is provided by the United States. We are having to carry a great part of the load.

We have put our men and our flag on the field of battle and both have been fired upon. We now have more than 200,000 fightingmen actually deployed in South Vietnam and many thousands more directly support them in southeast Asia. When I say "many thousands more," I mean perhaps 40,000 or 50,000 more, at the very least; including our naval forces and carriers and more members of the Air Force, in addition to the 200,000 who are on the mainland of Vietnam itself. More than 2,000 young Americans have already been called upon to make the final and greatest sacrifice for their country.

I am making this enumeration to place before the people what I believe will be the cost of this policy; but I believe it is necessary, and the quicker we face it, the better.

Our commitment in South Vietnam is constantly growing in terms of men, material, and money. Barring a completely unexpected and unforeseen development, it will grow even more before we reach the end of the road.

Informed sources tell me—and they are speculating—that we may very well have 350,000 to 400,000 troops in the field before the end of this year. Those are not my figures. I do not know; those who tell me do not know either. But informed sources give this as their speculative judgment.

Let me give one further word of warning before I conclude. Today, we very properly concentrate our attention on southeast Asia. However, in so doing we must not overlook the very real possibility that our Communist enemies may undertake additional adventure and aggressions at other places around the world where our vital interests are involved. Therefore, we must be certain that we do not let the drain which Vietnam imposes upon our manpower, material, and resources impair the readiness of our remaining forces to meet aggression at other potential hotspots around the world. We must spend the necessary money to supply the shortages which the requirements of Vietnam have created.

We must face the fact that until recently we have been trying to operate on a peacetime budget in fighting what was a very expensive and growing war exactly halfway around the world.

Some of the funds involved in the pending bill will be used to replenish the materiel, the military hardware, and like supplies which have been burned up and used up from the regular resources of our armed services. We must procure the necessary arms and equipment, supplies, and ammunition. We must recruit and train the necessary manpower.

Our manpower has been drained from other units in order to meet the demands of the situation in Vietnam.

We must not be found wanting or be unready to respond to aggression in other areas in which our vital interests are involved, if it should occur.

I do not believe I am an alarmist, but if we should let this war drag on, on just a holding basis, and fight it as a kind of diplomatic war, I believe we would be inviting smaller wars to break out by this or another aggressor, in one form or another, in other places.

The only reason why they have not broken out in other places, such as in Central and South America, is that there is our growing power.

I close this statement by paying a special tribute to our brave men who fight and sometimes die in Vietnam. They are doing a tremendous job under very difficult circumstances. They fight for the cause of freedom with the same high morale, courage, valor, and skill which have distinguished the American soldier, sailor, airman, and marine in all past battles and wars of our history.

I believe it has already been demonstrated that we have sent much of the cream of the manpower crop to Vietnam. That is not to speak disparagingly of any man who has not been sent there. However, the corporals, sergeants, and specialists in certain fields are among the best men in our military forces. We have also sent our best lieutenants, captains, and majors, and right up the line in rank. That is true of our Army, our Naval Forces, of the Marine Corps, and of the Air Force.

These men prove again that a properly motivated American is the finest fighting man the world has ever known. They deserve the gratitude and unstinting support of all Americans and freedom-loving peoples everywhere.

Let us pass this bill with dispatch. Debate and discussion are a part of our system of government. But with men fighting, bleeding, and even dying on the battlefields, it is time to act in voting funds to insure the equipment, the supplies, the military hardware, and other tools of war necessary to enable them to carry out their missions, protect themselves, and insure a positive victory.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Mississippi upon the very able address he has just delivered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The Senator from Mississippi is familiar with every aspect of this matter, particularly the military one, in view of the fact that

he presides over the very important Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

I well remember that when the question first arose of sending men to Vietnam, it was proposed that we send some 200 men to assist the French to prepare and maintain and keep in the air the planes that the French had in Vietnam. Most of the planes there were American planes. I believe we gave the French approximately $3 billion to support them in their abortive effort to hold on in Vietnam.

The distinguished Senator from Mississippi is entitled to great praise as a prophet. I remember that the Senator from Mississippi made one or more speeches at that time in opposition to sending men into Vietnam, because of the lack of congressional approval and also because of the geographic disadvantages.

I discussed this subject with the Senator from Mississippi on many occasions in 1954. On one occasion when we had a conference at the highest echelons of the executive branch we were informed of a proposal to send 200 men to Vietnam. I made a serious understatement by predicting, "If we send 200 men there now, it will not be long until we will have 20,000 men there." Today we find that we have closer to 300,000 men in Vietnam, and the waters and lands adjacent thereto. We hardly could have let the Communists euchre us into a more difficult position. It is one of the most difficult and unlikely spots in the world in which to fight a war.

I have had many reasons to think about that position.

In Vietnam there are the valleys of the Mekong and the highlands of the north. As a rule, we associate malaria with the lowlands, but it so happens that in Vietnam malaria is found in the highlands. The malaria found there is of a type for which we now have no completely satisfactory medications.

I have almost concluded that perhaps the only other area of the world in which it would be more difficult to engage in a war would be Afghanistan or in the mountains of Tibet. It would be more difficult to get to those areas, and there would also be the matter of logistics.

I am particularly impressed by the cogent reasoning of the Senator from Mississippi that, if this war were not going on in Vietnam, we might have a military confrontation somewhere else.

The Communist world has never deviated from its purpose, its drive, and its determination to achieve world domination. It will be probing everywhere on earth for weak spots. If the Communists are unable to find weak spots in Asia or in Europe, they will then come to this hemisphere, and we shall have rash of wars of national liberation or wars of some other nomenclature, and we shall have some slogan other than the one now being used in Vietnam.

I am glad that from his knowledge of military affairs the Senator has pointed out that we are spread rather thin all over the world today.

We have highly trained and well-equipped forces in Germany and Korea. A part of the force we had held in reserve in the continental United States has had to be moved to Vietnam and to Santo Domingo.

Ours is a rather farflung battleline, Mr. President, when we consider the widely separated areas where our troops are stationed. It certainly behooves us to be more insistent than ever before that our allies, for whom we have done so much, make a larger contribution to the defense of freedom throughout the world.

There is no parallel in all human history to what this country did at the end of World War II. We not only bound up the wounds and rebuilt the edifices and the homes of our allies; we went to those with whom we had been only recently engaged in mortal combat, the Germans and the Japanese, and expended billions of dollars to revive their economies and enable them to stand on their own feet again.

Countries like these, which have received benefits that are without parallel in all of history, should be willing to make a larger military contribution to preserving the cause of peace.

We shall not have complete peace in this troubled world any time soon, but we can at least contain this Communist problem. Would that we had cleaned up Cuba of Castro and the Communists there at the time we discovered that missiles had been placed in Cuba. As Senators will recall, we had passed a joint resolution, approved by the President of the United States, which said in essence that any offensive weapon in Cuba would be considered an act of aggression against the United States.

We had the means to destroy the enemy in Cuba, and to eliminate Castro and communism. We had marines at sea, just out of sight of land. We had the necessary air support at bases in Florida. We had moved an armored division from Fort Hood, Tex., to Camp Stewart, Ga., ready to load on ships so that it could follow the marines in.

But we settled for something less than that; and it may well develop in the future that we settled for a great deal less. The Russians did not comply with the original assurances they gave President Kennedy when he wrote them that famous message demanding that they pull out of Cuba and give us the right to inspect, to see that they had removed those weapons. That was a right that was promised us; but was later denied and refused.

We shall continue to be troubled, as the Senator from Mississippi has so well indicated, by the threat of communism. I think we can handle it better than it has been handled, in many instances. We can achieve more of our objectives by methods other than engagement of armed forces and the loss of blood that is occurring this very moment in Vietnam. But there will be no time, I fear, in my life, or even in the life of my friend from Mississippi—who is much younger and stronger than I—when the threat of Communist aggression will be absolutely allayed and destroyed all over the world. We shall be compelled to bear a heavy burden to maintain a force for freedom—which is an insurance policy. The huge amount that we spend is the premium on the insurance policy which insures the most valuable thing on earth: the American way of life, and the individual rights, liberties, and dignities of the citizen in this land of ours.

I feel better when men who are as dedicated as the Senator from Mississippi are willing to apply themselves to this very onerous task.

Senators who have not served on the Preparedness Subcommittee can hardly imagine the extent of the efforts by that subcommittee on the Senate Armed Services Committee, in our attempts to keep America strong. Despite the very best we can do, and despite the most efficient administration of the Department of Defense, there will be some oversights; there will be something lacking. The Senator from Mississippi, as chairman of that subcommittee, has done a fine job in pointing out such deficiencies and correcting them. He stands here today making his statement in the great tradition of American freedom and American statesmanship, and I commend him for his remarks.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Georgia very much for his most generous remarks. In all the years I have been in the Senate, the wise counsel of the Senator from Georgia and his advice on military matters and other matters has been of great value. He has always been up at the front where the decisions were made. I think he has given as little consideration to himself personally, in his advice and counsel, as any person I have ever known.

I remember the occasion in 1954 when the Senator from Georgia helped turn the balance against a proposal that would have gone a great deal further than the involvement of 200 Air Force mechanics in Vietnam. I remember well how President Eisenhower sent for him time and again. He and the present President of the United States were both opposed to our involvement in the situation as it stood then.

I am delighted to have been associated with the Senator from Georgia in the matters to which he has referred. He taught me all I know on the subject; and I thank him for that.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, to the Senator's very generous observations, I wish only to add that when someone brings forward some alternative to the present program, some proposal of a method for our disengaging ourselves in Vietnam in an honorable fashion, without turning tail and running like a whipped puppy, I shall be happy to support such a proposal, because I deplore what is going on in Vietnam today, with the loss of human lives, as much as anyone possibly can. In the absence of such an honorable solution, I have no alternative to supporting the President.

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad that the Senator from Georgia referred to our stretched-out position. He is as qualified to speak as any living person on the subject of our extended efforts all around the world, and how the time of peril and trouble in which we are living will continue for awhile.

I am sure that in his references to our allies, the Senator does not wish to discredit any of them. I know he is not quick to "pop off," if I may use that term,

on such matters. But what he says is very timely and very true. Our allies have, in effect, turned their backs upon us in this distressing situation. Many of them, for whom we have done so much, could help with manpower; and even those who could not help us with manpower could stand up for us in the diplomatic circles of the world, take our side, and let it be known that this is a matter of first priority with them. Instead of that, some of them are actively opposed to our position.

I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. I thank the Senator from Mississippi for clarifying many of the issues involved in this bill.

I marched with the 1st Army, in the 9th Infantry Division. I served under General Westmoreland, who was then a lieutenant colonel, my regimental commander. I have great confidence in him. I have watched his career since that time as an artilleryman, as an infantryman, as the superintendent of West Point, and as a paratroop officer. In my judgment he is the finest commander in the American Army. He has one of the hardest jobs that any American general ever faced. I feel that, even as I had confidence in him when I marched with the 9th Division, the men who are fighting under him in Vietnam today have confidence in him.

The point that the Senator from Mississippi has made is that we must give to him, his staff, his junior officers, his noncommissioned officers, and every man who is serving in Vietnam, as well as every one of the Vietnamese and every one of our allies, all the materials of war that they need. If they need a missile, if they need a helicopter, if they need additional artillery, if they need more ammunition, we must give it to them; and that is what the pending bill would do.

As was pointed out yesterday by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], this bill does not determine foreign policy. It does not ratify decisions made in the past. It does not endorse new commitments. It merely provides that whatever we do, we are going to give our boys who have volunteered out of a sense of patriotism, as well as boys who went into the Army as a result of the Selective Service System and were compelled to go over there, the fullest kind of support, the kind of weapons, the kind of tanks, and the kind of materiel which they need.

Mr. President, I intend to vote for the bill wholeheartedly because I feel that we are committed to a war that is one of the most difficult ever to be fought, as has been pointed out by the Senator from Georgia. We must wholeheartedly support every one of the soldiers whom we have sent over there. That is what this bill would do. If we are to debate policy on Vietnam, if we are to debate what we are to do in Vietnam, let us debate it on the kind of issue which does not mean denying our troops over there, or General Westmoreland and his fine staff, the kind of support which they need.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Montana very much for his fine remarks.

I yield now to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I join in the sentiments expressed with respect to the character of service and leadership provided, and the wisdom exemplified by the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

I recall that as a junior Senator I, along with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and other Senators, awaited the return of the Senator from Georgia and the then Democratic leader, Senator Lyndon Johnson, from a conference which was called at the White House prior to the tragedy of Dienbienphu for the French.

I believe that I correctly recall the report we received from the late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, and Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and perhaps others, urging President Eisenhower to send American troops to Vietnam to assist the French.

I recall that upon the return of the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Texas, we were advised that they had strongly advised against it. I do not believe that we got the report from them as to what President Eisenhower's decision was, but later the President followed that advice.

I recall one further point, that when the question of the 200 men to whom the Senator from Mississippi had made reference—the first American military men sent there—was under consideration, the Senator from Georgia advised that if we sent 200 men, they would be followed by 200,000. Let me ask the Senator from Georgia whether that statement is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The Senator gives me too much credit. I believe I said that if we sent 200 troops over there, 20,000 would have to follow in the very near future. I believe that was my prediction at that time.

Mr. GORE. Perhaps that is typical of the creeping escalation we have experienced on this issue, but 20,000 still makes the point. The case of the military forces was the event from which have flowed many other problems. I invite the attention of the Senate to this point, because of the pertinent remarks which the junior Senator from Mississippi has made.

I wish to say to him that I am grateful for the candor which he has displayed on this bill. Not from his lips have come denunciation of Senators who have questions in their minds, who are troubled by the vexatious predicament in which we find ourselves. Instead, the Senator from Mississippi has invited debate.

It seems to me that our aim must be to contribute to the formulation of policy for the enlightenment of the people with respect to that policy in a manner which will bring unity to the people, which is so badly needed.

As the war has been widened, the gap between the President and Congress seems also to have widened. Unrest among the people has increased.

This morning, I thought that General Taylor did an excellent job in presenting to the Committee on Foreign Relations the administration's policy in this regard.

There are many questions left to be asked, of course. But, if, out of all this debate and an examination of policy can come enlightenment of the people and Congress, and perhaps a modification of policy on the part of the administration and some limitations of objectives which the people can understand and support, then perhaps we shall have achieved a degree of unity which I believe is badly needed.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Tennessee very much for his very fine comments.

I am now glad to yield to the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING].

Mr. GRUENING. First, let me congratulate both the chairman of the Preparedness Subcommittee and the chairman of the Armed Services Committee for their great wisdom—when the issue of first invading Vietnam militarily by our forces came up—in opposing it, and for saying that it would be unwise policy, that it would lead to a much deeper involvement than appeared to be contemplated at that time, and that they joined in their counsels to the President and others in opposing this involvement.

I believe that their wisdom was prophetic and very great. It is to be regretted that their wisdom at that time did not prevail, because I believe we might have put across the thought which would have prevented many things which have happened since that time and which are leading us down a tragic path, the end of which no one can foresee.

I find myself in thorough agreement with some of the very fine sentiments which the Senator from Mississippi has expressed, and which the chairman of the full committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has also expressed, when he said a few moments ago that he would join in supporting any solution which would give us an honorable way out and stop the needless slaughter, not only of our own boys but also of all others. I know of no Member of Congress who would not share that view. Although there may be differences of opinion as to how that way should be found, no one in Congress and no one in the United States would dissent from that statement, and I applaud it most heartily.

The Senator from Mississippi says:

> No one has a greater or more sincere desire than I for halting the war in Vietnam and ending the sacrifices of American lives.

I applaud that sentiment, and I share it. I believe that we must all work together to that end, although some of us may differ in details, and some of us will differ on the future.

It is extremely important and fortunate that this debate has at last come to pass. Out of the discussions more wisdom may emerge, and we may be able to arrive at a better solution than that which we are now embarked upon.

We do not know where this debate is going to lead, but certainly we shall find agreement on the desire to find an honorable way out of the situation at the earliest possible moment. I support that view 100 percent.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Alaska very much.

Now I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE].

Mr. McGEE. Let me add my voice to those of my colleagues in commending the Senator from Mississippi, as well as the Senator from Georgia for the hard, bedrock stand which they have taken on this difficult question. What we tend to do, sometimes, is to reduce the question to overly simple terms, as though we had decided we were going to risk a war or live in peace, when that really is not the alternative which faces this country. We are living in a troubled world in which almost every day the risk of war is imminent. When the Senator titles his comments the way he did, he puts his finger on the nub of the question; namely, that we have to begin where we are at present.

It is water over the dam. We cannot do it over. History does not afford us the luxury of waiting 5 years before we make up our minds. We have to decide these issues now. When the Senator reminds us that here is a beginning, here is where we must start, he is rendering a great service to the dialog.

I should like to refer to the suggestions that have repeatedly occurred here on the part of my colleagues about our having to carry a disproportionate share of the burden in South Vietnam. I think occasionally we forget that a great power is not usually loved, and we sometimes tend to think, in affairs around the world, that we can put love on a priority. We have to put necessity, our own needs, the need to rise to our commitments and the demands of those commitments, on a priority. If someone will love us in the process, that is merely a fringe benefit.

Nobody loved the British when they kept the peace of the world for almost 100 years. In fact, the perfidious Albion was the object of much attack. So we must not judge of our actions on whether or not we shall be loved for them. We may hope that those we help will be grateful, but we may also be kicked in the face for our efforts.

We must keep the situation in perspective as to what is happening in various parts of the world.

The French and the British are committed in other areas of the world. Germany is committed in other areas of the world. The presence of the British, for example, around Singapore has had a stabilizing effect in the local disturbances that have taken place there.

The presence of French, German, and British troops in Western Europe means that this country can have a smaller complement of American troops there. The fact that hundreds of thousands of Korean troops are in Korea below the 38th parallel means that we have a much smaller commitment in that part of the world. We must also remember the fact that there are some 25,000 Korean troops in South Vietnam. It was announced the other day that Korea is sending 20,000 additional troops.

People tend to focus their eyes where our country is committed, and block out of view the fact that there are parts of the world where the French and the British are involved in commitments which have not involved a single member of our military forces.

The world being round and being smaller as a result of the modern genius of science, it behooves us to take cognizance of this kind of help. So we should recognize that there are numbers of Koreans and some Australians and New Zealanders in South Vietnam. The hard fact remains that we are there not in a club of friendship or in order to have group companionship. We are there because we have to be there. The times demand that we be there. We must assess our presence and its costs in those terms. When we do that, we should not go off on a tangent or an irrelevant issue as to whether we are getting sufficient help from our allies, and whether our allies are doing as much as they should. I do not believe that should be the criterion in determining what we should do.

The Senator from Mississippi was correct when he said that our commitment is there; we have to take it from there. We should not penalize ourselves, no matter what our feelings may be about other countries or what they are doing in other parts of the world.

I did not want the dialog to close without the reminder that there are commitments of other troops in the world. The bulk of the commitments are ours, as a result of trying to restore stability in the wake of World War II. And so while we risk a great deal in what we hope will eventually be successful, we must try to achieve it.

I conclude by commending the Senator from Mississippi for his wonderful statement this afternoon.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. He has made a forceful statement. The point he discusses has merit. I certainly did not mean to ignore the help we have, for example, from the very fine Korean troops. They mean exactly what they say in what they are doing. We have our own divisions on their battleline, as the Senator knows. But outside of the Koreans, there are very few other troops in there with rifles, and we want more. I feel that we deserve more, but I do not wish to pursue the argument further at this point. I am glad the Senator brought up the point and stated his view on it. He has made a very fine contribution by so doing.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRUENING. 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. GRUENING. Mr. President, one of the concomitants of our military engagement in southeast Asia is the far-reaching effect it is already having and will continue to have on our domestic programs.

We have already seen the far-reaching cuts in education, in resource development, in housing, in aviation, and in virtually every other field. That is one of the consequences of our involvement that those of us who opposed this involvement from the start foresaw and forecast.

It is to be hoped that the President's indication that we could have both things, that we could both develop the domestic programs, the programs at home, many of them overdue, and continue to conduct the war, may be fulfilled.

But the actions taken to date indicate that the actions are not always in accord with the hopeful words.

It seems to me that for economy reasons, if none other, if we are to be strong, if we are to meet our alleged commitments in southeast Asia and other parts of the world—and it was brought out only a few minutes ago by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] in discussing the war, that we are stretched very thin—it is important that we maintain our economy at home and not allow it to be eroded by what is taking place overseas.

An example of one of the many of these cuts came to me this morning in a communication from the capital of my State, Juneau, where the decision of the administration, which Alaskans fervently hope will be reversed, to eliminate substantial funds for public works in the 1967 budget, has demonstrated another example of the bitter fruits resulting from what I, for one, consider the inexcusable folly we have exhibited in choosing to fight an undeclared land war in southeast Asia.

This view has been shared by many eminent military leaders—views now coming into public knowledge—by such leaders as the late and great General MacArthur, General Ridgway, indeed, President Eisenhower, as well as the late President Kennedy.

In my State of Alaska one of the projects that was eliminated from the budget was the so-called Snettisham Dam in southeastern Alaska, to supply power badly needed right now. However, this dam, even if not eliminated by the action of the Bureau of the Budget, would not have brought that power into use until 1970.

But recently, and before the dam was planned to meet the immediate needs, a vast tract of timber was sold to the St. Regis Paper Co. of New York, to be used in the manufacture of wood pulp. It is the largest timber sale in the history of the Forest Service, a great economic event utilizing a great natural resource which has long been unutilized. It is timber going to waste because it is dying on the stump from old age. It would be exhibiting the most basic principle of conservation by cutting this overripe timber and allowing a regrowth of a much larger quantity of prime forest resources, Sitka spruce and hemlock.

One of the terms of the contract of sale was that the St. Regis Paper Co., of New York, would construct a huge pulpmill; and one of the prime inducements for the sale of that tract of timber was

that power would be provided by the Snettisham Dam, which was programed for construction at the beginning of this spring. Yet the Snettisham project was not included in this year's budget, although preliminary planning had been completed at a cost of $1,205,000. In other words, this dam was ready to go; and the Corps of Engineers had informed me that if the excision of this project stands, not only will there be great economic damage to this section and loss of payrolls in an area that needs them, but also that some of the experts, engineers, and planners who have been working there will be lost by being sent to other parts of the world, and their abilities will no longer be available.

What does the Snettisham project mean to southeastern Alaska? In quantitative terms, it means that the construction of the dam and pulpmill would provide upward of 1,100 new jobs. The size of the city of Juneau, the State capital, would approximately double. New State and Federal taxes would amount to $4,500,000. These estimates do not include increases in employment and revenues by related industries that would be attracted by this new industry.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution of the Greater Juneau Borough be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

"RESOLUTION 55

"Whereas funds for the Snettisham hydroelectric project were eliminated from the Federal budget for fiscal year 1967; and

"Whereas the decision to eliminate these funds was apparently made before the Juneau timber sale of 8.75 billion board feet of timber by the Forest Service which requires that a pulpmill be established in the sale area to process the timber; and

"Whereas the demand for power in the Greater Juneau Borough is presently at the peak which can be generated by local power sources without the development of additional generation capability; and

"Whereas very substantial normal growth in the demand for power in the Greater Juneau Borough is projected; and

"Whereas the power which Snettisham will provide is particularly needed in order to supply the pulp industry which will develop as a result of the timber sale in addition to being needed to meet the normal growth of power demand; and

"Whereas as a result of representations made to the Bureau of the Budget by Senator E. L. BARTLETT, Senator ERNEST GRUENING, and Representative RALPH J. RIVERS, the Alaska congressional delegation, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget has agreed to reconsider the elimination of Snettisham funds from the fiscal 1967 Federal budget; be it

"*Resolved*, That the assembly of the Greater Juneau Borough urges the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to consider the vital effect that the Snettisham hydroelectric project will have on the economic future of the area both in relation to the Juneau timber sale and to the normal economic growth of the area and to recommend that appropriation be made for this project this year."

Copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States; the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee; the Honorable GEORGE H. MAHON, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee; the Honorable Charles L. Schultze, Director, Bureau of the Budget; and to the Honorable E. L. BARTLETT and the Honorable ERNEST GRUENING, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable RALPH J. RIVERS, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

Adopted February 2, 1966.

——— ———, *President.*

Attest:

——— ———, *Clerk.*

——— ———, *Chairman.*

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the loss in taxes alone should rivet our attention. We should realize that the costly war in southeast Asia is likely to mean, as it already has, a reversal of the widely applauded, sound policy of the administration in reducing excise taxes and income taxes. This already has resulted, in the past few weeks, in proposals for the restoration of taxes which were so cheerfully and hopefully eliminated in the 1st session of the 89th Congress. This reduction in taxes was a great achievement, perhaps the greatest achievement in the history of Congress, accomplished with the cooperation of the President and Members of this body and the other body. It was a program that was far reaching, that in many respects was overdue, that covered the entire gamut of our economic and social front, and that did the many things that were sorely needed. It is tragic that now, in the 2d session of the 89th Congress, having marched up the hill, we seem compelled to march down again. This great program of benefit to the American people is being eroded for the benefit of our so-called commitment in southeast Asia, where vast sums, in addition to the military sums which we are being asked to approve now, and which apparently are only a beginning, will be supplemented by vast economic contributions, the end of which we cannot foresee.

The amount required to begin construction of the Snettisham Dam this year is not large—somewhere between $1.5 and $2.5 million. Surely in a budget calling for the expenditure of more than $112 billion, we should be able to find this amount.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, would the Senator from Alaska care to yield now for a discussion of the point he is raising, or would he prefer to wait until the end of his speech?

Mr. GRUENING. I should be very happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming. Knowing of his interest not merely in a successful conclusion of our engagement in Vietnam, but also of his interest in keeping our economy moving, I am sure that anything that he would say would be pertinent and welcome.

Mr. McGEE. I share with the Senator from Alaska the strong feeling that we have to keep the well-thought-out domestic programs going. It is my fear that some individuals who opposed those programs are now using Vietnam as an excuse to try to cut those programs back. In the first place, that is hypocrisy; in the second place, it is dangerous to cut the programs back on that score. Even with all the pressures that are upon us throughout the world, we cannot afford to forfeit equally significant efforts at home. I wonder whether the Senator from Alaska agrees with that general observation.

Mr. GRUENING. I could not agree more completely. This is one of the most vital issues now before us. It was foreseeable, but it was still an unpleasant surprise when, at the opening of this session of Congress, we examined the budget and noticed some of the far-reaching and drastic slashes which had been made.

We had been hopeful that the President's declarations that we could both continue the war in southeast Asia and maintain our economy at home would be carried out in the budget; but such is not the case. Some of these matters are just being discussed now.

In addition to the budget cuts, there is the depressing possibility that in some cases in which the amount requested in the budget is appropriated, the appropriation will be withheld from expenditure. This has been done before. I sincerely hope that that will not be the case, and that, although people may differ in their reasons for our becoming involved in southeast Asia and on the future conduct of operations there, whether to escalate or to hold firm, nevertheless we shall continue, certainly for the time being, in this first year of our heavy military commitment, not to let the domestic program erode.

Are we going to penalize the poor? Are we going to diminish the foresightedly conceived and hopefully entered into war on poverty? Are we going to stop vocational training, so that the unemployed may have an opportunity to obtain jobs? Are we going to cut into education, which, with our democracy, is one and inseparable? Are we going to stop research and development? Are we going to make the kind of cuts, which I just mentioned, which actually can be demonstrated to be detrimental in terms of income? We shall need to carry on our commitments, both at home and abroad.

I welcome the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. McGEE. I believe that much of what is being said about our ability to finance these programs is being said as a ruse to attack programs that were fought by these same people so vigorously at the time they were adopted by this body.

I do not believe that people ought to be fooled by that kind of tactic. The Senator from Alaska knows that he and I disagree on our presence in Vietnam, on why we are there, on the need for being there, and on what our presence there may do to our economy.

We were told these same things 30 years ago and 25 years ago when we were facing the great question of the barter system necessitated by Hitler in Europe and the great inroads being made at that time in the Pacific by Japan. We were told then that we could not afford to involve ourselves in both areas. Fortunately, history did not give us an opportunity to choose. We were forced into both areas at the same time.

One war is being fought now in southeast Asia and another war is being fought here at home. We should not sell ourselves short. We are capable of waging both wars. We must rise to the occasion. It would do us little good if, by our attempt to win peace around the world, we were to forfeit the opportunity for peace and security and a better standard of living at home. I do not believe that we dare to split these challenges as though we are able to choose one in preference to the other. I believe that we must have both.

If I may draw a parallel for a moment, in 1939 and 1940, when Mr. Hitler was reaching his peak, and in late 1941, when Pearl Harbor got us involved, I believe the Senator will recall the many things that were being suggested in those days.

I can recall being involved then in debate in the public schools, in which I was teaching, on the question of whether we ought to amend our Constitution to limit the national debt of the United States to $45 billion, because otherwise we would be broke and go down the drain and be lost. This was the argument that was being used to remind us that we could not afford to arm ourselves to slow down Mr. Hitler.

Mr. GRUENING. I recall it very well.

Mr. McGEE. The upshot was that Mr. Hitler and Mr. Mussolini did listen to the arguments that the American forces could not afford to do anything. The events in Pearl Harbor, the Rhineland, Munich, Hungary, Poland, and Ethiopia, triggered by Hitler and Mussolini, compelled us to go to war.

We then took the wraps off our great economy and discovered to our great shock that we had been operating part time for many years in our economy with at least one hand behind our back.

When the war began, we did things that we had been told we were not capable of doing in terms of economics. We unleashed American capitalism. By the end of the war, our national debt had jumped from approximately $40 to $263 billion, and we were still going strong at the end of the war.

We were guilty of underselling our great capabilities. Then, because we had to, we expanded our productivity. We began to tool up our great industry and create more jobs. Many people in our country made fun of an American Vice President because he said that some day we would have 60 million jobs. Many thought he was crazy. Today we have close to 75 million jobs, and we shall have more.

One great weakness, ofttimes repeated in our history, has been the tendency to underestimate ourselves and to sell ourselves short.

With all due respect to the position of my friend, the Senator from Alaska, with which position I disagree so strongly, I say that we must afford both. It would not do us well to reward aggression or to let an aggressor get by with tactics that would build up the kind of tension and head of steam that built up when we thought we could buy time in the thirties when dealing with an aggressor. Aggression is aggression. In time, we had to fight a major world conflict which did, indeed, slow down the great social programs of the thirties, though we recovered quickly as a result of the expansion of our production capabilities.

I believe that it would be far more damaging to the great programs at home if we were to pull back and reward an aggressor with the excuse that we had to protect our programs at home. I do not believe that history gives us that much choice.

We have to do both and we dare not forfeit one in favor of the other. Both programs are called for and both must be carried forward. We have the capability to rise to the demand. However, we do not like to do that. We have not set our personal priorities in the right order. We still like our Cadillacs. I guess that is the wrong term, because they are so common. However, whatever the term might be, we have not really laid our top objectives on the line—education, the battle against poverty, the battle for health and adequate medical care, the battle for individual economic security in the Great Society. These things must be laid alongside of the demand for power politics. Our country is one of the greatest powers available today to do something about the present situation. I believe that the time is at hand when we must make our decision. Let us quit kidding ourselves. We must do it. We can do it, and I hope, in the course of the deliberations of this great body, that we will do it.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I know that the reaction among my constituents—and I have no doubt that the same is true with the constituents of the Senator from Wyoming and others—when we learned that, under the school lunch program, the supply of milk for children was to be drastically reduced, was one of profound shock.

Mr. McGEE. It is ridiculous.

Mr. GRUENING. We can afford to give milk to our children and also engage in a billion-dollar program in the Mekong Delta. The American people will not stand for any other course.

Mr. McGEE. I agree. We can and must do both.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his very helpful contribution.

Mr. President, I am planning, sometime in the course of this discussion, to propose an amendment to the pending legislation, Senate bill 2791, which would provide, that in order for draftees to be sent involuntarily to the war in southeast Asia, Congress must first give its consent.

I have discussed this subject before. The history of my purpose for this amendment should be further explained. It seemed to me that there was a great lack of approval on the part of Congress for our performance in southeast Asia. While I am fully aware that the administration considers that the resolution which was drafted a year ago last August, after the Tonkin Gulf incident, gave the President a blank check to use the Armed Forces of the United States anywhere in southeast Asia that he saw fit. The language of the resolution covered, "Vietnam and the protocol states," which would include Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, and Vietnam. The administration considered that to be ample authorization to escalate the war to the point that we now have 200,000 men engaged in combat in South and North Vietnam.

A number of Senators now feel, and have so expressed themselves, that they had no idea how far this commitment would carry our intervention and escalation.

I say for myself and for my colleague the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that we did not have this feeling. We felt that this was a blank check and that, under the Constitution, this was not the proper way for Congress to delegate its authority to the President.

In any event, the language was plain, it was not in fine print; it was spelled out in the plainest of print. It gave the authority to the President, as he saw fit, to use the Armed Forces of the United States.

Nevertheless, there is a growing feeling, which has been expressed by Senators on both sides of the aisle, that a further expression of congressional intent should be sought and obtained.

My amendment would furnish that opportunity. If agreed to, it would give the Congress the opportunity to determine whether the taking of young draftees from their homes and sending them to southeast Asia to be slaughtered shall be approved or disapproved.

I feel, as I have stated before, that there is a certain difference between these young men and those who have made military service, whether in the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, or the Air Force, a part of their career, either permanently or temporarily, and who therefore are bound to follow the orders of the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States. I feel that they are in a different category from young men who are pursuing their education at home, many of whom now are married but no longer exempt from the draft. I feel that they should not be snatched by the draft and sent into jungle warfare in southeast Asia. Congress should face that problem, and should be on record by voting whether we shall send these boys to Vietnam, or not send them.

This is an important issue. Such a vote would bring the Congress closer to the war. It would enable us to share responsibility with the Executive, who so far, except for the Tonkin Gulf resolution, has been conducting the war merely as an Executive activity.

I discussed this matter with the President last August. It happened that I had an appointment with him, which came about in this manner: I had inserted an item in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD highly praising the President's achievement in securing, through the Congress, his great, unprecedented domestic program. The eulogy which I placed in the RECORD—fully deserved, I felt then and do now—caused him to telephone me at home and thank me for it.

However, to make sure that there was no misunderstanding—although I am sure he was aware of what my attitude

had been—I told him that while I sincerely and enthusiastically applauded his domestic program, I was in complete disagreement with his military program in southeast Asia, a disagreement which was not of recent origin, but which began nearly 2 years ago, shortly after President Johnson was inaugurated after campaigning on a platform somewhat more pacifistic than that of his Republican opponent. I felt then that it would have been very easy, at that time, when no men had been sent into combat, when no bombing of North Vietnam had taken place, when the American people were basking in the happy contentment of a pacific way of settling this problem, for that to take place; and in anticipation that the situation might be changed. When the President congratulated me on my statements in praise of the domestic program, I told him that I disagreed with him on the foreign program in southeast Asia, and that I hoped that I would have the opportunity to discuss it with him.

He agreed; and a few days later I received an appointment at the White House. I was given an opportunity to present my views on the conduct of the war—the feeling that we should never have been committed to a ground war on the continent of Asia; that our security was in no wise jeopardized by whatever happened in southeast Asia; that we had not been attacked; that we were engaging in an enterprise without the approval of Congress; and that it could lead only to disaster.

I elaborated on those views, and after I had finished, I told the President that I was preparing, on that very afternoon, to offer an amendment to the military pay bill which was about to come before the Congress to provide precisely that the Congress should approve or disapprove the question of whether draftees should be sent into combat in southeast Asia involuntarily.

The President very emphatically urged me not to do it, pleaded with me not to do it; and when I argued that it was important, and that I felt it desirable that the Congress be on record, he said to me, "If we are not out of there by January, you can do anything you please." He indicated that he thought it unlikely that the draftees would be sent to southeast Asia before January.

On the basis of his urgent plea—and it is very difficult to refuse any urgent request of the President of the United States, not merely for a Member of the House of Representatives or the Senate, but for any member of his party—I agreed that I would not offer the amendment at that time; and I returned to my office and sent him immediately a letter in which I included the text of the amendment that I had proposed to submit that very day and the text of the speech that I had planned to make in support of that amendment, telling him that because of his request and his hope that we would be out of Vietnam by January, I would not submit it.

January has passed, and most of February, and we are not out. We are in, deeper and deeper and deeper. I believe it is desirable, whether or not one may agree with my views on this war, that the Congress be on record on this issue. There are a number of reasons. For one thing, I believe as a matter of good military practice—although I am not a military expert—that some of those 340,000 trained troops which are now stationed in Europe should have priority. They have not been sent to southeast Asia. They, at least, should be sent first, before we take these young draftees from their families and the process of education. We should use those troops, which we have been supporting over in Europe now for many years, who are trained in combat and fully equipped. They should go first.

That is one of the reasons why I have introduced this amendment, and why I think it should be debated when I bring it up, as I hope to in the course of the present dialog.

My position is strongly suported by a member of the Armed Services Committee who recently made a visit to South Vietnam, one of our most enlightened colleagues, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], who incidentally had not taken a very strong position on the situation theretofore, although indicating at various times that he had grave doubts. But upon returning from South Vietnam, he stated that he had reached a very vital and important conclusion, that this was a civil war. Mr. President, that is one of the really important aspects of the situation.

A couple of weeks ago, the Under Secretary of State, Mr. George Ball, made a speech in Chicago, which was reprinted in full in the Washington Post on Sunday, February 6, in which he stated that if this were a civil war, we had no business taking sides in it.

That is precisely the position that I have maintained for more than 2 years. It is a civil war. President Kennedy, who certainly was in a position to know, who was elected to the House of Representatives in 1946 and to the Senate in 1952, and was on the Foreign Relations Committee during all those years of our steadily edging into the present situation, declared it to be a civil war. It is a civil war; and that is one of the many reasons for this debate which is now taking place, and which is so greatly assisted by the wisdom of the Foreign Relations Committee in holding open hearings, so that for the first time the American people may find out what is going on, what are the motivations that brought us in there, and what the prospects are for the future.

I believe, for this reason, that this is an important issue.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair). Does the Senator from Alaska yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. GRUENING. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. McGEE. In all fairness to Secretary Ball, the context in which he made his statement, in the speech to which the Senator from Alaska has referred, was that he was discussing many issues present in Vietnam, that if a civil war were the only issue, it would then be open to question whether we would have any right to be there. But, if I recall the article—and I have not had an opportunity to look at it now for over a week or 10 days—because there were other factors operating on the Vietnamese question, such as that of aggression over the 17th parallel, and interference in whatever civil war characteristics were present there, they had overtones which had to condition our presence there, and it was not a matter of isolating the civil war characteristics in order to make the decision easier for us.

The parallel has also been drawn, if I may suggest to the Senator from Alaska, that we had the same kind of harsh decision—even though in another setting—to make in Greece where a genuine civil war was underway in 1945 and 1946. The "good guys," as the Senator from Alaska refers to them, were located in the rural populations in Greece. They were being used, as the record is now clear in showing, by the forces that were coming across the border from a neighboring Balkan State, with leadership and supplies, and with doctrinaire solutions to capitalize on the division going on within Greece. Yet, President Truman rose to the occasion and backed the established Government, not because they were the "best guys" but because we had to win a position of stability before the voice of democracy, if we will, in Greece, would ever have an opportunity to practice democracy in their civil war.

Critics of the American policy toward Greece asserted that we were supporting their royalty, black marketeers, and embarrassing kinds of public personalities at the expense of the good people in the rural areas who really wanted freedom and democracy. Again, in Greece, the first issue was to erect a wall to seal off the border that would prevent this outside meddling with Greece's internal affairs, because if outsiders had succeeded in meddling, Greece would have had no opportunity to practice democracy, no opportunity for social growth, or economic expansion in the years ahead.

That is the reason we face the requisites in Vietnam at the same time. There are other considerations. But we must keep them in the right order if we are to have an opportunity to rise above the very confused and overlapping, complex, cross currents of the issues which are there, and which were likewise present in Greece.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator from Wyoming for his helpful contribution. Let me read him presently exactly what Secretary Ball said; but first I should like to say in connection with his remarks that we have supported all kinds of bad eggs. History shows we have frequently supported dictators, crooks, and scoundrels of the worst stripe merely because they surrendered to the idea that they were anti-Communist. That was their passport, that was the "open Sesame" to receive our lavish support. "We are anti-Communist," they would say, no matter what kind of scoundrels they were.

Mr. McGEE. We have been doing that at home, locally.

Mr. GRUENING. The most ruthless dictator in history in Latin America was a man who murdered many people in cold blood, who enriched himself, wrecked his country, and created the existing situation down there. There have been many other such men. I believe it is important that henceforth we consider whom we are supporting, and why.

Mr. McGEE. Is the Senator from Alaska suggesting that perhaps we were unwise in supporting——

Mr. GRUENING. I refer to Trujillo.

Mr. McGEE. The Government in Greece?

Mr. GRUENING. No. I am not. I have no comment on that.

Mr. McGEE. The parallel is a striking one because it had many of the same attributes that make us unhappy today in Vietnam. There was a preponderant military control in Greece. The control centered largely in the capital city, as it does in Saigon in Vietnam. The Greek rural population had no communication with or respect for the Central Government, which is true in Vietnam. Greece was in open rebellion. But, they were also about to be seized by a foreign power. They were being used by groups which the Soviets had trained, educated, and planted across the borders in the Balkan States. Thus, it had all the earmarks of a front takeover, not unlike the National Liberation Front in South Vietnam.

We might learn from those parallels, even though they were not precisely the same, because one involves the Soviet Union and the other involves the overwhelming presence of China farther to the north. These are considerations with respect to which we must make educated guesses. That is one of the reasons for the differences the Senator from Alaska and I share, but which, nonetheless, contribute to this dialog to resolve this very tough question.

Mr. GRUENING. One of the regimes which has come to power by a series of coups, without any democratic practice, has been particularly "perfumed" in that way. We have to keep on insisting on the overly long due reforms which President Eisenhower made conditional in his dealings with Diem—and which he never carried out. Diem was finally "removed"—I will not say with the assistance but certainly with the awareness of our Ambassador down there—after his tyranny, lack of cooperativeness, and lack of public spiritedness became manifest, and when the war was going from bad to worse. Diem's successors have apparently been no different, including the present incumbent, Ky, who, when interviewed on who were his heroes said, "I have only one: Adolf Hitler."

If that is the kind of man we are going to entrust with a reform program and with the inculcation of freedom which we allegedly are fighting for, the outlook is rather bleak.

Mr. McGEE. Let me say to the Senator from Alaska that I deplore such a statement as that attributed to Ky as much as my colleague from Alaska does; but I say that some time, farther down the list of our priorities, Mr. Ky may not be there tomorrow; he may be gone week after next. The point is that Vietnam will still be there, the problem of power will still be there, and the problem of priorities will still stare us in the face. There has been an act of aggression, openly and flagrantly practiced across the line. The suggestion is correct that that kind of aggression should not be rewarded, that once the line can be firmed up, there is then the opportunity to do things the right way—whatever they may be or seem to be—for the people of Vietnam.

Mr. GRUENING. Does not the Senator from Wyoming agree that if Mr. Ky is the best we can produce down there, he being the ninth incumbent after Diem was bumped off, we had better stop trying to make a silk purse out of a sow's ear, which, unfortunately, has been the situation down there in trying to get a public spirited and honest executive?

After all, we control the situation. We hold the purse strings. We should be able to achieve that.

Mr. McGEE. I should think so; and I would hope that we would. I would hope that the people of Vietnam and not the United States would be responsible for that, but I have not seen a word to the effect that there would be any opportunity for anyone to try to make something better out of the situation presented by the issues. If we allow the aggressors from the north to take over, it will be gone, and we shall not have an opportunity to reconsider.

Mr. GRUENING. Let me go back to the statement which Secretary Ball made. I hold in my hand a page from the Washington Post of Sunday, February 6, 1966, section E–3. This is what he declared:

> Is the war in South Vietnam an external aggression from the north, or is it an indigenous revolt? This is a question that Americans quite properly ask—and one to which they deserve a satisfactory answer. It is a question which we who have official responsibilities have necessarily probed in great depth. For if the Vietnam war were merely what the Communists say it is—an indigenous rebellion—then the United States would have no business taking sides in the conflict and helping one side to defeat the other by force of arms.

Mr. President, that is a clear statement.

Mr. McGEE. Is that not precisely what I suggested that Secretary Ball said to us? He then goes on to say that it was not what the Communists said it was, but it was an indigenous civil war, does he not?

Mr. GRUENING. But, on the other hand, let me say that a recent observer, one of our colleagues, a member of the Armed Services Committee, who spent considerable time in South Vietnam, reports his views as follows—and I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 8, 1966——

Mr. McGEE. Is the Senator referring to our friend from Ohio?

Mr. GRUENING. Yes. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG]. He is a most knowledgeable person. He served in the other body. He was elected to this body in the last election. He states as follows:

> This is a civil war going on in Vietnam. Before I visited southeast Asia, it had been my belief that all of the Vietcong fighting in South Vietnam were Communists and infiltrators from the north. But I had not been in Vietnam for more than 4 days—and during that period of time, I was in every area of Vietnam—when almost immediately I observed very definitely that we were involved in a miserable civil war in the steaming jungles and rice paddies of South Vietnam. I learned from General Westmoreland that the bulk of the Vietcong fighting in South Vietnam were born and reared in South Vietnam. I learned from General Stillwell and other generals that 80 percent of the Vietcong fighting the Americans and the South Vietnamese in the Mekong Delta south and west of Saigon were born and reared in that Mekong Delta area. This is a civil war in which we are involved. The fighting has been going on there since 1945. Very definitely, Vietnam is of no strategic importance to the defense of the United States.

The point is that he got this same information from our military authorities, General Westmoreland and General Stillwell. Would the Senator challenge that? Is that not correct?

Mr. McGEE. I would challenge the Senator's interpretation of what he has quoted, because they were responding to the percentage of the Vietcong born in South Vietnam. I was there in 1959, with the Senator from Tennessee. I was there 2 or 3 years later, and then still later. That still does not make me an expert. But we can give an educated guess about what Secretary Ball means.

There are, indeed, dissident forces loose in South Vietnam, but I do not believe that is the preponderant factor that should concern us in our action. We have only to remember that the forces to the north seek to split the country. To permit that would have the same effect that would have taken place in Greece, and that took place in Austria and Czechoslovakia. There should have been action then. There was not. We are not going to get by it by doing nothing. If it is not stopped now, there will be another nation, and then another, that will fall. Then the aggression will have to be stopped at a much greater cost. So now is the time and this is the place.

Is it not significant that of all the dissidents in South Vietnam, not a single sect—neither the Buddhists, the liberals, the students, the militarists, nor the Catholics—has embraced the Vietcong? Not one of them has pointed to the Vietcong and said, "There is our cause. Lead us to a better tomorrow."

With all the divergencies in Vietnam, they have not gone over to the Vietcong. So I say we should look at the Vietcong in proper perspective, the leadership of which is in the National Liberation Front, or Hanoi. This has been established not only by ourselves, but by the International Control Commission, which has been there since 1956. It has established that the real front, the head of this animal, the National Liberation Front, was conceived and born in Hanoi, to serve the cause of Hanoi.

We should have learned enough from the lessons of history to know enough

about the operations of a front and a deceptive propaganda wing, not to fall for it.

As to the views of the people, I suppose that one would find a divergence of views anywhere. The boys in the hills are down on capitalists. This is true in my own State of Wyoming. I would assume it to be true in Alaska. What is different in this situation and the reason for our commitment is that it has been clearly demonstrated that the intercession has been from the north.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator and I differ on the view that Hanoi is the villain, that Hanoi started the infiltration. My reading leads me to a different conclusion. It shows that this movement took place because of the violation and our persuasion of Diem to violate the 1954 Geneva agreements to hold elections; it was the tyrannical suppression and jailing of hundreds of people, the suppression of freedoms, which caused the civil war to break out. As we added to our arsenal, infiltration began from the north.

The hearings now being conducted by the Foreign Relations Committee may bring it out. It is important and crucial that it be brought out. I go back to the categorical statement on the part of Secretary Ball which seems to contain the entire issue, namely, that if it were merely an indigenous rebellion, the United States would have no business taking sides in the conflict. I have maintained from the beginning that we had no business taking sides.

I am glad to see that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] is now present and presiding. I say to him that I have just quoted from his address to the Senate on February 8, when he said categorically that:

> This is a civil war going on in Vietnam.

He then stated further that before his visit to southeast Asia:

> It had been my belief that all of the Vietcong fighting in South Vietnam were Communists and infiltrators from the north.

That is the propaganda which the administration has put out.

The Senator from Ohio further said:

> But I had not been in Vietnam for more than 4 days * * * when almost immediately I observed very definitely that we were involved in a miserable civil war in the steaming jungles and rice paddies of South Vietnam. I learned from General Westmoreland that the bulk of the Vietcong fighting in South Vietnam were born and reared in South Vietnam.

General Stilwell said the same thing. That shows that, if we take Secretary Ball's word, we have no business being there. That is the same thing I have maintained from the start.

Mr. McGEE. May I reply to that point? When the Senator refers to the Vietcong and what has been sought to be done through the peasants in South Vietnam, I think the Senator evades the issue and still misconstrues what was said. There again, in terms of powers of leadership, the head of the animal itself is Hanoi. The International Control Commission has documented this fact down to the last comma. Our own intelligence agencies have documented that fact. I do not believe it can be denied. It is a matter of record. It is evident to any rational person that the purpose is to take over South Vietnam. We have a commitment, and we must see it through.

At the end of World War II there was an unhappy division of territories with the Russians. It was done in order to expedite agreements with Russia. There was a division of Germany. There was a division of Berlin. Nobody wanted to see two Berlins, but it seemed to be the easiest way to come to an agreement. Korea was separated at the 38th parallel. Nobody wanted Korea to be separated, but that was the way to come to an agreement. Now we move to Vietnam, to the area which the French once controlled and then left. When the agreement was made to divide, there was a division which was not based on any ethnic division. It was a geographic division. North Vietnam would be north of the 17th parallel, and South Vietnam would be south of it.

Mr. GRUENING. Temporarily only.

Mr. McGEE. Temporarily, just as Korea was temporary, just as Berlin was temporary, and just as Germany was temporary. But the hard fact remains that this was the starting place and the original election to which we have committed ourselves. It has been the one fundamental conviction that we are not going to permit forces on the other side to nibble away in these commitments if there is any status quo on which we could build a better world. If they can get by with nibbling at it, we are rewarding the aggressor, and we shall pay a much heavier penalty at a later date.

That is what we did in Germany, and that is what we did in Berlin. That is what we took on in honoring the agreement in 1956 on the 17th parallel in Vietnam. We did not retreat from those temporary arrangements, temporary arrangements that some day will fade away. They are not designed to be permanent. They are the starting point. We do not dare forfeit them. At this date, it would be more suicidal than if we suggested that in the beginning.

Mr. GRUENING. Is the Senator aware that the United States made a unilateral declaration with respect to the agreement at Geneva that there would be elections; that we stated that as national policy; that we then went back on that declaration and violated that agreement; and that we encourged Diem not to hold those elections? That is the basis on which we have not pulled out.

Mr. McGEE. I do not agree with the Senator. If the Senator will read the RECORD, he will discover that by 1956 one of the two Vietnams had been divided. Ho Chi Minh had already outlawed the political opposition. In North Vietnam there was already but one political group, and that was the Vietminh. That was his group, and it was on that basis that he was going to hold free elections.

What would the Senator have done, even as a dictator in Vietnam?

It has already been stated how free elections were defeated, how they were a mockery, and could not have been and should not have been held. They still may be a long way off in a country as badly torn as Vietnam.

We have a great temptation to project the American image. It is assumed that they know what it is about when they have to face up to responsibilities of any kind in self-expression. I believe we have to understand that we cannot expect the impossible from them. It would destroy them.

There was a case in point when a vote in 1956 would have been like a free election in East Berlin. What kind of election is that? We have to be realistic on this matter and quit hiding behind nice-sounding words.

We must live with the facts of our time. This is difficult for us because we are idealistic. I hope that we apply what we learned in Vietnam, as well as we did in Korea, Berlin, Greece, and elsewhere.

Mr. GRUENING. What kind of democratic, fine American principle is it when it is agreed to go to an election, but when it is found that one is going to lose the election it is called off? It could not happen in the United States, and yet we are projecting that image in other countries. Is it an example of freedom, democracy, and adherence to law?

That election should have been held, but it was not.

Eighty percent of the people in North Vietnam favored Ho Chi Minh. He was their hero and would have been elected.

Mr. McGEE. That was 1954, but in 1956 it was a different kettle of fish when he had abolished the political opposition. We could not lend ourselves to condoning that kind of principle.

Mr. GRUENING. Just as Diem had abolished his opposition in South Vietnam.

Mr. McGEE. It is all the more ridiculous to say that free elections are to be held. There were none of the makings for a free election. We would have to live with the agreement until there was economic growth and expansion that would permit rising to a more sophisticated state.

Mr. GRUENING. The provision was that the elections would be supervised.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is so wrong.

Mr. GRUENING. They were to be supervised.

Mr. McGEE. I have a group waiting for me for lunch. I thank my friend for this dialog.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. General Taylor just finished explaining that the Communists would not agree to any kind of international supervision. They were going to give us a Communist election there.

What would they do? They would go ahead and stuff more ballots in the ballot box than there was population, and at the same time they would hold the other side to an honest count in South Vietnam.

When the Communists had North Vietnam and the anti-Communists had

South Vietnam, 1 million people moved from North Vietnam to South Vietnam to live under a form of government that is other than communism.

It is said that it is not good government. I challenge the Senator to tell me of any government on earth that is worse than government by communism. I would like to know.

The Communists were in the position to stuff the ballot box until it outnumbered the population, while holding the people of South Vietnam to an honest count. The ideas of free election are not ended. We are asking now and are ready now to have a free election.

That is one thing that the Communists would never agree to. They will never agree. Do not think they will make that mistake.

Mr. GRUENING. I would like to know if the question of the Senator is whether there is any government worse than communism.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would like to ask which government, if any, is worse than communism?

Mr. GRUENING. The United States invested $2 million in supporting a Communist dictator in Yugoslavia, Mr. Tito. The State Department and the administration think that that is a good investment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. As among Communists, he is the better of a bad lot.

Mr. GRUENING. I do not believe that it follows that the point is logical, when the administration supported a Communist dictator.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have been voting against Tito receiving aid from this country.

Mr. GRUENING. So have I.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is a Communist government.

The Senator has yet to name a government worse than the Communist government. He finds fault with our friends. Perhaps some are corrupt. We have even had some dishonest people in our own Government. The Communists do not have to worry about somebody stealing money out of the till because the Communist government owns everything, the houses, and even the eyeballs, and nobody can steal anything because no one is permitted to own anything. Corruption in government is one thing that they do not have to worry about.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. A few minutes ago Gen. Maxwell Taylor was adverted to for the reason that he testified this morning before the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The junior Senator from Ohio will not, today or tomorrow morning, pass up other important things to read what Gen. Maxwell Taylor had to say because of an incident that occurred the last time General Taylor testified before a joint meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services. At that time I asked General Taylor that assuming that the civilian Prime Minister of South Vietnam at the time would be overthrown and that the next Prime Minister would step in and announce, "We want the United States to withdraw its forces from South Vietnam," what would be our position keeping in mind that we are there at the invitation of the Government of South Vietnam?

Instead of answering the question, General Taylor said:

> There is no possibility that the present Prime Minister will be overthrown.

That statement is in the record. Within 48 hours after General Taylor had said that there was no possibility that the civilian administration could be overthrown, and before General Taylor could leave the United States, he was proven wrong. Whether the Central Intelligence Agency was to blame for having given him bad intelligence is something that the junior Senator from Ohio does not know. But the stark fact is that within 48 hours of General Taylor's making his positive statement, of General Taylor's posing as an authority because he had been in Vietnam, he was proven wrong. The Senator from Alaska may recall that 10 generals overthrew the civilian government of Prime Minister Quat and shortly afterward installed Air Marshal Ky as Prime Minister; and Ky has been Prime Minister ever since.

I say that although General Taylor was adverted to as an authority, to me he is a poor authority indeed. I do not pay any attention to his statements, and his testimony would not impress me.

But let us return to the facts. Much has been said about the Geneva accords of 1954. Historically, as the Senator from Alaska knows, there are no such countries and there have been no such countries over the years, as North Vietnam and South Vietnam.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator is correct.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, as the Senator from Alaska knows that the Geneva accords of 1954, which the United States agreed to in effect, but which our representatives failed to sign, stated:

> The military demarcation line at the 17th parallel is provisional and should not in any way be considered as constituting a political or territorial boundary.

Then, an International Control Commission was created with representatives from India, Canada, and Poland.

Under the Geneva agreements, an election in Vietnam was scheduled for 1956. That election was never held, and the United States was a party to this failure. President Eisenhower believed that Ho Chi Minh, who was regarded as the George Washington of Vietnam—not the George Washington of North Vietnam and of South Vietnam, but as the hero, the George Washington of Vietnam—would have been elected President had that election been held. Of course, the election was not held because the Central Intelligence Agency and Secretary of State Dulles intervened.

It is true that neither the Senator from Alaska nor the junior Senator from Ohio pretends or presumes to be an expert on southeast Asia. However, I made some trips to southeast Asia. From last September 28 to October 18, I was in Vietnam, Thailand, Korea, the Philippine Republic, Guam, and Hong Kong. The junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] and the junior Senator from Ohio were in those countries on an official mission.

We had gone to Korea as guests of the Korean Government, and at the expense of the Korean Government. Although the Senator from Alaska is likely to say that since American taxpayers' money is spent so lavishly all over the world, even though the Government of Korea paid our expenses, the money, in effect, came from the pockets of American taxpayers.

While I was in Vietnam, I did not spend much time in Saigon. I visited every Air Force base in what is called South Vietnam. I visited the camps and the hospitals; I spoke with many Ohio boys. I spoke with one boy from Cuyahoga County, the area where I live, within 3 hours after his leg had been amputated. I obtained the names and addresses of 180 Ohio GI's. Wherever I went in Vietnam, I spoke with soldiers, whenever I could, in the absence of officers. I would say to the young men from Ohio, "I served for 37 months in World War II. I want you to know that I have been an officer and I have been a private. In time of war, it is much harder to be a private than it is to be an officer. Now I am speaking with you in the absence of any officers. What are your problems? Are there any shortages?" With very few exceptions the answer invariably was, "no problems, sir."

The Senator from Alaska will agree with me, I feel certain, that the cream of our crop of American young men is in Vietnam right now. The 200,000 or more GI's who are fighting in the steaming jungles and rice paddies of South Vietnam are the finest of the youth of America. In addition, 50,000 men are attached to the 7th Fleet, offshore. I was in Thailand for 4 or 5 days, a country where we have 30,000 fine soldiers. I also traveled throughout Korea, as far up as Panmunjom, at the line of demarcation. Fifty-three thousand of our soldiers are committed in Korea.

It is said that we are likely to have 500,000 boys in Vietnam by next October. If we do, I will state publicly, anywhere, that the next 300,000 will not be any better than the 200,000-plus who are over there now. They are fine Americans. It is a great misfortune that we have involved these fine young men in a civil war in southeast Asia.

When I was over there, in late September and early October, it had been my belief that the Vietcong fighting in South Vietnam were all Communists, that they were all infiltrators from the north. I also had been told that Vietnam was of strategic importance to the defense of the United States.

Mr. GRUENING. May I ask the Senator whether he found that that was not true; that they were not all infiltrators?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Of course it was not true. That is not only my observation. General Westmoreland, the commanding officer in Vietnam, on one of the evenings when I was in Saigon, said that the bulk of the Vietcong fighting us in

South Vietnam was born and reared in South Vietnam. Directly after that, when I was in Thailand, Gen. Richard Stilwell, the second in command said—and I remember his exact words:

> Senator, 80 percent of the Vietcong fighting us in the Mekong Delta were born and reared in South Vietnam.

As the Senator knows, the Mekong Delta is west and south of Saigon.

Mr. GRUENING. Demonstrating, as the Senator has pointed out, that this is a civil war.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. This is very definitely a civil war in which we are involved. Futhermore, Vietnam is of no strategic importance whatever to the defense of the United States.

Mr. GRUENING. While the Senator from Ohio was occupying the chair as Presiding Officer I quoted, in my colloquy with the Senator from Wyoming, the statement of Under Secretary of State Ball, to the effect that if the Vietnam war were merely an indigenous rebellion, the United States would have no business taking sides in the conflict and helping one side to defeat the other by force of arms. We are engaged in a civil war. We are taking sides in a civil war.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. To emphasize this fact further, the leader of the National Liberation Front, Nguyen Huu Tho, the leader of the VC's, was born and reared in South Vietnam. It is said that he is not a Communist. He was a lawyer in Saigon.

On the other hand, Prime Minister Ky, who was installed as Prime Minister by the 10 generals who overthrew the civilian government, was born in North Vietnam. He talks about democracy. He does not know what democracy is. The fact is that he was born in the suburbs of Hanoi. He was reared in North Vietnam. Some cabinet members of the Saigon or South Vietnamese Government were born and reared in what is called North Vietnam. In addition, the commanding officers of two of the army corps of the South Vietnamese Army were born in North Vietnam. This is ample evidence that a civil war is being waged there.

We hear many patriotic speeches about our commitments in Vietnam. It was stated on the floor of the Senate that, "We are over there because of the commitments made by three Presidents."

However, the late great President John F. Kennedy said on September 3, shortly before his assassination:

> I don't think that, unless a greater effort is made by the Government to win popular support, the war can be won out there. In the final analysis, it is their war. They are the ones who have to win it or lose it. We can help them, we can give them equipment, we can send our men out there as advisers, but they have to win it—the people of Vietnam—against the Communists. We are prepared to continue to assist them, but I don't think that the war can be won unless the people support the effort, and, in my opinion, in the last 2 months the Government has gotten out of touch with the people.

The President was then referring to the Government of Saigon.

On another occasion, President Kennedy said:

> Transforming Vietnam into a western redoubt is ridiculous.

The President was saying, in other words, that Saigon is not a bastion to protect Seattle or Alaska.

The junior Senator from Ohio is not a great admirer of the 8-year administration of President Eisenhower. However, President Eisenhower did not commit us to South Vietnam. President Eisenhower said in 1954 in a letter to the President of South Vietnam:

> I am instructing the American Ambassador to examine with you how an intelligent program of American aid can serve to assist Vietnam in its present hour of trial.
>
> He added: The purpose of this offer is to assist the Government of Vietnam in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means. * * * The U.S. Government hopes that such aid, combined with your own continuing efforts will contribute effectively toward an independent Vietnam endowed with a strong government.

Can it really be claimed that Marshal Ky heads a strong, viable state? Throughout the entire time that General Eisenhower was President, the United States military advisory group to Vietnam was increased from 327 in 1953 to a total of 685 on January 20, 1961. What President Eisenhower said and what he did throughout his 8 years as President proves he did not make a commitment of American soldiers to combat in Vietnam.

It is not a truthful statement to say that three Presidents have committed our American forces to fight over there.

I congratulate the Senator from Alaska on the statements he has made here.

It will be recalled that our President said on several occasions that he would go anywhere in the quest of peace and sit down and talk with anyone. However, when Secretary of State Dean Rusk while recently testifying before the Committee on Foreign Relations was asked:

> Would you be agreeable to having the U.S. delegates sit down at a peace conference with representatives of the National Liberation Front or the Vietcong?

He replied:

> I would have to consider that.

There can be no peace anywhere; there can be no cease-fire; and there can be no armistice unless the representatives of those who are doing the fighting, the National Liberation Front, so called, are permitted to participate in the conference.

The Secretary of State is not being honest with the American people when he makes that reservation at the same time that our President is telling the world that we will participate in a peace conference at Geneva or any other place without any conditions whatever.

Mr. GRUENING. Does the Senator not think, in view of the various conflicting statements made by the President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense, that the opposition cannot have very much confidence that we can be on the level when and if we reach the peace table? Must we not have a policy firmly enunciated by the President of the United States that this is what we will do, and not have such a policy nullified by a statement from the Secretary of State?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. It would be more encouraging to the American people, and more particularly to the mothers and fathers of youngsters who are likely to be drafted, if an agreement were reached so that our President would not make one statement and then have our warhawk Secretary of State make a contrary statement at almost the same time.

Mr. GRUENING. Is it not a fact that repeatedly through recent months when statements have been issued from our supposedly responsible officials, they have said on the one hand: "We must insist on an independent South Vietnam," and have said on the other hand: "We must adhere to the Geneva accords." The Geneva accords provide for a reunited Vietnam and for an election.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. The Geneva accords provide for a free election throughout the entire country of Vietnam.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator is correct.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. The Senator from Alaska and I would not like it if a Communist were to be elected President of Vietnam.

Mr. GRUENING. Of course not.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. However, it is for the Vietnamese people to determine that by free elections supervised by the International Control Commission. I believe the Senator from Alaska will agree with my statement that the United States does not have a mandate from Almighty God to police the entire world.

The United States is supposed to be the most revolutionary nation on earth. Our Founding Fathers made it that way. Let us hope that we have not become complacent, wealthy, and easygoing to the point that we are now the most unrevolutionary nation in the entire world.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator.

I hope that this colloquy may continue as debate proceeds, but we are under obligation now to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] to take up other business.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

CALL OF CERTAIN MEASURES ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of certain measures on the calendar, be-

ginning with Calendar No. 929, that the items be considered in sequence, and that the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] be granted such additional time as he may need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will state the first measure.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON AERONAUTICAL AND SPACE SCIENCES

The resolution (S. Res. 187) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences was announced as next in order.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to delay the Senate in its due consideration of these resolutions. I know how useless it is to make any effort to eliminate or even reduce the moneys to be appropriated for the various subcommittees. I expect to make a general statement, and most of the resolutions will probably go unchallenged as far as I am concerned, except where there appears to be an increase in the number of employees.

As I shall demonstrate in a moment, the number of employees on the special committees has increased from 359 to 401. I have a list of the increases, and I shall ask the chairmen of the committees to justify those increases in personnel.

Mr. President, I regret to contest again some of these special resolutions, as I have been doing from year to year. This is a task which I neither look forward to nor enjoy performing. I have stuck with it year after year in the hope that one voice raised in protest would sooner or later have the effect of returning the Senate to a position of giving to the taxpayers respect rather than mere lipservice.

After a battle of 10 years or more, it is my hope every year to find that my efforts have borne fruit. It is my hope to examine the annual list of special resolutions and find that some of these subcommittees of highly questionable value have been dispensed with. It is my continued hope that the expenditures authorized by these annual resolutions will be below last year's total. Unfortunately, these hopes of mine are rarely, if ever, realized.

It sometimes seems to that these subcommittees resemble the hundred-headed hydra—every time one is cut off and done away with, two more jump up to take its place.

This year, for instance, I am glad to see that a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary which had as its duty reviewing the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act, has passed from existence. It would appear that by this action, a sum of approximately $60,000 will be saved each year. However, such is not the case, as I will point out in a moment.

I could not understand how one of these temporary subcommittees had come to an end for, as we all know, such events rarely take place. Once they are created, the so-called temporary subcommittees have a tendency to go on and on, no matter whether a useful purpose is served or not, or whether the original need for its creation is still to be found. It was my thought to congratulate the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the chairman of the Trading With the Enemy Act Subcommittee on their action in abolishing this subcommittee. However, I found that the subcommittee had been headed by my late friend and distinguished colleague, the Senator from South Carolina, Mr. Olin Johnston.

But even though the Trading With the Enemy Act Subcommittee has passed from existence, we do not find that the authorization request for judiciary subcommittees has been decreased. On the contrary, the requests have been increased from $2,302,800 in the last session to $2,484,800 in this, the second session. The increase amounts to $182,000. I will note in passing that a new subcommittee has been created to take the place of the old, namely, a subcommittee to deal with our criminal laws and procedures to be headed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]. I note that this subcommittee was created late last year and funded with $30,000. It is today requesting Senate approval of $120,000 for its operations this year.

My old friend, the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, has also increased once again, as is the case every year, from an authorization of $240,000 last year to a request for $260,000 this year. I note these only in passing, and it is my hope to return to these specific subcommittees in more detail as each chairman speaks to justify his request.

Let us return for a moment to the totals which these resolutions provide. Let us go back 10 years ago to the 84th Congress. A search of the records reveals that in the years 1955 and 1956, the Senate authorized $6,578,859 for special inquiries and investigations and the expenditure of $315,000 for routine purposes for a grand total of $6,893,859. I want to emphasize to the Senate that all but $160,000 of this amount was authorized through special resolutions. As is well known, each committee receives $10,000 per Congress for its operating expenditures under the Reorganization Act of 1946. Some committees, and I am proud to say that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is one of these, make every effort to live within the bounds of this expenditure.

But to return to the record, the total authorized expenditure for committee operations during the 84th Congress was $6,893,859 as I said. The total authorized expenditure for committee operations, including both special inquiries and investigations and routine expenditures on a projected basis will amount to the grand total of $12,138,800 for this 89th Congress; $5,783,000 was authorized for special inquiries and investigations in the last session. Requests before us today amount to $5,733,800. If we include the $230,000 already authorized for routine expenditures, and an estimate of an additional $392,000 which will be included in the legislative appropriations bill to carry on the functions of the Appropriations Committee, we come up with the grand total, as I said, of $12,138,800. This is $5,244,941 above the authorized amount approved by both sessions of the 84th Congress. As a matter of fact, we can see that the authorizations have very nearly doubled over the 10-year period.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a summary of the committee authorizations and expenditures for inquiries and investigations from the 84th through the 89th Congress.

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

EXHIBIT I

Summary of committee authorizations and expenditures for inquiries and investigations, 84th through 89th Congresses

	Authorized	Expended
84th Cong. (1955–56):		
Inquiries and investigations	$6,578,859.94	$4,530,074.67
Routine	315,000.00	239,523.35
Total	6,893,859.94	4,769,598.02
85th Cong. (1956–58):		
Inquiries and investigations	7,958,780.14	5,696,275.34
Routine	320,000.00	210,445.89
Total	8,278,780.14	5,906,721.23
86th Cong. (1959–60):		
Inquiries and investigations	10,458,231.37	7,619,895.65
Routine	300,000.00	214,326.52
Total	10,758,231.37	7,834,222.17
87th Cong. (1961–62):		
Inquiries and investigations	9,458,700.00	7,308,844.72
Routine	283,300.00	215,888.67
Total	9,742,000.00	7,524,733.39
88th Cong. (1963–64):		
Inquiries and investigations	9,802,933.00	7,716,828.20
Routine	280,000.00	202,089.85
Total	10,082,933.00	7,918,918.05
89th Cong.:		
1st sess.: Inquiries and investigations	5,783,000.00	4,361,956.41
2d sess. (projected):		
Inquiries and investigations	[1] 6,125,800.00	
Routine	230,000.00	
Total	12,138,800.00	

[1] Includes additional $392,000 for Senate Appropriations Committee in fiscal year 1967.

NOTE.—Authorization increase over a 10-year period: $5,244,941. Authorization increase over the last Congress: $2,055,867.

Mr. ELLENDER. Even more important, Mr. President, is the fact that the total committee authorizations for the 89th Congress are more than $2 million above those authorized for the 88th Congress—$2,055,867 to be exact.

In other words, the trend goes up and up and it does so in leaps and bounds. We sometimes speak of creeping inflation in the economy. I say that the subcommittee expenditures in the Senate are subject to jumping inflation. It is

all the more a pity because we have within our power the means to curb and control this jumping inflation if we but had the will to do so.

The creation of these subcommittees brings problems of both increased staffing, and of where to put all of these extra employees. Last year, for example, Senate passage of a batch of special resolutions provided funds for 359 well-paying positions. This year, the total of resolution employees has jumped to 401—an increase of 42 in less than a year.

Mr. President, heretofore I have confined my remarks to dollars and cents and the material facets of this problem. It is also of great concern to me that the establishing and constant upkeep and maintenance of these highly questionable subcommittees also present a very great policy question as to the Senate's functions.

In short, the creation of these subcommittees represents a way of negating the value of the Reorganization Act of 1946. As is well known, the act of 1946 has as its purpose the streamlining of the Congress and particularly the committee system. It reduced the number of major Senate committees from 33 to 15, but the attempt to consolidate the committees' functions has not been successful, for as Douglass Cater, one of the President's closest advisers and the author of "Power in Washington" points out, the Reorganization Act "has not prevented the spawning of subcommittees." I would like to quote at this point two passages from "Power in Washington," written by Mr. Cater in 1964. These passages are taken from pages 156 and 158:

> The reform of 1946 was intended, among other things, to bring order to the increasingly disintegrate committee system. The number of committees was drastically reduced—from 48 to 19 in the House, 33 to 15 in the Senate—and their jurisdictions carefully specified. To formalize committee procedures, requirements were set governing meeting days, quorums for transacting business, and maintenance of written records.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The Reorganization Act's attempt to reduce the fragmentation of the committee system has had quite a contrary effect. For it has not prevented the spawning of subcommittees. Numbering 180 before the 1946 reform, they now total, by latest count, more than 250. They constitute a locus of legislative action still further removed from the surveillance and the control of Congress and its elected leadership. For the committee member, they present demands on his time and attention that can be dizzying. Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, a member of 15 subcommittees, has described his predicament frankly: "I would not dare say to the people of Illinois that I knew all about all things that go on * * *. To do so I would really need roller skates to get from one subcommittee to another * * *.

Mr. President, these subcommittees raise a problem in economics, a problem in providing adequate space for committee staffs which grow larger each year, and a problem of Senate policy. I will hope to go into some of these problems in greater detail with each committee chairman.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD at this point a résumé of all of the extra employees that are provided for the 34 subcommittees with which we are dealing. As I pointed out previously, the number of extra employees provided by the special resolutions has increased in number from 359 to 401. I ask unanimous consent to have the table placed in the RECORD at this point.

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

RESOLUTION EMPLOYEES

	1965	1966
1. Aeronautics and Space	5	4
2. Armed Services	12	10
3. Banking and Currency	6	6
4. Federal Housing	8	8
5. Commerce	30	30
6. Foreign Policy	9	16
7. Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations	25	24
8. Executive Reorganization	6	11
9. Foreign Aid Expenditures	4	12
10. Research and Development Programs	--	4
11. Intergovernmental Relations	9	9
12. National Security	9	9
13. Interior	6	6
14. Administrative Practice and Procedure	11	12
15. Antitrust and Monopoly	35	35
16. Constitutional Rights	16	16
17. Criminal Laws and Procedure	--	7
18. Federal Charters	1	1
19. Immigration	10	10
20. Internal Security	28	32
21. Juvenile Delinquency	18	21
22. Patents	8	7
23. Refugees and Escapees	6	7
24. Statute Revision and Codification	3	3
25. Labor and Public Welfare	17	17
26. Post Office and Civil Service	6	9
27. Public Works	4	5
28. Privileges and Elections	8	8
29. Standing Rules of the Senate	5	5
30. Small Business	10	12
31. Aging	14	14
32. Constitutional Amendments	5	9
33. Judicial System	7	15
34. Migratory Labor	8	7
Total	359	401

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that until June 30 of last year, each standing committee was permitted to spend, without resolution, $168,432. That was the case up to June 30 of 1965.

Since that time, because of the increase in salaries voted by this Congress, every standing committee can spend at the rate of $174,495. That is to employ and pay the regular staff of each committee.

As all of us know, under the Reorganization Act of 1946, each committee was permitted to select four specialists and six clericals. However, in the course of time, many of the standing committees have been able to have additional help provided through resolutions. For example, the Foreign Relations Committee has a few extra employees.

The same goes for the Government Operations Committee. The same goes for the Labor and Public Welfare Committee. The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, counting the amount I have just mentioned, $174,495, which is made available to every Senate committee, has in the past and up to now raised the ante to $355,400. This has been generally true of the special resolutions. In addition to the four specialists and the six clericals allowed to each committee, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has provided an additional staff of 17 persons.

Mr. President, I am calling this matter to the attention of the Senate to indicate the extent to which the costs of operating the Senate have increased.

I would like to say a few words in respect to my old friend, the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee.

Before I do so, I yield to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the distinguished Senator. I commend him for what he is saying. What I am about to say does not pertain to the particular resolution that is before the Senate. It should be adopted. I do not make any criticism of any Senator or committee or staff member. I know that in many instances they work long and hard and do a good job. I believe we must turn to what has been a practice which is leading in the wrong direction. The Senator from Louisiana has put his finger on it—too many of them.

By the creation of additional subcommittees, the whole intent and purpose of the Reorganization Act has been thwarted. Also, as the committees increase and the staffs become larger, even more staffs are needed. So we have more layers of staffs in committees and subcommittees to keep checking on. So instead of Congress solving the problem, it is creating problems.

I hope the commission studying the reorganization of the Congress can deal with this problem.

Senators and Representatives who are elected by the people should be making the detailed decisions, and not adopting the policy decisions which are being made by staffs. Because so much is going on, that is happening. The staff members may be competent and patriotic but they are not responsible to the electorate.

I point the finger of accusation at no one. I am talking about a system and practice. In the past some of those who have controlled committees have not operated through subcommittees.

I believe that we ought to turn our attention to a few of the problems that subcommittees cause. In the first place, a Member is called upon to serve on many subcommittees. His time is scattered and his duties are multiplied. But after the subcommittee and the staff of the subcommittee have mastered a subject, still it must go to the full committee. The full committee must again master it if they are going to have an intelligent idea of what is presented to the Senate.

As a result, instead of saving time of Members of Congress, more time of the Member is taken. Instead of enabling him to do a better job, the various layers of committees, the multiplicity of staff, and the amount of staff required to keep track of what the staffs are doing, keeps us in a vicious circle.

I believe that this problem ought to be approached in an objective way. I

hope that the current committee studying reorganization can deal with it.

I wish to stress the point that I am not critical of any Senator or any committee, because I know how hard they work. I know how hard many members of the staff work.

I am raising my voice against a system and a practice that has caused too many subcommittees that are really operating as full committees, and too much staff around those committees, so that there are too many layers to go through. They add to the work of the members, lessening efficiency instead of increasing it because of many decisions to be made by individuals who cannot be reached.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Nebraska. I am not naming anybody.

Mr. CURTIS. I understand.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not trying to point the finger of scorn in the direction of anybody. I know that all Senators work hard, but they seem to want to multiply these efforts.

To me it seems ridiculous for us to have provided under the 1946 Reorganization Act a total of 160 employees to work on the 16 standing committees, and then to find out that we have 401 employees on the subcommittees.

In other words, there are about 2½ times more employees on the subcommittees than on the regular committees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to Senate Resolution 187.

The resolution was agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 187

Resolved, That the Committee on Aeronautical and Spaces Sciences, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the aeronautical and space activities of departments and agencies of the United States, including such activities peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purposes of this resolution the committee is authorized, from February 1, 1966, through January 31, 1967, inclusive, to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable, (2) employ upon a temporary basis and fix the compensation of technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants, and (3) with the prior consent of the head of the department or agency of the Government concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any department or agency of the Government.

(b) The minority is authorized to select one person for appointment as an assistant or consultant, and the person so selected shall be appointed. No assistant or consultant may receive compensation at an annual gross rate which exceeds by more than $2,200 the annual gross rate of compensation of any person so selected by the minority.

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

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I commend the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences. In 1965, the committee requested $95,000. Five persons were employed. In 1966, the request is for $50,000. I shall not attempt to find out why those persons are necessary. I tried to do so last year but did not get far.

As I stated in my opening remarks, it is not my intention to question the requests of any committees unless there has been an increase in the number of employees.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, before taking up the next resolution, I wish to speak in defense of the resolutions that are coming before the Senate. There are 34 of them. I might add that I wish to speak in defense of the entire committee system. There is one other committee, and that is the Committee on Penitentiaries. But it does not have a staff, so we cannot count one that does not have a staff. I do not believe that that committee has a room, either.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then why not drop it? Why is $5,000 provided for this year? Why not get rid of the subcommittee?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. The subcommittee spent only $1,200.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not care if it spent only "2-bits." Even if it did not spend 5 cents, why spend more?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. The Federal penitentiaries of the United States come under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Senate. It is necessary that they be visited occasionally. Occasions arise which need the attention of the Senate. When such occasions arise, it is necessary to send someone to check what is happening. It is necessary to investigate riots, prison conditions, health, doctors, and so forth. On such occasions, it is necessary to spend money. So the subcommittee is necessary, although it spends little money and has no staff.

The Committee on Rules and Administration creates no committees whatsoever. We have nothing to do with the number of committees that exist, the number of persons employed on the staffs, or anything else of that kind.

We have some problems about providing rooms. I wish to say for the benefit of all Senators that no rooms are available, so that any questions on their part might be headed off.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is now engaged in a study of reorganization. I presume that his Joint Committee on Reorganization will make recommendations as to committees and subcommittees, as was done several years ago. But the Committee on Rules and Administration is not the committee that reduces the number of committees, adds to them, subtracts from them, or anything else. We have no authority whatsoever in that direction.

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

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Then why do these resolutions go before the Committee on Rules and Administration before they are reported to the Senate? I understood that the Rules Committee had a perfect right to approve or reject requests for increases or decreases; but if its approval is automatic and the committee has to approve them without regard to its own opinion, why not abolish the Rules Committee and let the resolutions come directly to the Senate?

Does the committee not exercise its own opinions in reporting these resolutions?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I believe it is well known by most Senators that the chairman of every committee submits a request on behalf of the majority and the minority of the committee. He states the number of employees of the committee, the amount of money he seeks for the year, the amount he used in the previous year; the appropriation or authorization, and the amount he turned back or did not use. That inforfation is shown together with other information before the committee. It is contained in the reports.

So far as I and the other members of the committee are concerned, we hear the chairmen of the committees and the chairmen of the subcommittees justify their requests. But I am in no position to tell the chairman of any committee the number of employees or the size of the staff he should have.

Mr. ELLENDER. Could not the Senator perhaps obtain that information by ascertaining the kind of duty that is performed by a subcommittee and where the subcommittee employees work?

I understand it is within the province of the Committee on Rules and Administration to ascertain where the employees work and what they do. Next year something should be done. It is too late this year. If the Senator were to call in the chairmen and the persons who work on the subcommittees and ask what they have been doing, he would perhaps be enlightened. I have heard it said that some of the employees work out on the hustings for some of the bosses, though I cannot prove it.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I should be glad to answer that question right now.

Mr. ELLENDER. Very well.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I observe in the Chamber many chairmen of committees who have appeared before the Committee on Rules and Administration to justify what they are seeking. The committee does inquire as to the number of employees on a subcommittee's staff and what they are doing. But I personally cannot sit in every hearing on every subcommittee to see the number of people who are employed and then report back. That is a little beyond the scope of my endurance. The Senator from Louisiana can make his own check of committees, one by one, and question the chairmen and satisfy himself as to

whether the employees are needed or not. I have done the only thing I know the Committee on Rules and Administration is supposed to do. We have asked for a justification of the number of employees, the amount of salaries paid, and the increase in the number of employees over last year and the year before.

There was not a dissenting vote from the nine members on the Committee on Rules and Administration on any of the resolutions presented the other day. This is not a matter of one, two, or three men passing on all these resolutions.

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

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from North Carolina made the point that he had no alternative except to report these resolutions. The report states:

> The Committee on Rules and Administration, to which the resolution was referred, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon without amendment and recommends that the resolution be agreed to.

This is expressing an opinion.

The Senator may be correct in recommending these increases. However, the point is that the Senator claims he did examine, approve, and recommend these items. Certainly the committee did not have to make the recommendation. It could have reported that it recommended the requests unfavorably, and that they not be approved.

I disagree with the Senator from North Carolina when he states that the Committee on Rules and Administration has no responsibility to examine these requests and make recommendations to the Senate. The committee does have a responsibility. That is the very reason why the requests were sent to the committee. However, in discharging its responsibility the committee has approved these requests each year and recommended that they be increased.

The committee may not have exercised its authority or discharged its responsibilities but that does not excuse it.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, these requests were examined. No committee member recommended that the amounts be reduced.

I announced on the Senate floor some time ago that these meetings were open and that any Senator could attend and object or make recommendations or do anything that he wanted to do. I do not see anything else that our committee could have done. In each case the ranking minority member of the committee who requested the amount recommended that it be granted.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In the event that the ranking minority member of a committee were to disagree would the request have been rejected?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I do not know. I suppose that the request would not come from his committee in that event. Such action does not take place in our committee. The ranking member of the committee has acted on the measure in committee before the request comes to our committee. We have letters to that effect.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If the ranking minority member of the committee were to disagree with the recommendation, would his position be honored by the Committee on Rules and Administration and would the request for an increase be rejected?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I can answer that better by saying to the Senator that if the ranking minority member of a subcommittee or a full committee were to appear at our committee meeting when the request was brought up and if he were heard, our committee would consider the matter. I do not say that we would reject the entire authorization. The majority of the entire committee would have a say about that.

Mr. President, I point out that the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences had an authorization last year of $95,000. It used approximately $38,000 through yesterday. All these authorizations are through yesterday. The authorization last year was for February 1. It was not acted on. So these figures are up to date, as of yesterday.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The resolution (S. Res. 212) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Armed Services for making certain studies was considered and agreed to as follows:

S. RES. 212

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

(1) common defense generally;

(2) the Department of Defense, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force generally;

(3) soldiers' and sailors' homes;

(4) pay, promotion, retirement, and other benefits and privileges of members of the Armed Forces;

(5) selective service;

(6) size and composition of the Army, Navy, and Air Force;

(7) forts, arsenals, military reservations, and navy yards;

(8) ammunition depots;

(9) maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal, including the administration, sanitation, and government of the Canal Zone;

(10) conservation, development, and use of naval petroleum and oil shale reserves;

(11) strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense; and

(12) aeronautical and space activities peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations.

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

SEC. 3. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $175,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 173) authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to make certain investigations, and to provide additional funds therefor was considered and agreed to as follows:

S. RES. 173

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

(1) banking and currency generally;

(2) financial aid to commerce and industry;

(3) deposit insurance;

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

(5) economic stabilization, production, and mobilization;

(6) valuation and revaluation of the dollar;

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

(8) securities and exchange regulations;

(9) credit problems of small business; and

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

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

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

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

The resolution (S. Res. 172) to provide additional funds for the Committee

on Banking and Currency was considered and agreed to as follows:

S. RES. 172

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

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

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

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

AUTHORITY FOR THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE TO MAKE CERTAIN STUDIES

The resolution (S. Res. 213) to authorize the Committee on Commerce to make certain studies, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 213

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

(1) interstate commerce generally;

(2) foreign commerce generally;

(3) maritime matters;

(4) interoceanic canals;

(5) transportation policy;

(6) domestic surface transportation, including pipelines and highway safety;

(7) communications, including a complete review of national and international telecommunications and the use of communications satellites;

(8) Federal power matters;

(9) civil aeronautics;

(10) fisheries and wildlife;

(11) marine sciences; and

(12) weather services and modification, including the use of weather satellites.

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

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

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $450,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO MAKE CERTAIN INVESTIGATIONS

The resolution (S. Res. 183) authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to make investigations into the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches of Government was considered and agreed to as follows:

S. RES. 183

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from February 1, 1966, through January 31, 1967, to make investigations into the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches of the Government, including the possible existence of fraud, misfeasance, malfeasance, collusion, mismanagement, incompetence, corrupt or unethical practices, waste, extravagance, conflicts of interest, and the improper expenditure of Government funds in transactions, contracts, and activities of the Government or of Government officials and employees and any and all such improper practices between Government personnel and corporations, individuals, companies, or persons affiliated therewith, doing business with the Government; and the compliance or noncompliance of such corporations, companies, or individuals or other entities with the rules, regulations, and laws governing the various governmental agencies and its relationships with the public: *Provided,* That, in carrying out the duties herein set forth, the inquiries of this committee or any subcommittee thereof shall not be deemed limited to the records, functions, and operations of the particular branch of the Government under inquiry, and may extend to the records and activities of persons, corporations, or other entities dealing with or affecting that particular branch of the Government.

SEC. 2. The Committee on Government Operations or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is further authorized from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, to conduct an investigation and study of the extent to which criminal or other improper practices or activities are, or have been engaged in the field of labor-management relations or in groups or organizations of employees or employers, to the detriment of interests of the public, employers, or employees, and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect such interests against the occurrence of such practices or activities. Nothing contained in this resolution shall affect or impair the exercise by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of any power, or the discharge by such committee of any duty, conferred or imposed upon it by the Standing Rules of the Senate or by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

SEC. 3. The Committee on Government Operations or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is further authorized and directed from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, to make a full and complete study and investigation of syndicated or organized crime which may operate in or otherwise utilize the facilities of interstate or international commerce in furtherance of any transactions which are in violation of the law of the United States or of the State in which the transactions occur, and, if so, the manner and extent to which, and the identity of the persons, firms, or corporations, or other entities by whom such utilization is being made, what facilities, devices, method, techniques, and technicalities are beng used or employed, and whether or not organized crime utilizes such interstate facilities or otherwise operates in interstate commerce for the development of corrupting influences in violation of the law of the United States or the laws of any State and, further, to study and investigate the manner in which and the extent to which persons engaged in organized criminal activities have infiltrated into lawful business enterprise; and to study the adequacy of Federal laws to prevent the operations of organized crime in interstate or international commerce; and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect the public against the occurrences of such practices or activities. Nothing contained in this resolution shall affect or impair the exercise by the Committee on the Judiciary or by the Committee on Commerce of any power, or the discharge by such committee of any duty, conferred or imposed upon it by the Standing Rules of the Senate or by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

SEC. 4. The Committee on Government Operations or any of its duly authorized subcommittees shall report to the Senate by January 31, 1967, and shall, if deemed appropriate, include in its report specific legislative recommendations.

SEC. 5. (a) For the purposes of this resolution, the Committee on Government Operations or any of its duly authorized subcommittees, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized, as it deems necessary and appropriate, to (1) make such expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate; (2) hold such hearings; (3) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate; (4) administer such oaths; (5) take such testimony, either orally or by sworn statement; (6) employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (7) with the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, employ on a reimbursable basis such executive branch personnel as it deems advisable; and, further, with the consent of other committees or subcommittees to work in conjunction with and utilize their staffs, as it shall be deemed necessary and appropriate in the judgment of the chairman of the committee or subcommittee: *Provided further,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment and the person selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee.

(b) For the purpose of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, or its chairman, or any other member of the committee or subcommittee designated by the chairman, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized, in its or his or their discretion, as may be deemed advisable, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents.

SEC. 6. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $435,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY AND EVALUATION OF EFFECTS OF LAWS PERTAINING TO PROPOSED REORGANIZATION IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

The resolution (S. Res. 186) to provide funds to study and evaluate the effects of laws pertaining to proposed reorganization in the executive branch of the Government was announced as next in order.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, last year this subcommittee spent $57,500, and had six employees. There is now a request for $120,000 for an increase of five employees.

I should like to ask why this is necessary.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] has asked the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] to handle this matter for him.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I recall that last year there was a split subcommittee. There was money provided for a subcommittee and later the committee was split. Instead of having one subcommittee, we now have two. The executive reorganization, as I have just indicated, called for six employees and a total of $57,500. This year, the committee has asked for 11 employees and $120,000.

I believe that the Senate ought to know why it is that this subcommittee has been recreated and why there should be an additional number of employees.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I am delighted that my friend the Senator from Louisiana has asked that question. I shall do my best to try to answer it.

This subcommittee has the responsibility for the reorganization plans that take place within the executive branch of the Government.

As the Senator from Louisiana has pointed out today, and so frequently in the past, the Government must be modernized and economy must take place within the executive branch of the Government.

No committee has a greater responsibility than this subcommittee.

President Johnson told the Congress in his state of the Union message:

> I propose we take steps to modernize and streamline the executive branch and to modernize the relations between city, State, and Nation. A new Department of Transportation is needed to bring together our transportation activities.

The subcommittee expects to hold lengthy and complete hearings on the bill to create a Department of Transportation. It will also hold hearings on an estimated 20 reorganization plans which the President has indicated he will send to the Congress this year. The first of these plans, a controversial proposal to transfer the Community Relations Service from the Department of Commerce to the Department of Justice, has already been forwarded from the White House and will receive early consideration.

The subcommittee will also continue to exercise its oversight responsibilities in such fields as traffic safety, pesticides, and urban development.

Mr. President, the 89th Congress has already compiled an excellent record in promoting greater efficiency and economy in Government. In addition to creating a new Department of Housing and Urban Development, and extending the President's authority to submit reorganization plans to Congress, five such plans were submitted at the first session and went into effect.

Economy, efficiency, and effective management in the Federal Establishment can only be achieved through a constant review of the structure and functioning procedures of Government departments and bureaus. Congress shares responsibility for this review and need not wait for the executive branch to suggest reform. The Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization, with its small staff and modest budget, is in a position to take the initiative in matters of governmental management and achieve important savings to the taypayer.

As I stated in the beginning, the Senator from Louisiana has led the fight on the floor of the Senate and publicly for the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government and for economy in the Government and a streamlined Government. This subcommittee has a major responsibility in this area.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thought the Government Operations Committee, headed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], attended to that.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. This is a subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. How was it done before the creation of this subcommittee?

Mr. MCCLELLAN. While we have had subcommittees to do the work at different times, we have never before had an anticipated flood of 20 reorganization plans in a year. I do not believe this subcommittee will be able to do all of them. If these plans all come up at once, it will mean that other subcommittees will have to do some of the work. This subcommittee cannot handle 20 reorganization plans during 1 year, particularly if they all come up at one time. Other subcommittees or the full committee will have to handle some of them.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I think that is true, without any question.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it unusual to have this many reorganizations?

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Most unusual.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I might point out that last year there were five.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. As my friend knows those plans have to be processed, because within 60 days' time they go into effect and become law. Unless they are processed and unless there is developed a record upon which the Senate or the House, as the case may be, acts affirmatively to reject the plan, it becomes law.

Mr. ELLENDER. Are these 20 reorganization plans before this subcommittee now?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. No, they have not been sent up.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. One has been sent so far, but we have been advised——

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. There will be approximately 20.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. There will be approximately 20. I have been so advised by the Bureau of the Budget. I am sure the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] has likewise been so advised.

As I have stated, at the moment I have doubts that that one subcommittee would be able to process all of them; certainly not if they come up here 6 or 8 or 10 at a time. I do not believe they can do it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I probably agree with the Senator, but the subcommittee was formed last year, and I wonder how many reorganization plans it had before it then.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. That is not the only function it performs. It handles other bills. Senator RIBICOFF has been holding extended hearings, as I recall, on the problem of traffic safety and the legislation contemplated thereon. Mr. President, I have an editorial from the Washington Evening Star, heartily commending him for the work he has done so far.

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

RIBICOFF ROAD SAFETY BILL HAILED

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

Well, sir, it sounds an awful lot like heresy in the ranks of the States rights religion, but the avowal has to be made. Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF's bill to create a National Highway Traffic Safety Center ranks among the finest pieces of domestic legislation now pending in the Congress. The bill offered by the Connecticut Democrat should be passed.

It may seem incredible for a card-carrying conservative to speak in this unseemly fashion of the Ribicoff bill. After all, the measure numbers among its sponsors such certified liberals as CLARK, DOUGLAS, GRUENING, MCGEE, MORSE, Mrs. NEUBERGER, and KENNEDY of New York. The bill would create one more program of Federal grants in aid, to be added to the 120 such programs already channeling $13 billion a year back to the subservient States. One section of the proposed act would involve an educational frill. On the face of it, the bill bears all the aspects of legislation we could get along without.

Yet in point of fact, the wonder is that Congress has waited so long to tackle the prodigious problems of highway safety; and the puzzling thing is that the people themselves have applied no pressure for congressional action.

Surely, if there had been any disposition in the Congress to act, a solid constitutional

basis could have been laid long ago for Federal action in the field. The power to regulate commerce among the States plainly could be invoked to justify sweeping Federal regulation of our highways. Yet the Congress seldom has concerned itself with highway safety as such. A House committee conducted certain hearings in 1959, issued a largely unread report in 1961, and came up 2 years ago with Public Law 88–515, prescribing certain safety standards for motor vehicles purchased by the Government. Apart from a few small grants for research, that has been the size of the Federal interest.

A stoic and indifferent public has not asked for anything more. The American character, strange to say, seems almost averse to safety regulations. When the automobile comes in, reason departs; and the otherwise rational fellow succumbs to the automotive obsession. His mind blots out the unlovely aspects of his love—the cost, the fumes, the accident statistics. As an abstract proposition, highway safety may have some appeal. In terms of specifics, highway safety is a bore. The subject leaves him numb. He is deaf to the grisly facts.

Just a few days ago, while RIBICOFF was holding hearings on his bill, the annual report for 1965 came in from the National Safety Council. Highway accidents last year killed 49,000 persons, seriously injured 1.8 million more, and caused economic losses of $8.5 billion. These are staggering figures. But who is staggered by them? To judge from congressional mail, the public is far more concerned about the slaughter of steers. It is page one news when three soldiers die of meningitis, but it is ho-hum when nearly a thousand human beings are brought home dead off the highways every week.

RIBICOFF is determined to break through this stone wall of indifference. As one of Connecticut's most able governors, he made highway safety a personal crusade. Through research, education, stringent laws and firm enforcement, he got spectacular results. Some of these same approaches are embodied in his bill.

One part of the bill would create a National Highway Traffic Safety Center, equipped to conduct major programs of research and engineering. Out of these studies would come certain national minimum standards for highway traffic safety. The assumption is that eventually these standards would be applied to the design of automobiles, the engineering of highways, the fixing of speed limits, and the training and licensing of drivers.

A second part of the bill would provide incentive grants to the States, amounting to perhaps $105 million a year, to finance new or expanded programs of vehicle inspection and of driver training in the schools. It is not out of the question to imagine a day of Federal standards for operator's permits. Speeding on a Federal-aid highway may yet become a Federal offense, subject to trial in Federal courts. Convictions may be federally recorded as a factor in the fixing of punishment or the suspension of permits across the Nation.

Nothing so drastic may develop, for much can be accomplished by the auto manufacturers and by the States. Significantly, General Motors will make collapsible steering wheels a standard feature on its 1967 models. Other design changes, aimed solely at safety, doubtless can be achieved by indirect means instead of by compulsion. RIBICOFF's bill is a moderate bill, limited in scope but of vast potential value. It merits more favorable attention than it has received from motorists thus far.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Senator RIBICOFF led the fight for traffic safety while Governor of the State of Connecticut, and is now continuing his efforts.

Mr. McCLELLAN. And other bills are referred to that subcommittee from time to time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Do I correctly understand that the transportation problems of the Nation will come before this subcommittee? I thought the Commerce Committee had to do with that.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Under the Reorganization Act, the reorganization plan conferring that power upon the President comes before the Government Operations Committee. That committee has jurisdiction.

Mr. ELLENDER. But as to traffic safety, what is involved in the way of reorganization?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not know what will be involved in it.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Committee on Commerce has obtained, for such investigations, almost half a million dollars. We just agreed to it a minute ago. I wonder why it is——

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I can tell the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why should the traffic safety problem now come before this subcommittee? It is something new.

I wonder if the Senator from Arkansas would agree that if the reorganization plans remain at four or five per year, his committee can handle them; and if so——

Mr. McCLELLAN. I would think it could handle that number.

Mr. ELLENDER. Because this year 20 are anticipated, with only 1 having come thus far, why did the committee see fit to organize this special subcommittee?

Mr. McCLELLAN. This is not a special subcommittee organized for that purpose only. This subcommittee has other jurisdictions; other legislation is referred to it.

I point out that under the rules of the Senate, subsection (b) of section (j) of rule XXV provides, among other things, that reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government are under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Operations. The Senate has placed the jurisdiction there; that is why it goes there.

Mr. ELLENDER. I can understand that, if reorganization is involved.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It involves a reorganization plan.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator mean for transportation?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The Department of Transportation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why does not that go before the Commerce Committee?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I cannot answer that. The Senate has provided that these reorganization plans shall go before the Committee on Government Operations. That is the only answer I can give.

Mr. ELLENDER. With only one before the committee now——

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, there is only one thing before the Senate now, but we know that many things will come up before the session is over. We have already been advised.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 186) was agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 186

Resolved, That the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a full and complete study for the purpose of evaluating the effects of laws enacted to reorganize the executive branch of the Government, and to consider reorganizations proposed therein.

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

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings upon the study and investigation authorized by this resolution, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $120,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF FOREIGN AID EXPENDITURES

The resolution (S. Res. 182) authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of all matters pertaining to foreign assistance operations by the Federal Government was announced as next in order.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this is another branch of the subcommittee which split last year, as to the amount given to each of these, executive reorganization received $57,500, and is now asking for $120,000, as I have indicated.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. $115,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. $120,000.

Mr. GRUENING. $115,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am talking about the resolution just passed on executive reorganization.

Mr. GRUENING. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. ELLENDER. This committee, which until last year was combined with the other committee concerning which

the resolution was just passed, also received last year $57,500, and it had four employees. This year, there is a request for $115,000, with an additional eight employees.

I should like to find out from whoever is chairman of this subcommittee the reason for the increase from 4 employees to 12.

Mr. GRUENING. Is the Senator speaking of Senator RIBICOFF's subcommittee?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; foreign aid expenditures.

Mr. GRUENING. Our subcommittee has had 8 employees, and will be increased to 12. The reason for that is that we are conducting a number of very important investigations, which will result in saving the Government a great deal of money. One of these is an investigation of the disposal of surplus property, which has become a $6½ billion annual affair.

The property is scattered all over the world. It includes, we have discovered, items that will enable us to save the Government many times the total cost of this appropriation. Moreover, that is only one of our functions.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of what surplus property is the Senator speaking?

Mr. GRUENING. All the surplus property given away each year, largely by the Department of Defense. It includes everything: buildings and real estate, ships, planes, automotive machinery, refrigerators—everything one can possibly think of.

Much of that property is being disposed of at a negligible figure; and we believe we can find ways of saving the Government millions of dollars a year by a proper reorganization of the system. We have already found out a good deal about it.

That is only one of about six programs we are investigating. Another is foreign aid. We are conducting an investigation of foreign aid in five Latin American countries, similar to the investigation made 3 years ago, when we investigated aid in 10 foreign countries, as a result of which amendments to the foreign aid bill were obtained which saved substantial money. We obtained an increase in the loan interest rate from three-quarters of 1 percent to 2 percent. In Latin American countries where we find substantial waste and extravagance, and projects which have no justification, I think we can save very large amounts of money for the taxpayers.

We can demonstrate great savings to the Government. This is not a very large appropriation for the amount of work we will do. Those are two of the subjects we are investigating.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator stated that in 1965 he employed eight workers, and he used the sum of $57,500 to employ them; and now he wishes to add four more employees, which is doubling the appropriation. Why is that necessary?

Mr. GRUENING. Because this is a much larger investigation, for one thing. Of the 12 employees, 2 are part time. Last year's authorization came to a total of $91,000. I believe that these are all investigations toward which I know the Senator from Louisiana has been sympathetic. They will result in substantial savings.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator knows, I, myself, have conducted many investigations.

Mr. GRUENING. And very competent investigations, too.

Mr. ELLENDER. I did not have a staff of 8, 12, or even 2 employees. I went out alone and did it. I made my own notes and came back and made my own reports. I am therefore wondering how much more effective the Senator's investigations are going to be than many of those which have been conducted in the past.

Mr. GRUENING. I assure the Senator that the investigations which deal with surplus property that no one man could possibly investigate, even one so able as the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. This investigation involves Army surplus; does it not?

Mr. GRUENING. Largely. The greatest amount is generated from the armed services. We get rid of the materiel. It is first repaired and then easily disposed of. Then we take it over as foreign aid, which is given to foreign countries, when it could very well be sold at a profit to the United States, or it could be repaired and continue to be used.

We have evidence of that already. I believe the Senator will find that the subcommittee, as much as any, will be amply justified both by economies and greater efficiency which its investigations will bring to light.

Mr. ELLENDER. I presume that a committee of this kind will mushroom if it ever starts. I predict that next year it will come in asking for more money; but, since this program deals with the armed services, I wonder why it does not remain with the armed services?

Mr. GRUENING. That deals only with one aspect, which is really not an aspect exclusively connected with the armed services, although the armed services have generated a great amount of surplus. We have evidence of surplus, of practically new material not even being uncrated which is taken over into the foreign aid program. It then becomes another spigot of foreign aid, when it could be saved and sold, bringing a return to the U.S. Treasury. It could also go to some of the States. The States could buy it and make good use of it. We find that domestic needs are frequently neglected in this program. We have requests from States such as the Senator's, which wish desperately to obtain some of the materials which are being disposed of and going to foreign countries. We believe that is a point which should be carefully examined.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 182) was agreed to as follows:

S. RES. 182

Resolved, That the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction, specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the operation of foreign assistance activities by the Federal Government, with a view to determining the economy and efficiency of such activities.

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

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings upon the study and investigation authorized by this resolution, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $115,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, let me add the justification for that. Last year $91,500 was authorized. Only $51,000 was spent.

We asked all these committees whether they could not try to cut down the amounts asked for. Each one pledged its best efforts to reduce them and to turn back every cent possible. We hope that they will do so.

AUTHORIZATION TO COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO STUDY ORIGIN OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS FINANCED BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 218) authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to study the origin of research and development programs financed by the departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I notice that this is a new undertaking. The request is for $66,000 and for four employees. I wonder what is being done in this connection?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I believe that the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] can speak on this subject.

Mr. MUSKIE. I am not a member of the subcommittee, but I am a member of the full committee.

The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], who is unavoidably absent from the Senate today, asked me to handle this matter for him.

The subcommittee was created by the distinguished chairman of the full committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] last August 20.

His statement appears in the RECORD of August 20, 1965, together with a justification by the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS].

Yesterday, according to the RECORD at page 3124, the chairman of the subcommittee inserted in the RECORD a justification of this subcommittee. I read briefly from that statement, as follows:

The Subcommittee on Government Research is the only subcommittee in the Senate which has Government-wide jurisdiction in the field of research and development being carried on by the various agencies and departments of the Federal Government. Virtually every major agency or department in the Federal Government annually contracts for research and development. Last year the Federal Government spent a total of $15.5 billion for this purpose. The bulk of this figure, of course, was in the development field, but much of it was in basic research, both in the social and physical sciences.

* * * * *

Some of the very serious questions for which Congress must find the answers, suggest the fields of inquiry scheduled by our subcommittee.

First. Are the large expenditures for research and development and the various component research project expenditures necessary and justified?

Second. To what extent are improved administrative procedures required to guard against or eliminate unnecessary or improper overlapping and duplication among the Federal agencies?

Third. How may we establish broad national policies for making value judgments on how much emphasis will be given to various fields of research concerned, as compared with others, and for the best use of our limited national research manpower resources?

Fourth. How may we better provide for the dissemination of research results for governmental, institutional, and industrial use?

Fifth. How may we be more certain of fairness in the distribution of Government research contracts among potential research contract recipients, particularly institutions of higher education?

I may add to what the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee said in his remarks in the RECORD yesterday by saying that the full Committee on Government Operations has the responsibility for continuing oversight of all operations of the Government, from the point of view of efficiency and economy.

This is an activity of Government research and development which has vastly grown, especially in the post-World War II period.

The chairman of the full committee decided to look into what is being done, in depth, and to determine whether too little or too much is being done, and whether it can be done much better.

Therefore, this is consistent with the continuing responsibility of the Committee on Government Operations. It is important that the activity should be delegated to the subcommittee at this time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has this not been done before by the full committee?

Mr. MUSKIE. The full committee has worked in this field, in a limited sense, in connection with hearings on these activities, from the point of view of both labor contracts and management. Therefore, from time to time the full committee has devoted its attention to this problem.

Former Senator HUMPHREY, when he was chairman of the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, looked into the question of research in the field of health and international organizations.

Therefore, from time to time, the full committee has devoted its attention to one aspect or another of the research and development activities of the Government. An across-the-board study in depth is proposed. I know that the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] could respond more specifically to the Senator's questions, but this is my impression of what has been proposed.

The full committee was convinced of the justification of this activity when it was suggested by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]. I really believe that this is a worthwhile inquiry.

Mr. ELLENDER. I presume, from what the Senator has said, that this will be a permanent subcommittee.

Mr. MUSKIE. If the problem continued, the work of the subcommittee could continue. I am not in a position to promise its discontinuance. I am not the chairman of the committee or a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sure it will not be discontinued.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 218) was agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 218

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, from February 1, 1966, through January 31, 1967, to make studies as to the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches and functions of the Government with particular reference to:

(1) the operations of research and development programs financed by departments and agencies of the Federal Government, including research in such fields as economics and social science, as well as basic science, research, and technology;

(2) review those programs now being carried out through contracts with higher educational institutions and private organizations, corporations, and individuals to determine the need for the establishment of national research, development, and manpower policies and programs, in order to bring about Government-wide coordination and elimination of overlapping and duplication of scientific and research activities; and

(3) examine existing research information operations, the impact of Federal research and development programs on institutions of higher learning, and to recommend the establishment of programs to insure equitable distribution of research and development contracts among such institutions and other contractors.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized—

(1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable;

(2) to employ upon a temporary basis and fix the compensation of technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority of the committee is authorized at its discretion to select one employee for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and

(3) with the prior consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize on a reimbursable basis the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any department or agency of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $66,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AUTHORIZATION OF STUDY OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE STATES AND MUNICIPALITIES

The resolution (S. Res. 205) authorizing a study of intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 205

Resolved, That the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by subsection 1(g)(2)(D) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities, including an evaluation of studies, reports, and recommendations made thereon and submitted to the Congress by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 86-380, approved by the President on September 24, 1959.

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

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

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $137,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AUTHORITY TO STUDY CERTAIN ASPECTS OF NATIONAL SECURITY AND INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS

The resolution (S. Res. 181) to study certain aspects of national security and international operations was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 181

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdiction under XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, from February 1, 1966, through January 31, 1967, to make studies as to the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches and functions of the Government with particular reference to:

(1) the effectiveness of present national security methods, staffing, and processes as tested against the requirements imposed by the rapidly mounting complexity of national security problems;

(2) the capacity of present national security staffing, methods, and processes to make full use of the Nation's resources of knowledge, talents, and skills;

(3) the adequacy of present intergovernmental relationships between the United States and international organizations of which the United States is a member; and

(4) legislative and other proposals or means to improve these methods, processes, and relationships.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized—

(1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable;

(2) to employ upon a temporary basis and fix the compensation of technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority of the committee is authorized at its discretion to select one employee for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and

(3) with the prior consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize on a reimbursable basis the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any department or agency of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $90,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

The resolution (S. Res. 171) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 171

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

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

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

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

STUDY OF ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE IN GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 190) to study administrative practice and procedure, and for other purposes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice that here the ante has been increased from $150,000 last year to $175,000 this year, with one more employee. I wonder what is the justification for this additional sum.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. The information is not up to date. The subcommittee received $175,000 last year. It received a second appropriation. It spent only $146,621.

Mr. ELLENDER. How many employees did the subcommittee have working last year?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. It had 10 full-time employees and 1 part-time employee.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much did it spend?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. $146,621.15.

Mr. ELLENDER. The subcommittee wants one more employee?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. It is asking for the same amount of money that it requested last year, with the understanding that it will hold the expenditures down as low as possible and return whatever funds are left over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 190) was agreed to as follows:

S. RES. 190

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a full and complete study and investigation of administrative practices and procedures within the departments and agencies of the United States in the exercise of their rulemaking, licensing, investigatory, law enforcement, and adjudicatory functions, including a study of the effectiveness of the Administrative Procedure Act, with a view to determining whether additional legislation is required to provide for the fair, impartial, and effective performance of such functions.

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

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

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $175,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

The resolution (S. Res. 191) to investigate antitrust and monopoly laws of the United States was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 191

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a complete, comprehensive, and continuing study and investigation of unlawful restraints and monopolies, and of the antitrust and monopoly laws of the United States, their administration, interpretation, operation, enforcement, and effect, and to determine and from time to time redetermine the nature and extent of any legislation which may be necessary or desirable for—

(1) clarification of existing law to eliminate conflicts and uncertainties where necessary;

(2) improvement of the administration and enforcement of existing laws; and

(3) supplementation of existing law to provide any additional substantive, procedural, or organizational legislation which may be needed for the attainment of the fundamental objects of the laws and efficient administration and enforcement thereof.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minor-

ity is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

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

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $561,700 shall be paid from the contingent fund for the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

The resolution (S. Res. 194) to investigate matters pertaining to constitutional rights was considered and agreed to, as follows:

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

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

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

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $195,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF CRIMINAL LAWS AND PROCEDURES

The resolution (S. Res. 195) to investigate criminal laws and procedures was considered and agreed to as follows:

S. RES. 195

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

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

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

SEC. 4. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $120,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, did the Senate consider Calendar No. 945, Senate Resolution 195?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Calendar Nos. 944 and 945 have been agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is Calendar No. 945, Senate Resolution 195, before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; it has been agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the resolution was agreed to be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was reconsidered.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to ask a few questions. This subcommittee is a brand new one. It was created in the latter part of the first session, last year, with a funding of $30,000. I notice that the request is for $120,000 and for seven employees. I wonder what the purpose of it is.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, this subcommittee was created in September or October of last year to process a number of bills being introduced that dealt with crime problems. I think three have been referred to the committee up to the present. I am advised that three more will be sent to Congress by the administration in a very short time, and will be before the subcommittee. There will possibly be two or three before the end of the year.

Last year, in order to try to get a staff—and it is to be a technical staff—and get the work going, I asked for $30,000 for the remainder of last year. We spent less than $500 of that amount. The money was returned. My other commitments made it impossible for me to be present to give the attention required to get the program started this year.

I have asked for a staff of seven. Up to the moment I have employed only two. There are others already employed. Hearings are scheduled to begin the latter part of March.

While I have the floor, let me say that I am responsible for the termination of the Subcommittee on Trading With the Enemy Act. The subcommittee is still in existence, but it is asking for no money. I have sought no funds because I felt its work could be done by my own staff and other staff members. Therefore, that one is eliminated.

Let me also say, while we are on the subject of increasing staffs, that when I took over the Patents and Trademarks Subcommittee, it had nine staff members. I reduced the number to six.

Last year the Permanent Investigations Subcommittee returned $32,000. I have reduced its staff by two this year. So in those committees I am undertaking to reduce the staffs.

The funds I am asking for as chairman of the committee are equaled or more than made up by those reductions. The committee staff is necessary for a solution that is absolutely imperative. There is a crime menace in this country which is actually creating a danger to our society.

There are many causes for the problem and for the rapid increase in crime. I think some new tools are needed. Obviously, the Justice Department thinks so. The President thinks so. Soon there will be another message from the President on the subject, recommending legislation. So we are undertaking to report from the committee some measures that I believe should be enacted into law to strengthen law enforcement and combat the menace which is endangering the safety of our Nation.

I hope there will be no objection to this request. I assure my friend the Senator from Louisiana that it will be operated with the ultimate of responsibility with respect to economy and efficiency, as I try to operate the other subcommittees.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am wondering what the regular staff of the Judiciary Committee does. Here is a committee that has $174,000 and more for its regular staff of four specialists and six clericals. In addition, as I pointed out in my statement a while ago, that committee will spend over $2,284,000. I am wondering why it is necessary.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I cannot give a full answer to the question at the moment, but we must keep in mind that the committee processes more legislation than all the other committees of the Senate combined. So there is much work for the staff to do. Of course, it could not be expected that the same sized staff which might be authorized for other regular standing committees would be adequate to do the tremendous volume of work that falls into the responsibility of the Judiciary Committee.

In order to save money, instead of spending the money that was authorized last year, in the amount of $30,000, I used the regular staff members to begin to develop and build up for the subcommittee to get started. In the meantime we have sent out somewhere between 300 and 500 letters to distinguished jurists, attorneys general, and heads of crime commissions throughout the country, sending them copies of these measures,

asking them to study them and give us reports thereon, with their views.

I used the staff of the regular committee to do that instead of spending the $30,000 we were authorized to spend last year. I used every approach I could to achieve economy in the handling of committee work.

I am sure that we could have spent it, but instead I used the regular staff to do it during the session when Congress was in recess.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I pointed out a moment ago, the Judiciary Committee has as many subcommittees as it has members, or thereabouts.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It reports more bills.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct in saying that the Judiciary Committee reports more bills than the rest of the committees put together.

Before the reorganization I recall that I was chairman of a small Committee on Claims. That work is being done now by the Judiciary Committee.

That single committee which I headed before 1946 reported more bills than the rest of the committees put together.

Today the Judiciary Committee is reporting more bills than the rest of the committees put together, but it has a large staff to do that.

There are immigration bills being reported every day and also private claims bills which were formerly handled by the Claims Committee. Those are insignificant bills insofar as the work concerned, because I can well remember when the Claims Committee handled the work. The Senators did the work. The Senators contacted or got reports from the Post Office Department, Commerce Department, and other Departments where there might have been claims. These claims were looked into very carefully by each Senator who served on the Claims Committee. We reported anywhere from 52 to 54 percent of all bills considered by the Senate.

Added to that is the large number of immigration bills. But I point out that as to all of the small claims bills, as well as the Immigration Committees, there is a battery of specialists, lawyers, and others receiving good salaries on the subcommittees to perform that work.

In addition to the two subcommittees that report the many bills to which my good friend from Arkansas has referred, and in addition to the large number of employees who serve on the Judiciary Committee, there has been created in the Department of Justice a large battery of lawyers in order to assist this subcommittee. As I understand, there is also an Immigration Service, where many people are employed who do a great deal of work that should properly be done by subcommittees of the Judiciary Committee.

If we were to add the cost to the Government of all the small claims, it would be many times more costly than the cost was prior to reorganization. I attribute that to the fact that prior to reorganization there was a special committee to handle this work. As chairman of that committee I had all Senators on the committee, including myself, take so many bills each week or each 2 weeks. We would report the bills and do most of the work ourselves. Now this work is being done at a very high cost by many lawyers on the Judiciary Committee and many lawyers in the Department of Justice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 195) was agreed to.

FEDERAL CHARTERS, HOLIDAYS, AND CELEBRATIONS

The resolution (S. Res. 192) to consider matters pertaining to Federal charters, holidays, and celebrations, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. Res. 192

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to consider all matters pertaining to Federal charters, holidays, and celebrations.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $7,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AUTHORITY TO STUDY MATTERS PERTAINING TO IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The resolution (S. Res. 196) to study matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. Res. 196

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

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

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

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $170,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AUTHORITY TO INVESTIGATE ADMINISTRATION, OPERATION, AND ENFORCEMENT OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 197) to investigate the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this is a committee that has been in existence for quite some time. In 1965, it employed 28 people. Now a request is being made for four additional employees. I notice that the amount requested is not increased. I am wondering if the distinguished chairman of this committee can account for the discrepancy that seems to appear here.

There were 28 employees last year when $431,000 was provided by the Senate. The request is made for additional employees with the same amount of money, $431,000. Are we to understand that some of those funds were returned to the Treasury?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, there is an error there.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much of that amount was actually expended?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. $375,232.13 was actually expended. I cannot keep all these things in my head, but a great many times the subcommittees, as well as the full committees, have employees on a part-time basis. They anticipate that if they have some work to do, it will require certain specialists, such as lawyers or technical employees, on a good many things depending on the work they have to do. The money is included, but they do not need it. They do not spend it.

Incidentally, I have been advised since the meeting that they do not need four more. It is three. That was a mistake on their part.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will it be 29 instead of 32?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. No. It will be 31 instead of 32.

Mr. ELLENDER. They are receiving the same amount of money?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. They are asking for the same amount of money.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 197) was agreed to, as follows:

S. Res. 197

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, insofar as they relate to the authority of the committee, to make a complete and continuing study and investigation of (1)

the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act of 1950, as amended; (2) the administration, operation, and enforcement of other laws relating to espionage, sabotage, and the protection of the internal security of the United States; and (3) the extent, nature, and effect of subversive activities in the United States, its territories and possessions, including, but not limited to, espionage, sabotage, and infiltration by persons who are or may be under the domination of the foreign government or organizations controlling the world Communist movement or any other movement seeking to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence.

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

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $431,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

The Senate proceeded to the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 199) to investigate juvenile delinquency.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Senate knows about the criticism I have lodged from year to year on the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee. This committee is requesting authorization of $260,000 to carry on its operation during the current year, an increase of $20,000 above the authorization received last year. Its budget provides for 21 employees, an increase of 3 over last year.

As I recall, at one time, my good friend from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] and I had a great deal of difficulty in finding a room to add to the Agricultural Committee. The Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee was short of space last year with the employees it then had. Yet it is now asking for three more employees.

The total funding which this subcommittee will receive during the 89th Congress amounts to $500,000. For the 88th Congress a total authorization of $384,300 was received. In the 87th Congress the total authoried by the subcommittee amounted to $411,000.

So we see in the span of 6 years and three Congresses an expenditure of $1,295,300 has been authorized for its fight to control juvenile crime. I might add that most of the early authorizations have been actually expended by the subcommittee and its staff.

For all its efforts and all its expenditures the problem of juvenile delinquency seems to be worse now than it was when this so-called temporary committee was brought into existence many years ago. I can only wonder what this expenditure of $1.3 million over a 6-year period has accomplished.

Mr. President, I have often said that juvenile delinquency should be combated at the local level if any real good is to be done. This struggle must be waged in the home, in the school, and in the church. As necessary from time to time it should be waged in the woodshed.

At this time I would like to bring to the attention of the Senate the effort to control juvenile crime that has been conducted over the past 10 years by Sheriff F. O. Didier, Jr., of Avoyelles Parish in Louisiana. I would like to bring the results of his efforts to the attention of the Senate as an example of what might be done to control juvenile crime when local officials take a real interest in our young people.

To begin with, I point out that Sheriff Didier's campaign has not been funded at the exorbitant level of approximately $400,000 a year. A sheriff has under Louisiana law the right to use 10 percent of the parish salary fund, not to exceed $10,000, for youth programs each year. I daresay that Sheriff Didier's program has shown more real and tangible results from this modest expenditure over the years than can be found from the expenditures of well over a million dollars the last 6 years by this Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency.

Avoyelles is one of the larger parishes of Louisiana. Delinqency has been on a steady decline in the parish since the sheriff's program was instituted. In 1957, the year the program got into full swing, there were 65 active cases of juvenile delinquency with a carryover of the last year of 39 cases. In 1960 there were only 15 active cases and as of August 1962 only 5 active cases of juvenile delinquency were recorded in the parish. Of these five, three were repeaters and as the sheriff points out with pride, not one of his juvenile delinquency cases from 1956 to 1962 had ever actively participated in his program.

In brief, Sheriff Didier has instigated in Avoyelles Parish an organization of junior deputy sheriffs. He and his men properly feel that the problem of juvenile delinquency, as with most other crimes, is a problem of prevention more than it is one of detection and detention.

He and his men regularly visit and lecture in the classrooms of the Avoyelles Parish school system. They acquaint the youngsters not only with the administration and operation of the sheriff's department but all of the departments of the parish government—the government which concerns them most closely. I have discussed his program at length with him and at this time I would like to submit for the record materials which indicate this organization's scope. I believe the Senate will find them interesting.

I shall not stand here and read it; but this pamphlet contains the rules and regulations of the Junior Deputy Sheriffs' League of Avoyelles Parish, La.

I have before me a memorandum explaining the full operation of this method of dealing with child delinquency.

As I have frequently said, the subject of child delinquency cannot be treated from the Capital City of the Nation; it must be done on the local level.

I hope that Senators will read the memorandum, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD, so that it may serve as a guide to what should be done in the respective States.

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

AVOYELLES PARISH JUNIOR DEPUTY SHERIFFS

I. INTRODUCTION

When I assumed the office of sheriff of Avoyelles Parish, La., in 1956, I felt the necessity of instituting a program whereby the sheriff's department and the citizenry of the parish could come together on a common ground to promote better law enforcement. Knowing this would be quite an undertaking and also a long-range program, it was decided to adopt a program of crime prevention rather than one of crime cure. To successfully put this program into motion, I realized that I would have to enlist the aid of the teenagers and their parents without discrimination as to race, color, or creed. With this thought in mind I visited sheriff's departments throughout the State reviewing and studying junior deputy programs instituted by other sheriffs. Their programs were found to be successful with the exception that the percentage of participation was too small due to the fact the participant was invited to meet at designated times and places and to overcome this, it was concluded, rather than have the student come to take part in the junior deputy program, the program would be taken to the junior deputy. The only means by which this could be accomplished would be to sell the public schools the idea of adopting this program as part of their class work.

II. PURPOSE OF THIS PROGRAM

A. To aid in reducing juvenile delinquence. It brings these children face to face with officers from different branches of law enforcement. They learn what a peace officer is and that these officers are really friends.

B. These junior deputies are educated in the field of law enforcement.

C. It elevates, in their eyes, the profession of law enforcement and they readily see that an officer would rather help out than to condemn.

D. The aid to schools and communities is a reality, as traffic deputies, schoolbus deputies, and civic organization can call on these children for special assignments.

III. ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION

A. Institution of the first class was made in September 1956, and graduated in May 1957.

B. To be a successful organization, the approval and cooperation of the Avoyelles Parish School Board was a "must," so I appeared before this body and outlined my entire program, and after discussion, the board agreed to give it a trial and after one school term (9 months) if it proved satisfactory it would be adopted as part of the 10th grade civic classroom work. At the end of the first school year, the school board then met and adopted this program to be a permanent curriculum of the schools of Avoyelles Parish.

C. Every high school in Avoyelles Parish is very active in this program. There are 12 white high schools with 22 classes, and because of consolidation there are only 3 colored high schools with 5 classes. With the participation of these 15 schools in the 1962–63 term, there were 27 classes. Schools have from one to five civic classes.

D. Junior deputy studies work in perfectly, as the 10th grade civic class is a study of government. The ages of the children are 14 years and up. At this age a child is very vulnerable. We feel that this program

will steer them in the right direction. The junior deputies meet once a month in their respective classrooms, where a different phase of law enforcement is presented each month.

E. This department was the first in Louisiana to have girls in the organization. Why not girls? Girls can be delinquent as well as boys. And it is a fact that every branch of law enforcement known has women officers. The girls, as do the boys, learn what a delinquent is and to prevent being one. There are boys and girls in this organization who are at the present time making plans to be law enforcement officers. A junior deputy sheriff graduates while in the 10th grade but they are junior deputies until they have completed their high school education.

F. Utilize all agents of law enforcement; and these officers are of the best in their respective fields. The consent of the child's parents must be given in writing to me or my aids before this child can be a junior deputy. The parents receive from me in writing the complete outline of the program. After consent of the parents the child must sign a pledge card whereby he or she promises that he or she will observe all rules of the organization. A State police officer from the Louisiana Department of Public Safety, division of the State police, lectures on all traffic laws of our State. A juvenile officer lectures on delinquency and the functions of his office. Instructors in fingerprinting, casting, investigation, and narcotics are brought before these children. These officers are the best in their respective fields. The district judge, district attorney, clerk of court, and assessor explain the functions of their office and how they tie in with the sheriff's department. The end of classroom work is with a first aid instructor, guns, boating, etc.

G. A field day is one of the highlights of the organization. On this day, which is a schoolday, each class is taken on a tour of the Louisiana State Penitentiary. On this tour the junior deputies see firsthand the way the convicts are required to work in the cane, cotton, and corn fields, under the gun, which leaves these children with a picture that they do not easily forget. They also visit the Louisiana State Industrial School for Girls, and Louisiana State Colony and Training School. This is a school and rehabilitation center for the mentally retarded, with ages ranging from 6 months to 70 years. This is very enlightening to most normal children, as it gives them an inside picture of different phases of retardation and what can be done to train and rehabilitate these people toward having a place in society. They are also made aware of the desperate need for legislation to enlarge and expand these facilities.

H. The first Saturday in May is always set aside for graduation day. It is always held in one of the cities where both white and colored high schools are located. The reason for this is to eliminate many miles of travel from one city to another and to cut down time for the participants of the program. A full day (9 a.m. to 4 p.m.) of entertainment is provided for both schools.

The program usually consists of distinguished guest speakers such as, the attorney general, superintendent of education, register of State lands, and etc. Other entertainment includes expert judo teams, aerial rescue operations (helicopter), tear gas and flare and safety in firearms demonstrations. They are also shown our trained police dogs and bloodhounds. In addition to this we also have professionals in lighter entertainment, such as tumbling acts, marionettes, and local talented students from each school. At the end of the day, the sheriff presents each junior deputy with a diploma. This concludes the years program for that particular class.

The sheriff's department furnishes free lunch, cold drinks, and transportation from all high schools to the junior deputies to and from graduation.

IV. FUNDS, PERSONNEL, AND EQUIPMENT

A Louisiana law permits the sheriff to use 10 percent of the salary fund, not to exceed $10,000 for youth programs. The personnel required to handle this program (outside of instructors) is the sheriff and two assistants. Equipment used to conduct this program are, projector, film, narcotic board, fingerprint and casting equipment, guns, tear gas, shells, flares, and junior deputy badges insignia and complete uniform.

V. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the organization of the Junior Deputy Sheriffs' of Avoyelles Parish has indeed played a big part in reducing delinquency. Delinquency has been on a steady decline in this parish since this organization was instituted. In 1957, there were 65 active cases, with a carryover of 39 cases; in 1960 15 active cases, petitions were filed. To August 22, 1962, five active cases, petitions were filed, and of these five cases, three were repeaters and not one of all these cases from 1956 to 1962 ever wore the junior deputy sheriff's uniform.

F. O. DIDIER, Jr.,
Sheriff, Avoyelles Parish.

THE JUNIOR DEPUTY SHERIFF'S LEAGUE, AVOYELLES PARISH, F. O. DIDIER, JR., SHERIFF

The junior deputy sheriff's league will be a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization. It aspires to give youth a wholesome and attractive program of activities with these main objectives:

To achieve a constant decrease of the juvenile delinquency rate.

To prevent accidents in traffic, on the water, and with firearms.

To acquaint youth with the functions of local government and law enforcement.

To demonstrate that law enforcement officers are not enemies, but friends.

To enlist the help of youth itself to keep others of their own age out of trouble, criminal files, courts, reformatories, and jails.

To render valuable services to the community through juvenile police work, training for general emergencies, assistance in the protection of life and property.

To stimulate an interest for the choice of a later career, possibly in one of the law enforcement branches, as highly qualified young men, and young ladies.

This program is no duplication of effort on the part of other youth movements. A great portion of its activities is novel, in its psychological approach as well as its execution.

It appeals to that majority of the boys and girls who do not belong to any organization whatsoever. It appeals to those boys and girls—among them many a born leader—with a vivid imagination and a strong urge for a change and thrills who cannot be attracted by the naturally limited scope of many boys' clubs activities.

It offers an opportunity to every adolescent boy and girl between 12 and 17 years of age to find recognition, encouragement, confidence, a new sense of security and worthiness, a constructive outlet for his pent-up energies, in learning to perform a practical task with real responsibility.

JUNIOR DEPUTY SHERIFFS, AVOYELLES PARISH, F. O. DIDIER, JR., SHERIFF

UNIFORM INSTRUCTIONS

All junior deputy sheriffs must provide themselves with, and posess at all times the uniform listed below:

Boys: Khaki caps with patch properly sewed thereto. Khaki long-sleeved shirts with patch properly sewed thereto. Khaki pants. Black tie.

Girls: Khaki caps with patch properly sewed thereto. White blouse with patch properly sewed thereto. Khaki skirt. Black tie.

Junior deputy sheriff's badge is worn on the left-hand pocket of the shirt.

Shirts are to have the "junior deputy sheriff" patches sewed on the left-hand sleeve, 1 inch from the shoulder seam.

Caps are to have "junior deputy sheriff" patches sewed on the left-hand side 1 inch from the center front fold. This is the side that is solid. Names are to be permanently marked on the inside of the caps for purposes of identification.

The badge and "junior deputy sheriff" patches will be issued to you by the sheriff and shall remain your property as long as you are an active member of the league. At any time you are removed from the rolls of the league, all equipment issued you shall be returned. All other articles of clothing shall be furnished by you.

Junior deputies shall wear the full uniform specified when attending regular stated meetings, special meetings, or on special assignment. No distinguishable part of the uniform, which would identify the wearer as a junior deputy sheriff, will be worn in conjunction with civilian clothes.

JUNIOR DEPUTY, AVOYELLES PARISH, LA., SHERIFFS' LEAGUE

PLEDGE

I, * * * on my honor, do promise to respect and defend the Constitution of the United States, the Bill of Rights, and the constitution and the laws of the State of Louisiana.

I promise to be regular in my attendance at school or in fulfilling the duties of my job.

I promise that I will always conduct myself in such a manner that my actions will reflect credit on me and the junior deputy sheriffs' league of which I am a member.

I promise that I will always strive, by my example of right living and right action, to lead others to do right and to assist those who are in trouble and deserve help.

I promise always to be faithful to the league in the execution of my duties, and to attend all meetings if it is within my power to do so.

I promise to use my influence to help maintain law and order in this community and to aid all law enforcement officers in the discharge of their duties.

I promise not to aid any criminal by keeping from law enforcement officers any information or evidence that I might have against any person charged with a crime and who might be under investigation.

I promise always to be fair to the accused and that I will not through ill will give any false testimony against any person accused of crime.

I promise to obey the orders of the chief, and the officers of the junior deputy sheriffs' league, and to respect the rules.

_____ _____.

APPLICATION FOR MEMBERSHIP IN THE JUNIOR DEPUTY SHERIFFS' LEAGUE OF AVOYELLES PARISH

Name_____
Address_____
Telephone No_____
Age:
Date of birth: Month, day, year_____
School_____
Grade_____
Church_____
Boy or girl's organization, if any_____
Parent or guardian_____
Date_____
To Sheriff F. O. DIDIER, Jr.:

I hereby consent to my son, daughter (name), (age), (address), (telephone No.), being a member of the Junior Deputy Sheriff's League of Avoyelles Parish, La.

Signature of parent or guardian_____
Date_____
Cap size_____

RULES AND REGULATIONS JUNIOR DEPUTY SHERIFFS' LEAGUE

ADMINISTRATION

I

The Junior Deputy Sheriffs' League of Avoyelles Parish will be under the personal direction and supervision of Sheriff F. O. Didier, Jr., who will be assisted by a staff of well-known and well-qualified instructors and advisory board, and a committee of sponsors.

II

All activities will originate from the junior deputy sheriff's headquarters located in the sheriff's office at Avoyelles Parish courthouse. This club room was designed and dedicated to the junior deputy sheriffs' league by the sheriff.

1. The primary purpose of organizing and maintaining a Junior Deputy Sheriffs' League of Avoyelles Parish shall be to preserve the peace, protect life and property, prevent the commission of crime, to build character, and promote good fellowship.

2. It shall be the duty of all members of the junior deputy sheriffs' league to promote good conduct, good sportsmanship, traffic safety, and good morals in their community.

3. Upon the zeal, loyalty, good judgment, and good conduct of each member will depend the success of the junior deputy sheriffs' league.

4. You have been appointed and have assumed the responsibility of an office; do not forget your character is your capital. Deal honestly with all persons and hold your word sacred, no matter where, when, or to whom given. Make yourself useful and aid all citizens in their lawful pursuits, and try at all times to merit the good will of all citizens.

5. Be prompt and courteous at all times, and endeavor to make yourself a leader in your community.

6. All members of the junior deputy league will be required to cooperate to the fullest extent with his superior officers, the sheriff, sponsors committee.

7. All members of the junior deputy sheriffs' league must be willing at all times to assume any and all responsibilities assigned to them by their superior officers.

8. Members shall be subject to dismissal for any violation of the following rules: (a) Willful disobedience of any order issued to him by any superior officer in the junior deputy sheriffs' league; (b) for willfully neglecting to attend regular meetings; (c) for persistent truancy from home or school and (d) for conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman; (e) for conduct tending to cause disorder in the junior deputy sheriffs' league.

9. All members of the junior deputy sheriffs' league must endeavor to attain some special skill or goal in one of the activities of the league.

10. All members of the junior deputy sheriffs' league will be responsible for the upkeep and cleanliness of the junior deputy headquarters.

11. All members of the junior deputy sheriffs' league will be required to keep their persons and any equipment which may be issued to them in a strictly neat condition and in perfect order and repair.

12. Badges will be awarded at the end of the 60-day term on the following basis: (a) regular attendance; (b) special skill for goal attained; (c) general attitude toward being a junior deputy sheriff; (d) good behavior; (e) interest; (f) cooperation; (g) responsibility; (h) loyalty; (i) honesty; (j) discretion; and (k) dependability.

13. All junior deputies when attending meetings or on duty shall wear the official badge on the outside of the outermost garment over the left breast.

14. All junior deputies will be furnished with a copy of the rules, regulations and instructions, and shall make themselves perfectly familiar with its contents.

15. Respect to superior officers, courtesy and fairplay is absolutely necessary to the discipline and the efficiency of the junior deputy sheriffs' league and must be maintained at all times.

16. Any complaint by any member of the junior deputy sheriffs' league, or any charge against any members placed by a superior officer shall be presented in writing to the sheriff. The full name, rank, and badge shall accompany such reports.

17. Any member of the junior deputy sheriffs' league upon dismissal or resignation from the league will immediately turn over to the officer in charge all equipment issued to him by the junior deputy sheriffs' league.

18. No member at any time shall wear his badge except at regular stated meetings or except when he is called out on a special meeting or special assignment.

Mr. ELLENDER. I will say to my good friend from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] that I am very hopeful that he will take time out to look at the memorandum which I placed in the RECORD with regard to the sheriff of Avoyelles Parish to note how this problem was handled at the parish level.

Note the story that I placed in the RECORD. I spoke at length with the sheriff last year and asked his permission to use the information. I was much interested in it. It all goes back to the proposition I have been stating all along: That this problem can be handled at the local level, rather than the national level.

Going back a little bit, why is it necessary to have, or why did the Senator ask for, more employees?

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. DODD. First, I say to my good friend from Louisiana that I shall, of course, read what the sheriff said.

The three additional employees include two minority appointees at the request of the minority members of the subcommittee, and one new stenographer necessary to carry on the work. This also accounts for the additional money.

Mr. ELLENDER. Two minority members?

Mr. DODD. Two staff employees for the minority members of the subcommittee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Could not the subcommittee handle its work with the staff it now has?

Mr. DODD. We feel that it could not. I felt that this was a reasonable, intelligent request. The minority employees are helpful and are doing a good job.

Mr. ELLENDER. How many minority employees will the subcommittee have?

Mr. DODD. Three.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why cannot the subcommittee dispense with some of the employees the majority has and let the minority use them? This practice has been followed right along. It has been used as a method of increasing the number of employees.

Mr. DODD. I assure the Senator from Louisiana that I am not trying to increase the number of employees.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is, though.

Mr. DODD. The work is increasing. Juvenile delinquency is a growing problem across the country. I wish it could all be handled locally. I would be happy if it could be. But I do not know how some of these problems can be handled locally, especially the narcotics problem. In that field, only the Federal Government can make a difference.

Mr. ELLENDER. I agree that it is a problem, but the subcommittee is not doing too much to curb the problem.

Mr. DODD. We are doing the best we can. The Senate passed the 1965 drug control amendments.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was away back.

Mr. DODD. Oh, no; that was last year.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thought that when the justification was made last year, that was one of the reasons for asking for the money. What has been done in addition to the report of last year?

Mr. DODD. On the drug problem?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; everything. How many days of hearings did the subcommittee hold, and where were they held?

Mr. DODD. A great many days of hearings were held. For example, consider the firearms bill alone. I do not have the figure at my finger tips, but the subcommittee held many days of hearings, in various parts of the country.

Many days of hearings were held on the drug bill, the narcotics rehabilitation bill, and the interstate adoption legislation. I can assure the Senator that the subcommittee has not been inactive.

Mr. ELLENDER. I agree to that; it keeps busy.

Mr. DODD. We do the best we can. I do not say we are going to cure all delinquency. I never said so. I like to believe that our work contributes to a considerable degree toward helping to cure these problems. I believe that the passage of the National Juvenile Delinquency Act, the drug control amendments, and the interstate adoption legislation is indicative of that. We now have before us the Narcotics Rehabilitation Act. I do not know what more we could do.

Mr. ELLENDER. With all due respect, it is my belief that these additional jobs are provided merely to raise the ante, so far as the minority is concerned.

Mr. DODD. No; that is not so.

Mr. ELLENDER. The work could easily have been done with the number of persons that have been employed up to now.

Mr. DODD. I assure the Senator that the minority members of the subcommittee are hard-working.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that; but it is merely patronage they are securing. Let us make that plain.

Mr. DODD. That just is not so. The minority members spend a great deal of time on the work. They attend the hearings and follow the proceedings carefully. Without their help, I do not believe we could do the work.

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

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. First, I agree with the Senator from Louisiana that it is time the Senate began to raise a question about the expansion of all these subcommittees. Perhaps we should investigate not only the expansion of the executive branch, but also the Senate itself to determine why we are overexpanding our committee staffs.

In line with the question about the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, I observe that the subcommittee was established about 10 years ago and was supposed to be temporary.

Mr. ELLENDER. Twelve years ago.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Still the committee is expanding. I notice that the language provides:

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

A similar proposal has been in each of these resolutions for the past several years.

I ask the Senator from Connecticut: What legislative proposals has the subcommittee ever recommended to Congress?

Mr. DODD. Congress passed the Juvenile Delinquency Act, the drug control amendments, and is now considering the interstate adoption legislation, and the national firearms control amendment. The subcommittee is currently holding hearings on the narcotics rehabilitation amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Did all of those bills come from the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, or from the Committee on the Judiciary as a whole?

Mr. DODD. No; all those to which I have referred came from the subcommittee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. What legislative proposals is the subcommittee considering now?

Mr. DODD. The Narcotics Rehabilitation Act of 1965.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thought that had been included.

Mr. DODD. No; that was the drug amendment bill, which was passed last year. The narcotics rehabilitation bill is new and altogether different.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Are the proposed additional employees to take care of the needs of the minority members?

Mr. DODD. Two of them are.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I join the Senator from Louisiana in asking why the subcommittee cannot take care of the minority from the existing authority; or is it merely patronage?

Mr. DODD. No, it is not merely patronage. The Senators have asked for this type of staff assistance. I felt, and feel now, that this help is necessary. There is a tremendous amount of work to be done on this subcommittee. I feel that the help is needed. The additional employees will help us.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I feel that at a time when we are spending nationally about $600 million a month more than we are taking in—living beyond our income—and when we are going to have to call upon the executive branch to curtail some of its expenditures, we in Congress should start to trim the requests of some of the subcommittees.

I commend the Senator from Louisiana for what he is trying to do, and I join him in the effort, although I recognize, as he does, that we are fighting a losing battle. If the Senate continues to expand its expenditures year after year, we do not stand in a good position to call upon the executive branch to reduce its expenditures. We should start in the Senate. There is plenty of room to begin reducing here at home. For years, ever since I first came to Congress—and I think the Senator from Louisiana will agree with me—there has been expansion, year after year, of the number of staff members. It has almost reached the point where members of committees do not even know who the employees are.

After all we have our own office staffs to help us in our work, and much of this work could best be done by the Senators themselves.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I have the greatest esteem and admiration for the distinguished Senator from Delaware. But the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] is very modest. I serve on the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency. One part of its activities, which extended over a period of almost 3 months, was the preparation of legislation that is vital to effective State and local law enforcement in the United States; namely, the bill introduced by the Senator from Connecticut to protect State firearm registration controls. It would prohibit the mail-order purchase of pistols and certain other types of firearms, contrary to State laws, and the sale to persons having criminal records and known to have a dangerous background in the use of such firearms.

This is a very controversial area. It requires a great deal of work. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] was working on this problem even before I was elected to the Senate.

I know that the hearings held last year were highly educational. Only last year the American Bar Association changed its position primarily because of the educational effect of the hearings conducted by the Senator from Connecticut, in which there was testimony by law enforcement officers from all over the United States, which pointed out that the bill would not prohibit hunters or shooters from acquiring firearms, but would protect and assist States in having adequate protection for their citizens.

This involved a tremendous amount of work by the subcommittee. The Senator from Connecticut did not mention it, and I thought I would add it to the RECORD.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I wish to add to what the Senator from Maryland has said. I have only recently been made a member of the subcommittee, whose activities are being reviewed, and about which questions are being asked.

A question has been raised as to the members of the staff, and whether certain appointments involve patronage.

In the brief time that I have been a member of the subcommittee, I have been deeply impressed by the competence and high caliber of the individuals who serve the subcommittee.

I believe that any adverse reflection upon the qualifications and dedication of the staff is unwarranted.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have a report and a statement printed in the RECORD.

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

SUMMARY REPORT OF LEGISLATION ACTED ON BY THE SENATE JUVENILE DELINQUENCY SUBCOMMITTEE DURING 1965

1. Year 1965 Drug Control Amendments (Public Law 89–74): The subcommittee devoted much effort to the final passage on July 8, 1965 of the 1965 Drug Control Amendments—a law that was developed by the subcommittee after several years of investigation into the uncontrolled and indiscriminate manufacture, sale, and distribution of dangerous drugs.

2. Exclusion of peyote from the 1965 Drug Amendments: Further investigations were conducted with respect to the widespread smuggling of narcotics and dangerous drugs into this country from abroad with a new emphasis on the developing traffic in hallucinogenic drugs. As a result of this investigation the 1965 Drug Control Act was amended to include peyote under its provisions. Further legislation is being drafted to cover new drugs of addiction which are not included in the present Federal law.

3. Interstate adoption legislation: The Senate passed subcommittee bill S. 624, the black-market baby bill on March 22, 1965, and it is now pending House action.

4. State Firearms Control Assistance Amendments of 1965: The subcommittee held extensive hearings regarding the administration's bill S. 1592 which proposes sweeping revisions of the Federal Firearms Act. Hearings lasted 11 days during which 48 witnesses presented testimony before the subcommittee. Because of the pointed opposition to this measure its consideration involved a large amount of research, travel, preparation, and handling of correspondence by the staff of the subcommittee.

5. The Narcotics Rehabilitation Act of 1965: During the latter part of the year the subcommittee undertook preparation for the hearings with respect to S. 2152, the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1965, introduced by the chairman on behalf of the administration. These hearings were commenced on January 25, 1966, and will continue for several months.

FLOOR STATEMENT ON SENATE RESOLUTION 199—PROPOSED ACTIVITIES ON THE SUBCOMMITTEE IN 1966—FEBRUARY 16, 1966

1. Legislative hearings on the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1965:

The subcommittee is conducting a thorough inquiry into the various State civil commitment programs to find the most efficient methods for handling Federal narcotic addicts. We are presently surveying rehabilitation programs in high addiction centers and consulting with the best technicians in the field. We have already started hearings which will last several months and I in-

tend to report out a bill which will not only resolve the problem of institutional handling but will include adequate provisions for aftercare and postinstitutional adjustment.

The Federal Government has historically been assigned the task of policing the international narcotic traffic. In view of the fact that we are still faced with a gigantic smuggling problem I feel it is time for a full review of our enforcement policies and an outline of our present posture in our fight against the narcotic, marihuana, and dangerous drug traffickers.

I will, therefore, include in these hearings expert witnesses from the fields of law enforcement and the judiciary with the view toward additional Federal legislation based on recent developments in the narcotic-dangerous drug traffic.

2. Amending and reporting S. 1592, the State firearms control assistance amendments of 1965, which would control the indiscriminate sale of firearms to juveniles and adult criminals.

This is an extremely controversial piece of legislation and one that will take a great deal of the subcommittee's time and effort in the first months of 1966. I am confident that we will report out an amended bill that will be acceptable to the Nation's sportsmen and hunters. Law enforcement officials from all over the Nation are eager to see this bill passed into law as they feel it will be a major weapon in our war on crime and delinquency.

3. Programs of rehabilitation and treatment.

Information has come to the subcommittee that inexcusably deplorable conditions exist in many parts of the country in State institutions for juveniles and in foster homes and detention centers. As I have stated previously, I feel that it is wise to put a great deal of emphasis on the prevention of juvenile delinquency. However, we should also concern ourselves with the problem of those children who are already delinquent and who have been committed by the Nation's juvenile courts to training schools, jails, foster homes and detention centers. In 1966 the committee will thoroughly explore the methods with which committed delinquents are handled. Furthermore, we will seek a legislative solution to the problem of inadequate facilities with the goal of a more humane and intelligent handling of these unfortunate youngsters.

4. An investigation of the use of hallucinogenic drugs by juveniles and youthful offenders.

We have found that with the reduction in the traffic in heroin in certain areas and increased penalties for the use of other dangerous drugs, large numbers of the Nation's youth are becoming involved with a whole new family of drugs referred to as the hallucinogenic drugs. Because of the bizarre nature of the effects of these stimulants, I feel they may be more dangerous to our young people than the traditional drugs of abuse.

The subcommittee has already begun a survey of this problem to determine the extent of the abuse of these drugs and the need for additional legislation to control their production and distribution. Prolonged use of such drugs as LSD–25 and mescaline has already caused serious crimes, aggravated antisocial behavior, and other eccentric behavior problems among large numbers of our Nation's youth. We must move quickly in this area in order to prevent an epidemic to spread among our young people as happened with the dangerous drugs.

5. In keeping with the subcommittee's interest in the crime problem in the Nation's Capital, we are conducting a survey of the Durham rule which is applied in cases where the defendant has entered an insanity plea.

We have preliminary results on this survey and I feel our final report on this subject will be a major contribution to the fields of criminology and jurisprudence. It will certainly make more efficient our efforts to handle certain types of offenders and dispel many of the accusations that have been made against this enlightened far-reaching court decision.

6. The interstate traffic in pornography and obscene material.

Mr. President, as you know, we have been involved in this investigation for several years. While this is a very difficult problem that does not readily lend itself to legislative solution, I feel that the subcommittee's experience in this area has been invaluable to local, State and Federal authorities charged with the task of keeping this traffic under control. We maintain frequent liaison with the Post Office Department and with the legal authorities of those cities throughout the country where pornography poses a sizable problem. We continuously refer to the Post Office Department information that we obtain on this traffic from concerned parents and responsible citizens throughout the country. I am still hopeful of arriving at reasonable legislative proposals that will permit the Federal Government to put a sizable dent in this multimillion dollar racket.

In addition to what I have just outlined, Mr. President, the subcommittee is working closely with the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime, and with the Departments of Justice, Treasury, and Health, Education, and Welfare, to develop new proposals and approaches to the delinquency problem as new findings become available particularly from crime control programs developed under the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act and the President's antipoverty legislation. During the coming year I expect to have referred to the committee other administration proposals which will require subcommittee investigation and hearings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 199) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to juvenile delinquency in the United States, including (a) the extent and character of juvenile delinquency in the United States and its causes and contributing factors; (b) the adequacy of existing provisions of law, including chapters 402 and 403 of title 18 of the United States Code, in dealing with youthful offenders of Federal laws; (c) sentences imposed on, or other correctional action taken with respect to, youthful offenders by Federal courts; and (d) the extent to which juveniles are violating Federal laws relating to the sale or use of narcotics.

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

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

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $260,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF NATIONAL PENITENTIARIES

The resolution (S. Res. 200) to investigate national penitentiaries was considered and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and inspect national penitentiaries.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

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

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

EXAMINATION AND REVIEW OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE PATENT OFFICE

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 201) to examine and review the administration of the Patent Office.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I observe with respect to this resolution that when I became chairman of the committee in 1961, the committee had nine employees. We reduced that number to six. Last year, we had an allotment of $120,000. We only spent $83,000 and returned $37,000 of that amount.

Last year we had 28 bills referred to us. We processed four of them to the point that they were enacted into law. Five of them were considered and indefinitely postponed. Hearings were held. There were three or four bills on the same subject. The hearings are completed and we are now ready to mark the measure up. We have undertaken to economize, and we have had some measure of success in doing it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution, S. Res. 201, was agreed to as follows:

S. RES. 201

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee

thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to conduct a full and complete examination and review of the administration of the Patent Office and a complete examination and review of the statutes relating to patents, trademarks, and copyrights.

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

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

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $110,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS CREATED BY THE FLOW OF REFUGEES AND ESCAPEES FROM COMMUNISTIC TYRANNY

The resolution (S. Res. 202) to investigate problems created by the flow of refugees and escapees from communistic tyranny was considered and agreed to as follows:

S. RES. 202

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the problems created by the flow of refugees and escapees from Communist tyranny.

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

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

SEC. 4. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $105,400, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF REVISION AND CODIFICATION OF STATUTES OF THE UNITED STATES

The resolution (S. Res. 203) to study revision and codification of the Statutes of the United States was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 203

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

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

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

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $42,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL STAFF FOR THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

The resolution (S. Res. 215) to authorize additional staff for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 215

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is authorized from February 1, 1966, through January 31, 1967, to employ one additional assistant chief clerk, seven additional professional staff members, and nine additional clerical assistants to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202(e), as amended, of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and the provisions of Public Law 4, Eightieth Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 180) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for continuation of certain studies.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I note that there is an increase of three employees and $50,000 in funds. I wonder if we could have an explanation as to the increased number of employees and the request for increased funds.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, we have asked that our funds, which were appropriated in the amount of $100,000 last year, be increased to $150,000.

I point out that on January 31, 1966, the committee returned $31,000-plus from last year's authorization. We have tried to economize in every way possible. Instead of having nine employees, as we had last year, we now have eight staff employees on the regular staff. Last year we had 10 employees on the resolution payroll. We now have seven. This number needs to be increased. The increase will largely be for additional clerical help and some additional professional help.

We deal with the confirmation of every postmaster appointed in the United States, excepting the fourth-class post offices. We deal with the health insurance of all Federal employees. We deal with their retirement benefits and with all aspects of the civil service, as well as the $5.5 billion operations of the Post Office Department.

We should like very much to be able to employ one of the outside accounting firms of national reputation to give us a study of the cost ascertainment so that we can have expert information when asked to increase the postage rates, particularly on second-, third-, and fourth-class matter.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, how much does the Senator expect to spend on the contract?

Mr. MONRONEY. The last time we contracted, in the 83d Congress, $50,000 was authorized. Not all of it was spent. This is one of the reasons that we have asked for $50,000 additional money. We hope by the economies we are making to employ some skilled technical staff members to help us on these postal problems.

This is the full Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and its five subcommittees. We are not asking for any money for subcommittees, as most of the committees have done. We feel that this is a modest request to equip this important committee that has broad jurisdiction over all civil service and post office matters. We must keep abreast with all that the law requires us to do. We must provide for comparability of Federal pay with the pay of outside businesses.

The committee is required each year to make a study of that matter. I certainly feel that we need this additional professional assistance to do the very important job which I am sure the Senate and the American people expect of us.

Mr. ELLENDER. Am I to understand that this is the only money that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is requesting, aside from the regular allocation made for the standing committee?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is correct. We had been asking for $100,000. Last year we did not spend the entire amount and returned $31,000. We are proud of that.

The Senate has our assurance that prudence and economy will continue to be characteristic of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 180) was agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 180

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and conduct such studies as may be deemed necessary with respect to any and all aspects of—

(1) the postal service, including determinations of the desirability and feasibility of utilizing to a greater degree modernized equipment and processing techniques in order to improve and perfect the basic functions of the postal delivery service;

(2) postal rates, including ascertainment of the costs of postal service, adjustments in fourth-class postal rates in order to maintain a proper balance between costs and revenue, and further study into the area of parcel post service as provided by Public Laws 82–199 and 88–51;

(3) the Federal civil service, including basic compensation adjustments in compliance with the policy of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, fringe-benefit compensation, particularly in the areas of health and life insurance and retirement annuities, and careful consideration of proposals to improve the overall quality of Federal civilian employment policies, practices, and personnel administration; and

(4) committee jurisdiction extending into the census and the collection of statistics generally.

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

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

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $150,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY BY THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

The resolution (S. Res. 206) authorizing the Committee on Public Works to make a study of any and all matters pertaining to flood control, navigation, rivers and harbors, water and air pollution, public buildings and all features of resources development and economic growth was announced as next in order.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I notice that a request is made for an additional employee. The same amount of money is requested as was requested last year.

Am I to understand that the committee did not have a full complement last year?

Mr. MUSKIE. This request does not involve any additional employee. We have the same number of employees.

Mr. ELLENDER. Four employees?

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. No additional employees?

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 206) was agreed to as follows:

S. RES. 206

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Works, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to flood control, navigation, rivers and harbors, roads and highways, water pollution, air pollution, public buildings, and all features of water resource development and economic growth.

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

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

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $110,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

FUNDS FOR THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

The resolution (S. Res. 209) to provide funds for the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Committee on Rules and Administration was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 209

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

(1) the election of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress;

(2) corrupt practices;

(3) contested elections;

(4) credentials and qualifications;

(5) Federal elections generally, and

(6) Presidential succession.

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

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

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $150,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

The resolution (S. Res. 211) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Rules and Administration was considered and agreed to, as follows:

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

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

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

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $67,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The resolution (S. Res. 178) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Small Business was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, may I say that the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] expected to handle this resolution. He is absent attending the Foreign Relations Committee hearing. I could handle it, but I am not as well prepared as he.

Senator LONG will be here in a moment, and I would like very much if the Senate would pass the resolution over until he arrives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

CONTINUATION AND ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

The resolution (S. Res. 189) to continue and to provide additional funds for the Special Committee on Aging was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 189

Resolved, That the Special Committee on Aging, established by S. Res. 33, Eighty-seventh Congress, agreed to on February 13, 1961, as amended and supplemented, is hereby extended through January 31, 1967.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of such committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of any and all matters pertaining to problems and opportunities of older people, including but not limited to, problems and opportunities of maintaining health, of assuring adequate income, of finding employment, of engaging in productive and rewarding activity, of securing proper housing, and, when necessary, of obtaining care or assistance. No proposed legislation shall be referred to such committee, and such committee shall not have power to report by bill or otherwise have legislative jurisdiction.

SEC. 3. The said committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable.

SEC. 4. A majority of the members of the committee or any subcommittee thereof shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony.

SEC. 5. For purposes of this resolution, the committee is authorized (1) to employ on a temporary basis from February 1, 1966, through January 31, 1967, such technical, clerical, or other assistants, experts, and consultants as it deems advisable: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (2) with the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to employ on a reimbursable basis such executive branch personnel as it deems advisable.

SEC. 6. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $221,000 from February 1, 1966, through January 31, 1967, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SEC. 7. The committee shall report the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967. The committee shall cease to exist at the close of business on January 31, 1967.

STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 193) authorizing a study of matters pertaining to constitutional amendments which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment, on page 2, line 18, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$117,685.00" and insert "$117,700"; so as to make the resolution read:

S. RES 193

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

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

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

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $117,700, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, did I understand that the committee increased the amount provided, or permitted it to be increased?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Just to even money, instead of 15 cents or something of that nature.

Mr. ELLENDER. The amendment, as I understood, increased the amount from $91,000 to $117,000.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. No. The amount requested——

Mr. ELLENDER. What was that request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will re-read the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 18, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$117,685,000", and insert "$117,700";.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I can answer the Senator's question very easily. The disbursing officer has stated that it requires a great deal of additional bookkeeping to account for odd dollars.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, why the additional employees?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if I may respond in the absence of the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. BAYH], who is unavoidably absent today, first of all, there will be an additional workload. The President has already suggested two constitutional amendments, one of them relating to the electoral college and the other relating to the 4-year term for Members of the House of Representatives.

In addition, there are other amendments or resolutions of a constitutional nature which go to that committee. In fact, I have had a few on that score myself, and I fancy that I shall have a few more before we are through. So that is going to be a busy committee, and obviously, they will have to have staff. When matters of this kind are delved into, it ramifies not only all over the country, but back into history.

Then, of course, we must have in mind the prospective results or the impact of a constitutional amendment. These matters have great appeal to professors of political science and to lawyers in the constitutional field, and the amount of testimony that is taken and the amount of spadework which must be done, I suggest, merits good staff.

I believe that the additional staff requested is thoroughly justified, and I say that notwithstanding the fact that the subcommittee does not always agree with me.

Mr. ELLENDER. What does the regular staff of the Judiciary Committee do, if all of these bills are considered by special subcommittees?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, may I suggest to my friend that in volume, the Judiciary Committee——

Mr. ELLENDER. I have heard that before.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Has the Senator heard it?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then the Senator may listen again: In volume, that committee handles more resolutions——

Mr. ELLENDER. More bills than all——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Than all other committees of the Senate put together.

Mr. ELLENDER. Right; I have heard that before.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me add one thing. The Senator should see the mail that comes in to that committee. Of course, all that mail must be answered, and we have to give the people a reasoned answer.

In addition, all these special items are separate and independent, and quite distinctly independent, one from the other. We cannot do it any other way.

I happen to serve on eight subcommittees of the Judiciary Committee. How in the world to get around to all that work is more than I know. If anything, we should be a little more liberal with staff. If I had it to do, I would double it.

They spend money like sailors down in the executive branch, and yet when we add two or three people, or add ten or fifteen or twenty thousand dollars, the old missile goes up. I am not so niggardly as all that.

In proportion as we are staffed, and in proportion as the facts and the data are developed and made clear, the Senate does a better job, and likewise the committees, before legislation is ever brought to this floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask for further recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wish to say to my friend from Louisiana that I tried once to get $5 million for the House Appropriations Committee, when I was a member, because I knew what staff can do.

If, over the recess period, when Congress adjourns, we send staff members into the departments, and tell the Secretary of the Department to give ear to what the staff man wishes, and let them supply him with the information, when the time comes for the procession of witnesses before the committee, here is someone who has labored for months in the departments, whose loyalties are to the chairman of the committee, and, Mr. President, you would be surprised at the difference it makes.

I wish to say for the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, that he has one of the best staffs on the Hill, by far, and I think he does a monumental job. The Senator himself does a monumental job because, when he sits there on civil functions and takes testimony day after day and week after week, he knows more about the little and big water courses of this country than any man I have ever known in my 33 years in the House and Senate, with one possible exception: That was Representative Mansfield, of Texas, who had come in in a wheelchair. But my friend from Louisiana has done an equally superb job.

Staff will do it. I do not know of any other answer. I would multiply the proposed appropriation twofold, if it were up to me, and yet I am not a loose-handed spender.

Mr. ELLENDER. May I say to my good friend from Illinois, if he will listen to me for just a minute——

Mr. DIRKSEN. With pleasure.

Mr. ELLENDER. I used to handle claims bills in the Senate. I can remember when I succeeded the late Senator Josiah Bailey as chairman of that committee. I am not trying to be critical of anybody, but there was a time when claims bills were introduced year after year and no action was taken.

When I became chairman, the Claims Committee actually went to work and passed on every bill that was introduced and referred to that committee. And when the committee made its report, the number of bills reported were about 54 percent of the total bills enacted in Congress.

Now all of that has been transferred to the Committee on the Judiciary. In addition, immigration bills go to Judiciary. That is why that committee has so many bills to consider.

But let us not forget that the work is being done by staff members which used to be done by Senators; and in addition to the committee staff members, we have created quite a large staff in the Attorney General's department to deal with problems with which we alone used to deal before the 1946 act.

I agree that it is nice to have staffs. I do not say this boastfully but I do not suppose there is a committee which has handled more important legislation, in recent years, than the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The Senator is familiar with what happened last year. We had many bills before us. We have many bills now.

It is my belief that those better capable of handling that work are the members on the committee with the committee sitting as a whole.

Mr. DIRKSEN. They could not, if the Senator will permit——

Mr. ELLENDER. I have been able to do all of that, not with four specialists, which I could employ, but only two. The more employees we use on committees the more they pass the buck to each other. That has been my experience since I became a Senator. If there are three or four economists or three or four lawyers on a committee, they will soon find themselves at loggerheads. If we employ one good economist and one good lawyer, they are going to do the work and will do it better than employing four or five on each side. At least, that has been my experience in the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But my good friend from Louisiana forgets that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry deals with a compact package, with bureaus that are all related in a single department of government. Here, there are so many unrelated factors, such as immigration, refugees, escapees, the National Code, the Criminal Code, prisons, and judicial machinery—and goodness knows what all. I should have the list here to read to the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have the list before me.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is good.

Mr. ELLENDER. I point out further that each committee is allocated about $170,000 for its staffing, but in addition to that the Committee on the Judiciary spends $2,484,000.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, but it has a professional staff complete with secretaries——

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It works constantly upon general matters such as claims, and upon the mail which comes in. They are constantly at work. Let me point out to my good friend that I am the only Republican chairman of that subcommittee. I have a committee of two—that is, myself and the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]. I hope the Senator from Louisiana will take note of that.

Mr. ELLENDER. Oh, yes. And one employee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, one employee, at $7,500 a year. We have made a great record. Last year, I believe, we reported 40 bills—that is, the Committee on Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations. Give us time, and we shall have something for every day, every week, and every month on the calendar.

Mr. ELLENDER. With so many subcommittees, I am wondering what the regular staff of the committee does, because we seem to create subcommittees for each subject to be dealt with. I am wondering what the regular staff of four specialists and six clericals does.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me ask the Senator, how can a staff member give time, for instance, to the question of immigration, and then flop around and work on the mess we call title VIII of the Criminal Code? Of all the messy things in the statutes, that is the worst. The Senator is lucky that we have not come in and asked for perhaps several hundred thousand dollars to get that job done. It will defy analogy by any criminal lawyer in the country. We have not asked for that money yet. I hope that the charity in my friend's heart will carry over when we come back for the rest of the money.

STUDY AND EXAMINATION OF FEDERAL JUDICIAL SYSTEM

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 198) to study and examine the Federal judicial system which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment on page 2, line 21, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$184,020" and insert "$184,000"; so as to make the resolution read:

S. RES. 198

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to conduct a study and examination of the administration, practice, and procedures of the Federal judicial system with a view to determining the legislation, if any, which may be necessary or desirable in order to improve the operations of the Federal courts in the just and expeditious adjudication of the cases, controversies, and other matters which may be brought before them.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to

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

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

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $184,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, in 1965, $100,000 was asked to pay for seven employees. In 1966, they are now asking for $184,000, with eight additional employees. I wonder whether an explanation could be forthcoming on this point.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] can answer that question.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the reasons for the substantial increase in the appropriation are as follows:

In the past, this committee has primarily handled regular matters pertaining to improvements in judicial machinery; but since last August or September, the committee has begun a study in three vital areas to improve the judicial machinery of the federal system particularly in the area of the efficiency of the Federal courts, and the great caseload problem. I was the Senator in charge of the bill last year on the omnibus judgeships, which required the addition of 31 Federal judges at the district level, and 10 at the circuit level. This was in addition. I believe that twice that many had been added only 4 years before.

The area which this committee is looking into is very important for the effective operation of the Federal judiciary.

First, we are going into extensive study as to the feasibility of revising the entire U.S. Commissioner system of the Federal judiciary, upgrading it to magisterial level and taking away some of the great caseload in the district courts.

We have been holding hearings continuously on this subject since before the first of the year. We are going to continue them and, hopefully will have proposed legislation in draft form ready by the end of this year.

This study, incidentally, has been requested by the Judicial Conference on at least three different occasions during the past 30 years.

Second, we are looking into the area of judicial fitness and the problem of the removal of judges by reason of senility, alcoholism, incompetence, laziness, or mental or physical disability, for which they cannot be impeached. Congressman Randolph, of Virginia, first requested legislation in this field in 1807. Thomas Jefferson, in 1819, stated that the impeachment system for the removal of unfit judges was merely a scarecrow. In the history of this Government, we have had only eight impeachments and four convictions therefor.

Hopefully, if we have this great caseload problem and an unfit judge on the bench, he will complicate it and immeasurably increase the problems already in existence.

These are the areas we are going to study. We need the best talent we can get to help with this study. We have fine lawyers and staff members on the subcommittee, as well as Senators, but they cannot be there continuously. We need the staff to do the job and, hopefully, we will do the job.

That is the reason for the increase in the budget.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE FOR FURTHER STUDY OF MIGRATORY LABOR

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 188) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for further study of migratory labor reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with amendments and then from the Committee on Rules and Administration without additional amendment which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments.

The amendments of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare are, as follows:

On page 2, line 5, after the word "workers", to insert "and", and in the same line, after the letter "(c)", to strike out "the effectiveness of pertinent programs established by the Economic Opportunity Act, and (d)"; so as to make the resolution read:

"S. RES. 188

"*Resolved*, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to migratory labor including, but not limited to, such matters as (a) the wages of migratory workers, their working conditions, transportation facilities, housing, health, and educational opportunities for migrants and their children, (b) the nature of and the relationships between the programs of the Federal Government and the programs of State and local governments and the activities of private organizations dealing with the problems of migratory workers, and (c) the degree of additional Federal action necessary in this area.

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

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

"SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $75,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee."

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR MAKING CERTAIN STUDIES

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 214.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 214) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Foreign Relations for making certain studies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 214) was agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 214

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make complete studies of any and all matters pertaining to the foreign policies of the United States and their administration.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; (3) to hold such hearings, to take such testimony, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; and (4) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government, as the committee deems advisable.

SEC. 3. In the conduct of its studies the committee may use the experience, knowledge, and advice of private organizations, schools, institutions, and individuals in its discretion, and it is authorized to divide the work of the studies among such individuals, groups, and institutions as it may deem appropriate, and may enter into contracts for this purpose.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $200,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 178.

The resolution (S. Res. 178) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 178

Resolved, That the Select Committee on Small Business, in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by S. Res. 58, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to February 20, 1950, as amended and supplemented, is authorized to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of the problems of American small and independent business and to make recommendations concerning those problems to the appropriate legislative committees of the Senate.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $145,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

PRINTING ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARING ON S. 4, 89TH CONGRESS

The resolution (S. Res. 207) to authorize printing additional copies of hearing on S. 4, 89th Congress, for the Committee on Public Works was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 207

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Public Works one thousand additional copies of the hearings helding during the Eighty-ninth Congress, first session, by its Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, on S. 4, the Water Quality Act of 1965.

PRINTING ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARING ON S. 3, 89TH CONGRESS

The resolution (S. Res. 208) to authorize printing additional copies of hearing on S. 3, 89th Congress, for the Committee on Public Works was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 208

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Public Works one thousand additional copies of the hearings held during the Eighty-ninth Congress, first session, by the Committee on Public Works, on S. 3, the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT ENTITLED "REPORT ON THE 5-YEAR RECORD OF THE ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS"

The resolution (S. Res. 219) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the report entitled "Report on the 5-Year Record of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations" was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 219

Resolved, That the committee print entitled "Report on the Five-Year Record of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and Its Future Role", issued by the Committee on Government Operations during the Eighty-ninth Congress, second session, be printed as a Senate document, and that three thousand five hundred additional copies be printed for the use of that committee.

WILFRED C. ROBERTSON

The resolution (S. Res. 222) to pay a gratuity to Wilfred C. Robertson was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 222

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Wilfred C. Robertson, widower of Elizabeth Bond Robertson, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum equal to one year's compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

FRED W. FRAY, SR.

The resolution (S. Res. 223) to pay a gratuity to Fred W. Fray, Sr., was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 223

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Fred W. Fray, Senior, widower of Iva L. Fray, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death (a sum equal to seven months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider, en bloc, the votes by which certain resolutions were agreed to during the calendar call today.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 18, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 17, 1966:

U.S. COAST GUARD

Rear Adm. Willard J. Smith, U.S. Coast Guard, to be Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard with the rank of admiral.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Surge for Clean Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. HOWARD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, the people of this Nation will be forever indebted to the man who has made the need for clean water a topic of conversation on every one's lips. I refer to our distinguished colleague, the dean of the Minnesota delegation, Mr. JOHN BLATNIK.

It would be an endless task to list the accolades that have poured in across the country in honor of the chief sponsor of such laws as the Water Quality Act of 1965. In appreciation of his great contribution to his Nation, our colleague has well earned the name, "Mr. Water Pollution Control."

Today JOHN BLATNIK is delivering an important talk before the Midwest Governors' Conference in Lexington, Ky., as part of his relentless campaign to clean up our rivers and streams.

I urge every Member of this House to read and digest this talk:

THE SURGE FOR CLEAN WATER

(Remarks of the Honorable JOHN A. BLATNIK at Midwest Governors' Conference, Lexington, Ky., February 17, 1966)

I am privileged and certainly honored to be invited to address this distinguished group of Midwest Governors. I convey the best wishes of your respective congressional delegations for a successful conference. It is indeed an inspiration to see successful leaders like yourselves turn so much attention to the enormous task of cleaning up our water. This is the kind of team effort we have fought for since the first water pollution control bill back in 1956. If we are to overturn pollution as the boss of our waterways, our joint effort must be a total all-out commitment.

During the decade since 1956 the Federal Government has spent approximately $200 million for treatment plant construction right here in the Midwestern States that are represented here today. This is not even a down payment on what should be done. This kind of pace in 1966 is like using the same tools today to cross the ocean that Columbus used. As you know, it took him 70 days to cross the Atlantic. Lindbergh crossed it in 33 hours. A B–58 can do it in a little over 3 hours, and 2 months ago our Gemini spacecraft covered that distance in just about 10 minutes.

Why is it then, with this fantistic advance of science, that we are still in the era of

Columbus when it comes to rolling back the tide of pollution? This, gentlemen, is the immediate and enormous task that we must set about. We need your leadership, your help. There is a big gap between 70 days and 10 minutes. But we are going to close it.

The surge for clean water soared to an all-time high in the 89th Congress. To help make up for lost time Congress directed five separate cabinet level agencies to zero in on what has been called the No. 1 domestic problem—that of cleaning up our waters. These bold, realistic steps are more in keeping with 20th century living. This all-out legislative effort will push us forward at least to the Lindbergh era. But the fact still remains that we have allowed pollution's poisoning power to become the absolute master of our waterways before we launched this fivefold 89th congressional attack for clean water.

Let's look briefly at the highlights of these major efforts:

Water Quality Act of 1965: This powerful instrument is the result of just plain hard work. We met with conservationists, with industrialists, with State and Federal officials, civic groups and many others to come up with a cross section representation of the needs of this vast program. I must admit some of these meetings were not too pleasant, but we called a spade a spade and so did our opposition. Finally, after 5 months in conference and about eight drafts of statutory language, we emerged with a strong workable bill that was a major, significant surge forward in our pollution abatement program.

Frankly, the States' role in the stepped-up program for clean water put us to the wall. Many said the States "have obviously failed—we cannot depend on them." But fortunately the majority of the conferees agreed—and I led that point of view—that the States should be given a chance to establish their own water quality criteria. If they comply, then this can be the basis for Federal standards. This is consistent with the team effort of having governments at every level work hand in hand to accomplish this task.

In addition to upgrading the whole program, this act also doubles the amount of the grants available for single and joint projects. It also makes $20 million a year available the next 4 years for waste-water research and development. I have summarized the contents of the act in the handout that you should have at your tables. Now let's move on briefly to other 89th Congress legislation that fortifies our all-out effort for clean water.

HHFA (Public Law 89–117): Now under new Cabinet head, Robert C. Weaver. This act includes authorization for 50 percent of project cost to local governing bodies to build public water and sewer facilities. The purpose of this act is to promote orderly urban development, especially in needed community facilities for low income families. As of this date $100 million was appropriated under this act for this fiscal year ending June 30, 1966.

Farmers Home Administration Amendments of 1965: Administered by the Department of Agriculture, grants for the construction of rural water and waste disposal systems will be available on a 50-percent matching grant basis. The grants are authorized to total $50 million annually for water and sewer facilities. It is expected that over 30,000 rural communities (less than 5,500 population) will qualify for this 50-percent matching grants. These grants are designed to serve a rural area and as such take up where other programs leave off, so as not to leave a gap between urban and rural programs. No grant will be made unless the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare certifies that the waste water carried by the proposed facility meets the appropriate water quality standards.

Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965: I was privileged to manage this act on the House side, and I am proud to say that we got the Federal share up to 80 percent in the neediest areas for water and sewer facilities. Basic criteria for eligibility for substantial unemployment and/or low family income. As you know, this program combines the best features of accelerated public works and ARA and authorizes $500 million annually for 4 years for public works and development facility grants.

Water Resources Planning Act: This act establishes a water resources council made up of the Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare, Interior, Agriculture, Army, and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission. The purpose of it is for maximum development of water resources by the coordinated planning of water supply needs by region. The act authorizes $5 million per year for 10 years to States for water resource planning, with emphasis on comprehensive development.

Encouraging as this legislation seems, it is but an idle paper entry unless we are able to harness the State leaders right here in this room in an all-out unprecedented "pull together" effort to meet the challenge at hand. One only need glance at the overpowering reality of the 20th century to appreciate the urgency of maintaining clean water. Look at the population explosion alone.

Keep in mind that our supply of water is more or less constant, but think that at the beginning of the Christian era—at the time of the first Christmas—there were only about 250 million people in the whole world.

In another 10 years there'll be that many right here in the United States. And we live on only 7 percent of the earth's surface. So it's time we take bold action commensurate with the era in which we live.

We have no choice but to manage and conserve this precious item called water. The same amount of water must be made to serve more and more people. This mandate is made clear by the fact that it took the human race over 2,000 years to develop a population of 3 billion people, and we are going to double that figure in less than 30 years. Right here in America we are growing so rapidly that we have almost the numerical equivalent of a new State of Kentucky every year. This is just people increase, not to mention the vast new technological, chemical, and scientific changes that correspond to such a growth.

Imagine the impact these changes have on our supply of water. One of the best yardsticks to demonstrate this impact of our changing times is the fact that our old processes are becoming obsolete so fast today that the average American industrial worker changes jobs 15 times and has to be retrained 3 times in the course of his career. So just as our highly retrained industrial worker gives his product the 1966 treatment, let's do the same for our Nation's water. Let us stop pretending that the ancient aqueducts that carry our combined sewer and storm runoff are sufficient. Like the up-to-date industrial worker, let's attack the backlog of unbuilt treatment plants. Let us prod our State pollution officers into firm action. Some of our States have been real laggards in this effort. Once we get a full, all-out commitment, then you prod us into increasing the Federal share of the cost of this national problem. The success of this joint effort stems largely from your initiative. Your cooperation made the highway program work. It will also make this program work.

A good example of strong, bold, realistic State action is the billion-dollar bond issue passed by New York State. The worst drought in two centuries has forced public action in that State. It's not hard to talk about clean usable water to New Yorkers. The lack of usable water has made it the number one topic of conversation. Restaurants were forbidden to serve water unless the customer specifically asked for it. This is a real paradox when the Hudson flows right by their doorstep, but severe pollution has put the Hudson water off limits. Even if it took the drought to bring the message home to New York, they responded, and in 6 years they hope to again have clean usable water. I salute New York's commitment and I hope other States will follow suit.

As we enter our 60th month of continuous economic expansion—the longest period of unbroken economic growth in the history of our Nation—I hope all of us here make a firm commitment to provide enough clean useable water to allow this economic trend to continue. Water is the lifeblood of our economy, yet through misuse and mismanagement we enter 1966 with torrents of pollution and a trickle of clean water. With your forceful help in the months ahead, we will reverse this.

We can count on help from others too. The Presidential Science Advisory Committee has just released its pollution panel report with over 100 recommendations ranging from assessing taxes on those who pollute to suggested enforcing procedures. This is not the only panel of experts channeling their efforts to restore clean water. With the fivefold increase of water in the United States, just in the last 50 years industry too is tooling up to meet this challenge—the industrially supported National Council for Stream Improvement has established five regional research centers, the soap and detergent industry spent over a million dollars last year to minimize the role of detergents as pollutants. We can also count on technical and scientific data to start flowing from the two national water quality labs that are staffing up now to join the surge for clean water. So you can see, many hands are at work in our common effort to unseat pollution as the king of our waterways.

The most helpful of these cooperative hands has been in the form of Federal incentive grants. From 1956 through 1965 the 13 midwestern States represented here today have received over $200 million in grants under the Federal Water Pollution Control and Accelerated Public Works Acts. This construction assistance for these 2,325 projects represents a total cost of $835.5 million. Your larger cities alone need a staggering $660 million worth of construction at present. By 1972 they must provide an additional $747 million worth of facilities.

Now I do not want to sound too critical, but the one area where we have failed the greatest and received the least amount of support is at the State level. Though the States have the primary responsibility for water pollution control, the 13 States represented here today have not put up $1 toward the over $835 million construction cost of these waste treatment plants just mentioned. The communities or municipalities have had to come up with over $635 million and the Federal Government came up with over $200 million in grants. So I urge you to go to your legislatures and bring the States into this program. Surely if the local communities can raise over $600 million and the Federal Government can put in over $200 million, then the State can come up with some financial grants. If one city like St. Louis can commit itself to a $95 million program, the State should be able to come up with as much, and more. One of the States here provides loans for treatment construction plants, but I was horrified to learn that none of our 13 States provide construction

grants. I hope you will join the all-out effort and urge your legislatures to correct this. The alternative, and you would not wish to countenance it, is having your cities bypass the State entirely and deal directly with the Federal Government in Washington.

If these States would authorize construction grants like some of their sister States do, we on a Federal level would have a much easier job. As you know, the Federal construction grants program expires June 30, 1967. How do you expect us to renew this program if we have to report that blocks of States like this group meeting here today do not put one 1 cent for construction grants. This is the same kind of inactivity that forced the Federal Government to go in and set standards. The States failed to act and the Federal Government was forced to step in.

Stepped-up State activity in all aspects of water pollution prevention, control, and abatement is now urgently necessary. Your universities are training and turning out scientific minds eager for the challenge. Put them to work for you in developing effective solutions to your complex problems. In your efforts to further your State's economic growth and progress, keep the long-range interest in view. Insist that the new industries attracted to your States abide by your conditions for waste disposal. They would be the first to leave if their supply of acceptable water should run out. Enforce these conditions, as well on all water users in your State. A modern treatment plant is a considerable investment. It would be better protected if the State provided for certification of those entrusted with its operation and maintenance. These are only some of the measures to be taken. Most important, of course, is the effective administration and implementation of the laws you already have for controlling water pollution.

I hope we can have more meetings like this one in order to better understand our mutual problem of cleaning up our water.

In closing then I just want to remind you of President Johnson's closing remarks at the signing of this Water Quality Act of 1956: "The ultimate victory of cleaning up our waters really rests in the hands of all the people of America, not just the Government in Washington. Much of the money, imagination, and effort must be generated at the local level."

Thanks again for your indulgence, and I firmly believe with your help and cooperation water pollution can be conquered in this century.

The People of Louisiana Are Grateful to the Corps of Engineers for Their Assistance Following Hurricane Betsy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, it would be difficult for the average person to imagine the tremendous amount of devastation wrought by Hurricane Betsy when it hit Louisiana last fall—only if you had personally witnessed this tragedy would you comprehend the magnitude of the task undertaken by the Corps of Engineers to repair and rebuild facilities necessary to the health and safety of the people of Louisiana, and to assist them in debris clearance. The Corps of Engineers rose to the challenge and are accomplishing this herculean task in a remarkable manner.

To commend the Engineers for this magnificent job, I have written the following letters to the Chief of Engineers, Lt. Gen. William F. Cassidy, and the district engineer in Louisiana, Col. Thomas J. Bowen:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 16, 1966.

Lt. Gen. WILLIAM F. CASSIDY,
Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL CASSIDY: Now that the shock of the disastrous Hurricane Betsy, which struck Louisiana with such fury last fall, has passed and reconstruction is underway, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the Corps of Engineers for the magnificent role which they played in aiding and assisting our stricken State.

Without the capable help of the engineers, Louisiana could not have so rapidly made strides toward recovery from the devastating effects of this storm, perhaps the worst hurricane ever to hit our shores. Naturally, much remains to be done to obtain further protection from future storms of a similar nature, however progress is being made toward this goal, which is encouraging.

You can be assured that the people of Louisiana will long remember the helping hand of the Corps of Engineers which was extended at the time of their greatest need.

With kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely,

JAMES H. MORRISON,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 16, 1966.

Col. THOMAS J. BOWEN,
District Engineer, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New Orleans, La.

DEAR COLONEL BOWEN: The people of Louisiana owe a tremendous debt of gratitude to you for the wonderful job that the Corps of Engineers did in aiding and assisting the State in recovering from the devastating effects of Hurricane Betsy.

Only those who personally witnessed the awesome damage will know to the fullest extent the magnificence of this accomplishment. The capable and willing help of the corps will always be remembered and appreciated by a grateful State.

With kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely,

JAMES H. MORRISON,
Member of Congress.

The 56th Anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD RUMSFELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, this month the Boy Scouts of America are celebrating their 56th anniversary.

The history of this outstanding organization is one of which all Boy Scouts—past and present—can be tremendously proud. The Boy Scouts were chartered by Congress in 1916. In the past 56 years, more than 37 million Americans have been members of the Boy Scouts; the Scouts have more than 5½ million members today. Many of our Nation's leaders were Boy Scouts in their youth.

The Boy Scouts work to develop honorable young men of initiative and good character. Good citizenship and good sense is stressed.

I join with millions of other Americans in saluting the Boy Scouts of America and in wishing them continued success.

The Office of Emergency Planning Rendered Magnificent Service to Louisiana in Aiding and Assisting the State To Recover From the Effects of the Disastrous Hurricane Betsy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, Hurricane Betsy was one of the most disastrous storms ever to hit this hemisphere in all history, and at the time that the Louisiana people so desperately needed help, and needed it quickly, the Office of Emergency Planning arrived—hardly before the wind stopped blowing. In fact, President Lyndon Johnson literally put them off the Presidential plane when it arrived in New Orleans with instructions to "get going and get the job done" and they did just that. They set up headquarters immediately and did an amazing job in the weeks that followed.

In view of this tremendous accomplishment, I have written the following letter of commendation to the Honorable Franklin B. Dryden, Acting Director of the Office of Emergency Planning:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 16, 1966.

Hon. FRANKLIN B. DRYDEN,
Acting Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DRYDEN: There is an old adage which goes "a friend in need, is a friend indeed," and I would like to take this opportunity to thank your agency for being such a magnificent friend to the people of Louisiana in their hours of deepest need following the devastating Hurricane Betsy.

The fine assistance of your agency in organizing, coordinating, and directing Federal emergency relief held the tragic effects of this storm to a minimum by helping to prevent further loss of life and human suffering, and by aiding and assisting our State in overcoming this tragedy.

Louisiana will be forever grateful to your agency, and to your capable, hardworking representatives, who went far beyond the call of duty to come to the aid of our stricken State.

With kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely,

JAMES H. MORRISON,
Member of Congress.